P1
964
A5006 U.S. Congress. Congressional Record
23 -

Appendix

U.S. Naval Academy Experiences Best Attended Open House Weekend for Parents and Relatives of New Midshipmen—One Family Delegation Includes Mother, Father, and Nine Brothers and Sisters of Plebe From New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is my belief that among our country's most vital investments are those in the service academies and the capable young men selected for education and officer training there. It is pleasing when I am afforded opportunities to become better acquainted with developments at the academies.

As a former college professor and university administrator and as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, I appreciate the value of efforts to elicit the personal interest of parents and to better orient them on educational and related programs for their children. It is heartening to know that our service academies are performing with a high degree of expertness in the worthy field of engendering more intimate parental and public interest in and knowledge of their programs. In the process, the academies are enhancing not only their public relations posture and their capabilities but also are improving esprit de corps.

It is a privilege to make a special report on the most recent case in point. I begin with a quotation as follows:

> It is my hope that 4 years hence the then Superintendent will be able to express to you his pride in having seen your sons living up to my expectations.

Thus spoke Rear Adm. Charles S. Minter, Jr., U.S. Navy, incumbent Superintendent of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., as he closed an informative and meaningful address to parents of Academy plebes last Saturday night, August 29, 1964.

The occasion was a parents' forum, one of the highlights of the 15th annual Open House Weekend at the Naval Academy, August 28, 29, and 30, 1964, for parents, guardians, and other relatives of this year's entering class of midshipmen—the fourth class—the class to graduate in 1968.

On the same program, Dr. A. Bernard Drought, D.S., Academic Dean of the Naval Academy, told the plebes' parents and guardians:

> We saw your young men this morning on the parade ground. If 4 years from now the class has the same pride and enthusiasm that we saw today, the U.S. Navy will be in good hands * * *

And from the Academy's Commandant of Midshipmen, Capt. Sheldon H. Kinney, U.S. Navy, the parents heard these significant comments:

> We strive constantly to imbue your son with the highest ideals of duty, honor, and loyalty * * * Emphasis is placed on self-reliance and self-confidence. This in turn leads to a deep sense of responsibility and dedication.
>
> The officers on duty at the Naval Academy see your son not just as a midshipman and student to whom on graduation day we shall say goodby, but as a future shipmate on whom we shall rely at sea in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I acknowledge the courtesy and cooperation of the capable and dedicated superintendent, Rear Admiral Minter, and the efficient and helpful academic aide to the superintendent, Capt. Robert W. McNitt, U.S. Navy. The latter, scheduled to be promoted to rear admiral and soon to leave the Naval Academy staff for other duties, received a deserved tribute from the superintendent and an appropriate affirmative response by the parents when he presided with distinction as moderator of the parents' forum.

At my request, they supplied pertinent information which is the basis of this presentation.

It is pleasing to report to my colleagues of the Congress that this year's Naval Academy parents' open house weekend was the best attended in the 15-year history of these significant annual events in Annapolis. Although the registered attendance probably was below the actual total attendance, formal registration records revealed the presence of at least 1,818 parents. The previous high was 1,722 in 1963. Total guests registered numbered 3,612. This compares with the 3,211 registered in 1963, or 401 more this year than last year's record total.

The Department of the Navy and the Superintendent of the Naval Academy and his staff merit commendation for these achievements and for having perpetuated and expanded this annual parent-plebe reunion and orientation event inaugurated in September 1950 by the Superintendent at that time, Vice Adm. Harry W. Hill, U.S. Navy.

Parents and guests visited the Naval Academy last weekend from as far away as Heidelberg, Germany, and Hawaii.

Academy officials report that probably the largest single family delegation came from Scarsdale, N.Y.—mother, father, and nine brothers and sisters of a plebe.

The father of another plebe said he was a Polish prisoner of war in Germany for 6 years prior to liberation by U.S. forces. He and his wife from the 41st Congressional District of New York were touchingly grateful to see their son at "this beautiful U.S. Naval Academy."

Reports I have received from parents who participated indicate that there was extensive praise and appreciation for the opportunities afforded parents to visit the Academy and to be with their sons, to observe the state of their well-being, and to marvel at the progress of the regiment of plebes in the short period they have been at the Academy. Most entered the first week of July.

Visitors from distant States and the closer ones alike expressed gratitude for the opportunities, facilities, and expert guidance and instruction provided by our Federal Government for the education, training, and character building of their sons.

My colleagues of the Congress will be hearing from grateful parents just as I have been privileged to receive expressions of appreciation from kin of midshipmen whom I was privileged to nominate. It is to be anticipated and hoped that the superintendent and his staff will be recipients of hundreds of deserved messages of commendation for their outstanding work with the plebes and for the excellent program.

Mr. President, highlights of the 3 days were: liberty for plebes with their parents; open house in academic departments; YP boat trips and sailing; tours of Bancroft Hall service facilities for the brigade of midshipmen; Saturday morning regimental parade—four battalions of plebes; athletic programs and exhibitions; Saturday evening meal for parents and plebes together in midshipmen's mess—largest in the world; band concerts; parents' forum in the fieldhouse; reception for parents and plebes, academic department heads, and battalion and company officers; formations for Catholic mass and for Protestant chapel services; open house in Bancroft Hall and parent visits with sons in their rooms. The weekend closed with the evening meal formation Sunday.

Today, with about 4,000 midshipmen—approximately 1,250 of them plebes—the Naval Academy occupies 292 acres and has 219 major buildings containing classrooms and laboratories. Its athletic fields and other facilities are among the finest in the country.

From the time of its founding, the Naval Academy has graduated over 33,000 officers.

The first basic indoctrination in the Navy way of life is now completed for the new class and, as members of the brigade of midshipmen, the plebes will be expected to become good shipmates as well as exemplary leaders and followers. The next 4 years of study and hard work will form the foundation for their careers of service to the U.S. Navy and the Nation. In later years, they will rely many times on the experience and mature judgment they gain during 4 years at the Naval Academy.

We extend to the midshipmen of all classes our best wishes as they now enter a new academic year.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Mr. President, I join the overwhelming majority of parents of the Naval Academy class of 1968 who expressed obvious and sincere approval at the parents' forum when Admiral Minter forthrightly enunciated his policies with respect to church service attendance and participation by all midshipmen. I am personally and officially in accord with the superintendent's belief that the midshipmen need spiritual guidance as well as physical, academic, and service training. He cogently points out that these future officers will have the duty and the responsibility to make provision for religious services for men of the Navy around the world and on the seas. They must not be spiritually deficient and without adequate knowledge of how properly to fulfill this mission.

Religious facilities and churches at the Naval Academy and in Annapolis are of high order. The chaplains on duty at the Academy are dedicated, active, and helpful in serving the brigade of midshipmen and the permanent party. I feel sure that most of the parents of the new midshipmen verified and observed these facts and feel comforted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, in the order listed, excerpts from remarks made at the parents' forum of the 1964 open house weekend at the U.S. Naval Academy, August 29, by Rear Adm. Charles S. Minter, Jr., U.S. Navy, Superintendent; by Dr. A. Bernard Drought, D.S., the academy dean; and by Capt. Sheldon H. Kinney, U.S. Navy, Commandant of Midshipmen.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF THE SUPERINTENDENT, REAR ADM. CHARLES S. MINTER, JR., AT U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY PARENTS' FORUM, AUGUST 29, 1964

I am particularly pleased to greet the largest number of parents and relatives we have ever had at the Naval Academy during parents' weekend. (3,612 registered—400 more than last year.)

I hope that you are as pleased as we are with the spirit, enthusiasm and progress of the class of 1968. The parade this morning was indicative of the pride they have in themselves and in their class.

You might be interested in the profile of the class of 1968: 6,220 young men were nominated; 1,334 were admitted; 79 percent came directly from public schools; 70 percent stood in the first fifth of their high school class; 38 percent were national honor society members.

The past 9 weeks have been extremely busy ones, covering a wide range of activities, including: Infantry training, seamanship and navigation, academic lectures, validation examinations, physical training, rifle range, military indoctrination.

All have been crowded into an extremely busy summer which was specifically designed to prepare your sons for entrance into the brigade of midshipmen.

This class is entering at a particularly auspicious time. Your sons will have the advantage of a fine new curriculum which has been approved just this summer by our Secretary of the Navy, and which is being introduced for the first time with the class of 1968.

They will see the results of a strengthened faculty which our academic dean, Dr. Drought, will discuss later on.

The renovation of Bancroft Hall which will be finished next winter will make it possible in the future for the brigade to be housed in modern two-man rooms. The new mess hall which you perhaps have already seen is a great improvement, and the modernization of the academic facilities headed by the construction of a badly needed new science building, will make a great difference in our ability to advance and modernize our educational program.

All of these improvements combine to provide this class with the best of facilities and educational opportunities.

I would like to mention briefly a major difference between the Naval Academy and other institutions—a difference highlighted by the mission of the Naval Academy. The execution of our mission to develop midshipmen morally, mentally, and physically and to imbue them with the highest ideals of duty, honor, and loyalty, is the responsibility of everyone assigned to the Naval Academy—officer and civilian. Our officers working with your sons are from all branches of the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Assistance is available to your sons from a variety of sources: His first classman, his company officer, the commandant, the chaplains and medical officers, his professors and his athletic coaches. There is no reason why any man who has a problem cannot find help in solving it.

It all boils down to the fact that your son is now in—unquestionably—the finest institution of its kind in the world. We are all here to give him the best that we can, but we are going to require that he meet the standards which are not unreasonable. All that we ask from him in return is his best effort to assist us in the accomplishment of the Naval Academy mission.

It is my hope that 4 years hence the then Superintendent will be able to express to you his pride in having seen your sons living up to my expectations.

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BEFORE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY PARENTS' FORUM, BY THE ACADEMIC DEAN, DR. A. BERNARD DROUGHT, AUGUST 29, 1964

Your young men are embarking on a career that follows a long blue line which started before the Civil War when we were a young nation and hardly recognized as such by the great powers of Europe and Asia. The great esteem and respect we Americans enjoy throughout the world has been made possible only because of the sacrifice, the leadership, and the great respect that people the world over have recognized in the officers and the men of the U.S. Navy and the Marine Corps. Your sons are following in the foosteps of officers like Mahan, Dewey, Halsey, Nimitz, and King. At least 25 percent of you parents here tonight are the proud parents of a future naval officer who will command and have the full responsibility for a U.S. man-of-war. Many times during his lifetime he will lay his life and his commission on the line and stand for what he believes to be right. His home, his church, and his school have already done much to develop this courage, these ethical qualities that are so rare and unpopular today. Yes, tonight you have every reason to be proud, and all I can say is congratulations.

The heart of any educational institution is its faculty. The officers and civilian members of the academic departments, the physical education department, and the fine officers of the executive department have all been carefully selected, and each will make his own unique contribution to your son's education.

This fall we hired 33 new outstanding civilian faculty members; 13 hold the Ph. D. and all but 1 have a master's degree with additional work toward the doctorate; 101 new officer instructors reported aboard to replace an equal number who have gone on to other assignments in the Navy. These are all professional naval officers, but look—4 have the Ph. D., and 69 have their master's degree. We can and will give your young man more personal attention than any civilian college in the country.

We can't, however, guarantee him an education or a degree, for as I told your son's class last week—we really teach very little—a student learns. And the burden for learning is on the midshipman. We can and will guide him in every way possible, but in the final analysis, it is the learning process which is all important.

In describing the new curriculum which is available to your sons this year for the first time, I would like to highlight several features.

First, as in any professional preparation, the new curriculum provides professional naval science courses every term throughout the 4 years. These are courses which are unique to the naval service.

Second, a course in the social sciences and humanities is taught every term for 4 years, since naval officers must be educated gentlemen in every sense of the word.

Third, an improved preparation in the basic sciences and engineering is provided.

Fourth, every midshipman is offered an opportunity to choose a field of concentration within his basic curriculum, allowing him to take about six courses which are of interest to him and of value to the Navy.

In addition, the proven features of the Naval Academy educational program—validation of college level courses previously completed, and the opportunity to take additional elective courses will be continued.

We saw your young men this morning on the parade ground. If 4 years from now the class has the same pride and enthusiasm that we saw today, the U.S. Navy will be in good hands.

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BEFORE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY PARENTS' FORUM, BY THE COMMANDANT OF MIDSHIPMEN, CAPT. SHELDON H. KINNEY, USN, AUGUST 29, 1964

Parents and guardians of the Naval Academy class of 1968: As Commandant of Midshipmen, it is my privilege to command the brigade. I share with you at the dress parade today that tremendous surge of pride when your sons passed in review. The magnificent progress which they have made in the 9 short weeks since they took the oath of office as midshipmen in the U.S. Navy was evident in their military smartness. You have good reason to be proud of your sons.

Today in your tour of Bancroft Hall you had the opportunity to see the fine facilities which our Nation has provided for the midshipmen's logistic support. You witnessed the caliber of personnel as well as facilities for your son's medical care, dental care, religious needs, and physical exercise. Tomorrow you will have the opportunity to visit his fine room.

While I am sure that physical facilities are of interest to you, the real heart of your son's life at the Naval Academy is the process of his molding into the disciplined young officer. We strive constantly to imbue your son with the highest ideals of duty, honor, and loyalty. This is accomplished through precept and example by prescribing a way of life in keeping with the requirements, the customs, and the traditions of the naval service. Emphasis is placed on self-reliance and self-confidence. This in turn leads to a deep sense of responsibility and dedication.

When the midshipman takes his oath of office, it is impressed on him that he is entering a career of voluntary service to his country and that this service requires his complete allegiance. You have nurtured and developed your sons; our responsibility is to continue this development in mind, body,

character in order that they may become enthusiastic and competent career officers.

The officers who have the closest daily contact with your sons are their company and battalion officers. These officers of the Navy and Marine Corps have been selected especially for that duty. They are tremendously interested in each midshipman of their organization as an individual and monitor his progress in every field with vital concern. They will require the most strict standards of appearance and behavior; yet, while stern in their discipline, as good leaders, their role is to assist your son in every field, as well as to conduct military indoctrination.

The officers on duty at the Naval Academy see your son not just as midshipman and student to whom on graduation day we shall say goodby, but as a future shipmate on whom we shall rely at sea in the years ahead.

American Bar Association Study of the Communist Meaning of Peaceful Coexistence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the American Bar Association, through its standing Committee on Education Against Communism, has recently undertaken the task of analyzing over 500 Communist documents and statements as they relate to and shed light on the Communist meaning of "peaceful coexistence." The association has performed a fine service to the country in issuing this study and making it available to students of foreign affairs, teachers, libraries, Government agencies, and the public.

I should like to take this opportunity to commend Mr. Morris I. Leibman, chairman of the ABA Committee on Education Against Communism, for commissioning this study and Dr. Richard V. Allen of the Center for Strategic Studies at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., for undertaking the task of analyzing this new Communist technique for "waging a many-pronged offensive at and within the non-Communist world," as he states in his booklet, "Peaceful Coexistence—A Communist Blueprint for Victory."

At a recent press conference in New York City, Dr. Allen pointed out that "peaceful coexistence meant living peacefully as neighbors and not trespassing upon one another in a 'world safe for diversity.'" He went on to say that it was important for Americans to know and understand the different meaning that the Chinese and Russian Communists place upon the term. In his booklet, Dr. Allen wrote:

It is clear that when Communists employ the language of peace, they do so to mask their true strategic purposes: the isolation, encirclement, weakening and destruction of the free world and its way of life. The cold war has not concluded, but has entered a new and still more complex phase in which the spectrum of psychological, political, economic, and class warfare will be radically expanded.

Mr. Speaker, the goal of the Communists is total victory over all non-Communist institutions and societies. The Soviet Union continues to train Communist agents throughout the world in the tactics of subversion, infiltration, propaganda, sabotage, and other techniques for their offensive against the free world, whereas our country and other countries of the free world have failed to undertake intensive research and training to counter this offensive, and to awaken the people to the dangers of communism. The ABA study can be an effective weapon in the free world's continuing struggle against the forces of communism. I urge interested Members to acquaint themselves with this report.

Supreme Court Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues a very eloquent and outstanding address which was delivered by the distinguished Representative from the Third District of South Carolina, the Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, in Atlanta on August 15, 1964. The address was delivered by Representative DORN to the Order of the Stars and Bars and the Sons of Confederate Veterans, at their annual convention in Atlanta.

Representative DORN was introduced by the commander in chief of the convention, State Representative John A. May, of Aiken, S.C. Representative May is a respected and able member of the State legislature. He represents my home county in the South Carolina House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I find myself in full agreement with the comments made in the address, entitled "Supreme Court Dictatorship." I commend the address to all my colleagues in Congress, and therefore ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so they will be available for all Members of Congress to read and study.

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

SUPREME COURT DICTATORSHIP

(Excerpts from address by Representative WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN before Order of the Stars and Bars and Sons of Confederate Veterans in annual convention at Riviera Motor Hotel, Atlanta, Ga., Commander in Chief John A. May, Aiken, S.C., presiding)

It is good to visit the hospitals, progressive, and friendly city of Atlanta. It is a pleasure always to be a guest in the congressional district of my warm personal friend, the Honorable CHARLIE WELTNER, and to bring you greetings from your outstanding Georgia delegation to the Congress. I congratulate the people of the great State of Georgia for sharing with the Nation the leadership, wisdom, and integrity of RICHARD B. RUSSELL and HERMAN E. TALMADGE. I supported RICHARD B. RUSSELL with every ounce of energy when he was a candidate for the Presidency. There is no man in the United States today who would add more strength to the Democratic ticket as Vice President than Senator RUSSELL. I wholeheartedly endorse Senator RUSSELL for Vice President. I am proud and my people are proud that my voting record in the Congress is virtually identical to that of Senator RUSSELL.

NO. 1 POLITICAL ISSUE

The greatest single political issue before the American people this fall will be a rampaging unbridled power-mad Supreme Court. In this country today we no longer enjoy constitutional Government, as written by the Founding Fathers and amended in the manner prescribed by the Constitution. We do not have a government of checks and balances. The legislative powers of Congress have been usurped by the Supreme Court and even the executive branch shoved aside for a virtual Supreme Court dictatorship over the American people.

Yes, it will be a political issue and the degree of assurance given the American people this fall by the two parties could well determine the outcome of the national election this fall.

In the next 4 to 8 years, the President of the United States, whoever he may be, will very likely appoint a Chief Justice and a majority of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court. The American people are now well aware of this fact. The American people are going to demand of the presidential candidates before the November election that better men be appointed to the Supreme Court. They are going to demand Justices with much experience in the field of legal jurisprudence; men who are dedicated to the private enterprise system; men who are devoted to the Constitution, as written; and who are steeped in the traditions of our great American heritage.

We must bear in mind that the Chief Justice and the Justices of the Supreme Court are appointed by the President of the United States for life. They are not elected by the people. They are not responsible to the people. The only assurance the American people have that these Justices will be loyal Americans, men of integrity and character is the assurance that can be given by their candidates for President.

REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

The latest in a shocking series of unbelievable and incredible decisions of the Supreme Court is the reapportionment case of June 15. In this decision, the Supreme Court not only aimed a body blow at the Constitution, but at the very foundation stones of our form of government—the citizen, his local community, and the legislative body to whom they are closest, his State legislature. The Supreme Court, in that decision, ruled that the State senate in each State of this Union will henceforth have to be based solely upon population. This will destroy the legislatures of the several States as known under our Constitition for almost 200 years. The U.S. Government came into being as a result of the Constitutional Convention, duly assembled, representing the States and the people.

The Constitution of the United States provides for two Senators from each State—two from Rhode Island, two from Delaware, two from California, and two from New York, regardless of the population of the States, while the representation in the House of Representatives of the National Congress has been based upon population. The States

largely wrote their constitutions and patterned them after the National Constitution, providing for a House of Representatives based on population, and for a Senate based upon geography. This system has worked well. It has been democratic. It has been and is constitutional. It has protected the rights of the people, the minority as well as the majority. It has promoted good government.

This decision of the Supreme Court, if allowed to stand, will make a mockery of the rights of the States and the constitutional rights of the people. I know of nothing more detrimental to the future of our Nation than for the Supreme Court to take from the States the right to apportion their own legislatures. As surely as night follows the day, if this decision is allowed to stand, the Supreme Court will reapportion city councils, county commissioners, school trustees and create confusion and chaos in every segment, however small, of local as well as State government. If this Machiavellian decision of the Court is permitted to stand, it will not only be the city councils, the county commissoners, the State legislatures, but then it will be the Senate of the United States which will be reapportioned by a rampaging Supreme Court. Representation of the small States in the Union will be wiped out and our Constitution will be completely destroyed. The small States of this Republic must be protected. The rights of the small States, the rights of the unorganized minority in the remote areas of our Republic must be preserved and protected.

The most determined effort in modern times by the Congress to protect the American people from unwarranted unconstitutional abuses of the Supreme Court is now underway. The House Rules Committee, under the leadership of that great dedicated American and distinguished attorney, HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia, reported out a bill which will forbid the Supreme Court or any district Federal court from usurping the right of the States to apportion their legislatures. An overwhelming majority of the U.S. Senate is moving in the direction of curbing the Supreme Court in the reapportionment case. The House and Senate are determined to preserve the integrity of the States they represent and their legislatures. Every effort will be made at this session of Congress to pass the legislation which will prevent the chaotic conditions now existing in Colorado, Georgia, and Virginia, and other States which have been created by the Supreme Court. The majority of this Congress is perfectly willing to remain in session for as long as necessary to restore our system of checks and balances and to preserve the constitutional right of our States to apportion their own State legislatures.

I view the Supreme Court as the greatest single threat to freedom in this Nation today. In decision after decision, too numerous to enumerate, the Supreme Court has made a mockery of the Constitution, usurped the power of the legislative branch of the Government, trampled on the Executive and run roughshod over the American people. The Supreme Court put Communists in the same class with Democrats and Republicans by its decision of June 22, 1964. An atheist Communist, sworn to lie, to cheat, steal and commit murder and overthrow by violence the Government of this country can enjoy the same rights as any patriotic Democrat or Republican, according to the Supreme Court. One Justice of the Supreme Court said, "Being a Communist certainly is not a crime."

On the other hand Justices Clark, Harlan and White, in their dissenting opinion, quoted from a statute passed by Congress in 1954 which stated that "The Communist Party of the United States * * * is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States." The minority opinion continued: "The right to travel is not absolute. Congress had ample evidence that use of passports by Americans belonging to the world Communist movement is a threat to our national security."

The Supreme Court in another recent decision has turned loose murderers and criminals convicted in open court by a jury of their peers. By strange rulings regarding search and seizure, the Court has in essence applauded the lawlessness of dope peddlers and drug addicts. The Court has protected the sinister criminal who would pervert the youth of our Nation by selling and mailing lewd, obscene pornographic literature. The Supreme Court has ruled that criminals, embezzlers, perjurers, and housebreakers in any local and State court can plead the fifth amendment.

In the New York and Maryland prayer cases, the Supreme Court, to all intents and purposes, outlawed prayer and Bible reading in the public schools of our Nation. They amended the Constitution of the United States contrary to article 9 which prescribes how the Constitution must be amended. In this decision the Supreme Court aimed a low blow at the very foundation and heart of this Republic—religious freedom as practiced for generations under the first amendment to the Constitution. Our people are fearful that unless the Court is curbed, chaplains will be eliminated from the Armed Forces; "In God We Trust" from our coins; and "Under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States.

The Supreme Court has legalized mob violence and disrespect for law and order. In flagrant disregard for local and State laws, it has legalized the drafting of schoolchildren from the classroom by mob leaders. The Supreme Court has set the stage in these incredible decisions for anarchy, for lawlessness and for a complete change in our form of government. The Supreme Court would not permit the President some years ago to seize the steel mills, but they themselves seized the rights and powers of local governments, individual citizens, the States, and the Congress itself. The Supreme Court has been making its own rules and regulations and changing them at its own whim and fancy. Without the aid of any legislation under the sun, the Court has taken over the supervision of State court procedures and attendance in public schools.

The Supreme Court is legislating. It has issued executive decrees and has rewritten laws passed by the Congress. It has made new Federal regulations with the full force and intent of law. These sinister violations of our constitutional principles by the Court have been heralded the law of the land and enforced with the naked power of the Armed Forces of the Nation.

Of course it is important who will be elected President of the United States in the November elections. It is important who will be elected to the U.S. House and Senate. It is important who will be elected Governor in the sovereign States of the Union or who will represent the people in their legislatures, but the paramount question of major concern is who will be appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States in the years to follow November 3.

The people are going to elect a President who will appoint more responsible learned and patriotic men to the Supreme Court. The people are going to elect a Congress which can and will set the qualifications of the Justices of the Supreme Court. The new Congress will not sit idly by and watch that great institution—the Congress—completely destroyed by nine unelected men subverted to the philosophy of national socialism. We in the Congress must assume some responsibility for this Hitlerian Court. It has been our indifference and complacency to these unconstitutional decisions which have permitted this outrage upon our individual liberty and our Constitution. With your help we will correct our mistakes.

The American people are now in the frame of mind to take whatever action they deem necessary to preserve their freedom from dictators and power-mad zealots, whether they be foreign or domestic.

George Washington, President of the Constitutional Convention and our immortal first President said:

"The basis of our political system is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the constitution which at any time exists till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people is sacredly obligatory upon all * * *.

"If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

The Best and Boldest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Bennett County Booster, Martin, S. Dak., for August 13, 1964.

Wendell Long, the editor, is thoroughly familiar with the so-called Indian problem, and has made a very complete evaluation of the failure of the paternalistic program now in operation intended to deal with the situation. While costs have skyrocketed and more and more taxpayers' money is being spent to ease the problem, no real solutions have been found and the Indian has simply become more and more dependent on Government welfare rather than developing his intelligence, initiative, and natural resources.

I commend Mr. Long's excellent editorial to my colleagues for careful consideration. It is as follows:

THE BEST AND BOLDEST

Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall last month called for a 10-year plan "to raise the standard of living on Indian reservations above the poverty line."

Philleo Nash, U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs, previously had asserted:

"Chronic unemployment on the reservations runs 7 or 8 times the national average. The average income of the reservation Indian is between a third and a fourth the national average.

"Average age at death is 42 years, as compared with 62 years among the national population. Reservation housing for 9 out of 10 families is far below the minimum standards of comfort, safety and decency."

Secretary Udall set October 1, 1964, as the deadline for submission of reports by Bureau officials spelling out ways and means of instituting a 10-year plan, and outlining

needs of the 380,000 Indians the Bureau says it has under its care.

Calling for the "best, boldest and most imaginative thinking" on the part of Bureau officials, the Secretary listed various factors to be considered in preparation of reports on reservation needs.

The Booster wonders if any Bureau official will be so "bold" and so "imaginative" as to suggest the elimination of socialism and government control of the reservations as a method for raising the standard of living for the Indians.

In most addresses, statements and discussions by the BIA or other officials about the "Indian problems," as it is called, the base point is always "what the Government should do for the Indian."

The idea of promoting programs to encourage the Indian to apply his intelligence and energy to the development of the vast resources available to him is seldom considered.

The Booster wonders, also, how much more money it will take to "raise the standard of living on Indian reservations above the poverty line."

The BIA now has 15,383 employees in the United States—1,187 of them in South Dakota. (The number has been increasing from 11,994 in 1945.) Adding to this the 7,000 other Government workers spread among other departments, principally Health, Education, and Welfare, and Agriculture, the total makes one Government employee for every 17 Indians.

The various States also have employees dealing with Indian matters which brings the ratio still lower.

Since 1900 more than $3 billion has been spent servicing and regimenting these wards of the state. The annual amount of appropriations has been gradually increasing—from $29,101,000 in 1945 to $206,601,000 in 1964.

And in the present budget the amount will be between $277 million and $280 million—more than $730 per Indian man, woman, and child. That's nearly four times the national yearly average per capita income of the 380,000 Indians—which runs around $200 per Indian.

The 75-year result of all this bureaucratic domination and billions of dollars stands as eloquent testimony of the futility and debility incurred by the "state way."

By the Commissioner's and the Secretary's own admissions, the paternalism has maintained the Indians in a state of shocking poverty, ignorance, disease and complete dependence.

Such a picture would argue for a radical change in policy, but all the "best, boldest and most imaginative thinking" can hardly be expected to suggest relaxing of the regimentation, which for decades has cost the taxpayers millions and has kept the Indians dependent on Government bureaucracy while draining away even the hope of self-betterment.

Paul Quattlebaum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of South Carolina's most distinguished and respected citizens, former Senator Paul Quattlebaum, of Conway, passed away on August 9, 1964. Senator Quattlebaum made many important contributions to the betterment of our State and the county he served with such distinction in the South Carolina Senate.

Senator Quattlebaum will long be remembered in our State for his many good works in so many areas of public and private endeavor; and he will be especially remembered for the contributions he made to the recording of the history of his region in 10 books which he wrote on South Carolina and the Presbyterian Church, to which he was also loyally devoted.

I rise on the Senate floor today, Mr. President, to pay tribute to this great and good man, whom I had the pleasure of counting one of my best friends.

As further evidence of the high esteem in which Senator Quattlebaum was held by his fellow citizens in South Carolina, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the State, of Columbia, S.C., of August 12, 1964; an editorial from the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C., of August 11, 1964; and a news article from the News and Courier of August 10, 1964.

There being no objection, the article and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., Aug. 12, 1964]

TO BE REMEMBERED

Paul Quattlebaum, of Horry, will be remembered for many things by many South Carolinians—but his memory will be most lasting and most appreciated for his contributions to the history of the Palmetto State.

His death Sunday at Conway ended a career which had involved active and effective participation in business, government, education, and civic development—on both State and local levels.

Those same characteristics went into his extracurricular work as an amateur historian of professional competence. He nurtured a consuming affection for his native State and applied his ability and intellect to both the study and recording of little-known facets of history.

His most celebrated work (and one not even yet fully appreciated) was "The Land Called Chicora," in which he told of early Spanish exploration and settlement in the Winyah Bay region—more than a century before the English landed at Charleston.

If for no other reason—and there are other reasons galore—South Carolinians have cause to be grateful to Paul Quattlebaum for that one work alone.

[From the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C., Aug. 10, 1964]

QUATTLEBAUM, EX-HORRY SENATOR, DIES

CONWAY.—Paul Quattlebaum, author, retired State senator, and utilities executive, of Kingston Street, was pronounced dead upon arrival at a local hospital Sunday at 9 p.m.

Mr. Quattlebaum had just finished attending a session of the Kingston Presbyterian Church when he suffered a heart attack.

Funeral arrangements will be announced by Goldfinch Funeral Home.

Mr. Quattlebaum was educated in private schools in Conway and received his BS in electrical and mechanical engineering from Clemson.

He was founder and president of the Conway Light & Power Co., Quattlebaum Ice Co., and the Quattlebaum Light & Ice Co.

He and T. C. Williams cooperated in the promotion of the South Carolina Public Service Authority (Santee-Cooper). He is past chairman of the board of Quattlebaum Electric Co., in Charleston.

He was also active in civic and church activities. He was former chairman of the State executive committee of the South Carolina YMCA, former member of the executive committee of the South Carolina Sunday School Association and Adult Department Superintendent for South Carolina. He has been a ruling elder at Kingston Presbyterian Church in Conway since 1907 and has served in various other capacities in the church.

He was a member of the board of trustees at Queens College and president of Men of Pee Dee Presbytery from 1933–34.

A trustee of city schools for 2 years, Mr. Quattlebaum was also formerly president of the Conway Chamber of Commerce, the Kiwanis Club, and the Lions Club.

He was an ex-member of the executive committee of the South Carolina Board of Trade, first president of Ice Manufacturers Association, a member of the State senate from 1935–44, a member of the South Carolina Historical Society, member of the University of South Carolina Society, and life member of the Horry County Memorial Commission.

Active in Clemson College affairs, Mr. Quattlebaum aided countless students while they were attending college. He was presented an honorary degree in literature by Clemson in 1961 and in 1956 he received the Distinguished Citizens Award from the American Legion.

Mr. Quattlebaum authored 10 books on South Carolina and the Presbyterian Church besides contributing articles to the News and Courier and other publications.

He was born in Conway February 25, 1886, a son of the late Col. Cephus Perry Quattlebaum and the late Janette Taylor McQueen Quattlebaum. He was married to the former Miss Sue Martin, of Marion, in 1911.

Surviving are his widow, one son, Paul Quattlebaum, Jr., of Charleston; three daughters, Miss Laura Janette Quattlebaum, of Conway; Miss J. P. (Katherine) Brunson, Jr., of Darlington, and Mrs. D. L. (Sue) Grantham of Savannah; seven grandchildren; two great grandchildren; two brothers, Perry Quattlebaum, of Conway, and McQueen Quattlebaum, of Johnston, and one sister, Mrs. Marjorie Langston, of Conway.

[From the News & Courier, Charleston, S.C., Aug. 11, 1964]

PAUL QUATTLEBAUM

In business, politics, and civic affairs, Paul Quattlebaum of Conway spent many years and much hard work in service to the public. He was interested in people, and also in the history of his region, about which he had written with skill and perception. He served as State senator from Horry County.

A native of Conway, Mr. Quattlebaum was a fitting son of the "Independent Republic of Horry." He was a man with a mind of his own.

Mr. Quattlebaum graduated in engineering at Clemson, and founded the Conway Light & Power Co. and other enterprises. He was a leader in civic and church affairs, and received many honors, among them an honorary degree from Clemson. As a man of solid conviction and wide attainment, Mr. Quattlebaum had our respect. He was an outstanding citizen of South Carolina. We note with regret his death at 78. We shall remember him with friendship and admiration.

Remarks of Senator Bennett at Senate Prayer Breakfast Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the greatest benefits I have derived from being a Member of the U.S. Senate has come from my membership in the Senate Prayer Breakfast Group, which meets each Wednesday morning. I have had the opportunity to listen to many eloquent and inspiring statements which have been presented before this group by Members of the Senate and others who meet with us in these important gatherings. One of the most impressive talks ever presented to our group was made on August 5, 1964, by the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. His remarks dealt with the gradual erosion of moral precepts and principles in our Nation and some of the reasons therefor.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this most inspiring and interesting talk printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so it will be available to all other Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR WALLACE F. BENNETT, AT THE MEETING OF THE SENATE PRAYER BREAKFAST GROUP, AUGUST 5, 1964

The famous—or infamous—prayer decision of the Supreme Court has had at least one potential beneficial effect. It has focused national attention upon the proper relationship of the church and the state; and out of this concern, benefits may come to both of these important institutions. Naturally, up to date, the chief concern has been with possible interference by the state in matters properly within the province of the church. But in our system, the church, as the source of spiritual strength, has great responsibility for the preservation of our traditional system of government. And I should like to reverse the usual emphasis given to this problem and talk about the need for greater acceptance of responsibility by the church for the benefit of the state.

Religion and its organized expression, the church, have many unique and irreplaceable functions to perform in our lives. Only it can give them meaning and direction. Only through it can we know God and His plans for us. Only through it can we fit our mortal experiences into their eternal frame. And only through it can we acquire the scale of values by the use of which we can command the great powers of the spirit. And only when our citizens have an adequate scale of spiritual values can they be prepared to accept their responsibilities as citizens.

While these values are eternal and absolute, human acceptance of them is always changing; and history records the high tides and the low—the golden and the dark ages—the periods of progress and the tragic eras of decline.

Our system of government came into being at a time when men in what was then an obscure corner of the world held these spiritual values which their church had taught high in their hearts, and it is based upon them. In the years since, we have moved through cycles of weakness and recovery. Where are we today, and what can we do about it? What can the church do about it?

On the surface, we are in a golden age, and materially we are at the zenith of prosperity by every method of comparison. Militarily, we command the world's greatest power. Church membership is at an alltime high. And yet our basic system is in danger, and our society is sick. Why? Because our standard of values seems to be deteriorating. This means only one thing: the church is failing in its spiritual responsibility.

The most obvious evidence of lowered values is in the field of morals. Sin is justified as "sickness" and love is exploited as sex. No wonder family stability is undermined by divorce, which is increasing. Let's look at the record.

Since 1950, divorces in the United States have increased 2 percent, while in the same time span, the number of marriages has decreased by 8 percent. In 1950, there was 1 divorce per every 4.3 marriages; in 1960, the ratio climbed to 1 divorce per every 3.9 marriages. Utah reflected the Nation's increase in divorce rate on a lesser scale.

Our national crime statistics give us another means of measuring our spiritual deterioration. Crime is increasing both totally and among juveniles.

Police arrest data issued by the FBI and court statistics collected by the U.S. Children's Bureau indicate that close to a million young people in the 10-through-17 age group came in contact with law enforcement agencies during the past year. In 1963, over 1962, there was an 11-percent increase in arrests of persons under 18 years of age. Actually, 17.5 percent of the total number of arrests made in 1963 were juveniles under the age of 18.

These demonstrations of deterioration are easy to see because they can be measured statistically. Behind them are others that are visible only through their effects. Self-discipline is out; self-indulgence is in. Work, sacrifice, and responsibility are suspect; State-supported welfare, selfishness, and escape are becoming worthy goals. Ambition is considered an evil; getting by, without rocking the boat, until retirement is becoming the smart thing to do.

Philosophically, we tend to reject absolutes in value and prefer consensuses. We trade the long-range goal for today's benefit. We shun the clear challenge of simplicity by taking refuge in the obscure and the sophisticated—even in religion.

What are the effects of this shift in values upon our concept of government? To me, they are many—dangerous and sad. In total, and in the ultimate, they may some day add up to a reversal of the American revolution and a return to the tyranny of government imposed from above. The Founding Fathers, translating the great spiritual values of our Christian heritage into a political institution, reversed the ancient pattern and built on the assumption that divine power lodged with the people, not the king. In our present retreat from spiritual responsibility, we are returning to the old flesh pots of central power, and it frightens me.

At the risk of sounding sacrilegious, I often wonder if there are not some people in this country for whom the Federal Government is becoming a substitute for God. Increasingly, we are asked to accept the idea that the Government is our greatest repository of wisdom to the extent that its decisions are all-wise and should not be challenged and that it would be well to endow it with all power. To many people, the Federal Government is looked upon as the source of all blessings.

Of course, this is a materialistic concept, barren of spiritual values. But can't the same thing be said, more or less, of other false gods that have arisen in our time. Are we in danger of violating the first commandment, which says, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," as easily as we seem to have violated the seventh commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and the eighth comandment, "Thou shalt not steal"?

In the field of government, our sense of values seems to be slipping. Instead of simple interpretations of the Constitution, we have tortured rationalizations. Instead of patriotism, we talk of world opinion. Men seeking office seek power instead of opportunity for service and appeal for votes on the seductive promise of material benefit rather than devotion to basic American principles. In some cases—fortunately, few—but, unfortunately, effective, blatant atheism, godlessness, has been given frightening weight in judicial decisions.

Are the American people disturbed? Not too much, apparently, because any government which draws power from the people must be only a reflection of their own scale of values. And while we claim to be shocked by revelations of wrongdoing in high places in the present spiritual atmosphere, we tend to shrug them off.

How can we change this trend? Where can we find inspiration and leadership to regain our greater sense of spiritual values? Where else but in religion and the church? And where can we start but with our own churches—and ourselves.

The recent civil rights debate revealed, or exposed, a dangerous shift in direction in some churches. We have a Mormon saying that in the church we teach the people correct principles, and they govern themselves. Abandoning this vital function of indirect support to government, many ministers—in the name of the church—have attempted to influence the decision of Congress directly. And a few have openly advocated what they call "civil disobedience," forgetting God's statement, through Samuel to Saul, after he had destroyed the Amalekites and saved their cattle for sacrifice in violation of God's command. Said Samuel:

"Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice and to hearken than the fat of rams.

"For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as inquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king." (I Samuel 15: 22–23).

I hope we, as a government, will not be found wanting for our failure to live up to the values God has set for our guidance and be rejected, as was Saul. To protect us from that fate, the church must resume its proper role as guardian and prophet and be effective in the teaching of those principles.

Is this putting an impossible burden on churches and their members? Not in my book. To illustrate my faith in them, let me turn back to the question of divorce. A survey was made recently among 451 Mormon college students who revealed these interesting facts about their parents in terms of the relationship between church membership and participation and the incidence of divorce. The following statistics show the percentage of parents in all of these categories who have been divorced:

	Percent
Both nonchurch members	20.4
Mixed marriages	13.8
Both church members	5.2
Civil marriage	12.3
Temple marriage	2.2
Husbands who regularly went to church	1.9
Wives who regularly went to church	2.3
Husbands who never went to church	18.2
Wives who never went to church	25.0

In closing, may I quote again a few lines from the Book of Mormon, to which my mind

always returns when I worry about this problem.

"Behold, this is a choice land, and whatsoever nation shall possess it shall be free from bondage, and from captivity, and from all other nations under Heaven, if they will but serve the God of the land, who is Jesus Christ." (Esther 2: 12.)

Fiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there can be no better description of the 1964 Democrat Party platform than that offered in an editorial in the August 26 issue of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier:

It is one of the most pleasant pieces of fiction we have read in a long time.

Following is the full text of the Courier editorial:

The Democratic Convention in Atlantic City has adopted a wonderful platform. Most Americans can agree wholeheartedly with most of it. All we hope is that some effort is made to carry it out.

For example, the party proposed a three-point farm program designed "To achieve the goals of higher incomes to the farm and ranch, particularly the family sized farm, lower prices for the consumer, and lower costs to the Government."

Only an extremist Republican could object to such a delightful program as this. Higher crop prices for farmers, lower food costs for the consumer, and less tax expenditure by the Government represents a goal that will win the votes of all unthinking citizens.

The platform also indorses "commodity programs to strengthen the farm income structure and reach the goal of parity of income to every aspect of American agriculture."

Farmers are certainly entitled to full parity of income. Only a backward-looking reactionary would point out that the Democrats promised the same thing in 1960 and that since that time the parity ratio of farm prices has drastically declined.

The platform also takes a strong stand in support of honesty: "Each person who participates in the Government must be held to a standard of ethics which permits no compromise with the principles of absolute honesty and the maintenance of undivided loyalty to the public interest."

The party is to be commended on this sharp criticism of situations such as that which prevailed a few years ago when a Senate majority leader and later a Vice President by the name of Johnson permitted Bobby Baker to use his official Senate job to gain enormous wealth.

After thousands of words devoted to promises for new or expanded Federal programs, the platform goes on to say:

"The Federal Government exists not to grow larger, but to enlarge the individual potential and achievement of the people."

Everyone will be pleased to learn that the Democrats are not committed to big government for its own sake. And it is true that the Democratic majority has refrained from increasing the size of Congress. It has merely increased the salary of Representatives and Senators by $7,500 a year—an act which obviously enlarges their individual potential.

Thus we can find little to criticize in the Democratic platform. It is one of the most pleasant pieces of fiction we have read in a long time.

Conservation Tide Called Underrated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union of August 20, 1964:

CONSERVATIVE TIDE CALLED UNDERRATED
(By Edward Niciejewski)

The political leaders of this country do not realize the strength of the conservative movement, Author J. Evetts Haley said here yesterday.

Haley is a cowman, rancher, Texas Democrat, and author of 12 books of history and biography. He is considered one of the most noted living historians of the Southwest.

His opinions on history and politics were given during an interview. Haley visited San Diego a few days this week to arrange for circulation of his latest book, "A Texan Looks at Lyndon."

BOOK DESCRIBED

The book is a detailed, scholarly, and footnoted study of the power and influence of President Johnson, not because it was intended to be but because it turned out that way, Haley says.

Haley began the book as a historical treatise at his Texas ranch in the early thirties, when neither he nor many other Americans knew of Lyndon B. Johnson.

The original purpose was to write about history and policies of the Federal Government. Stimulus came from the Federal Government's going off the gold standard. Haley objected to that action.

By 1948 the pieces had begun to fall into place, pointing to a clear and present danger, Haley said, and the theme of the book was established as a story of the Johnson climb to power.

AN INDICTMENT

"I have written an indictment of the most prominent man in the United States," Haley said yesterday. "I've put the facts in there to back it up."

Facts there are, the author said. The book is thoroughly documented by the numerous footnotes and attorneys have checked it extensively, Haley said.

The book, a paperback, begins with early Johnson political activities and continues through his rise to political power and family fortune. It ends with an analysis of the President's character, Haley said.

"This is a critical year to bring it out," Haley says of the book.

"All of us in Texas who know this man are afraid of him. He is using the Texas approach on the national scale. * * * The theme of this book is that the country is ruled by an illegitimate government."

Haley derives the term "illegitimate government" from Italian Author Ferrero's quotation:

"Authority comes from above * * * legitimacy from below."

When people fear the government, Haley said, it is illegitimate.

His evidence on strength of the national conservative movement is reflected in clamor for his book, Haley said.

The ink is hardly dry on the pages, but demand for "A Texan Looks at Lyndon" exceeds the supply by one-third. More than 1 million copies will have been printed and sold before this month ends, Haley said.

"The grassroots rebellion is evident," he said. "People are suspicious of this administration. They know something is haywire. The people I associate with are the cowboys, the truckdrivers, the little people. * * * They know something is wrong."

Tall and spare, Haley shows his pride in his grassroots origin by wearing cowboy boots, a western suit, a 10-gallon hat. His hands have rope burns and his legs are bowed from the saddle.

In addition to being a noted historian, Haley owns three southwestern cattle ranches. He is a graduate of West Texas University and the University of Texas. He lives at Canyon, Tex.

Suppression of Truth in Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Charleston Evening Post, of Charleston, S.C., published on August 13, 1964, an editorial which shows how the so-called "fairness doctrine" of the Federal Communications Commission is being used to suppress the truth in broadcasting. This editorial is entitled "The Quiet Suppression of Truth," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, Aug. 13, 1964]

THE QUIET SUPPRESSION OF TRUTH

Several months ago in these columns we came to the defense of a North Carolina television station, WRAL–TV, in Raleigh, and its conservative commentator, Jesse Helms. In what was a transparent attempt to silence Mr. Helms, the Federal Communications Commission was delaying a routine license renewal. This struck us as censorship. It was censorship.

Now, 8 months after the license should have come through, we have received word from Washington that Mr. Helms will, after all, be allowed to continue on the air a little longer, provided he is a good boy. WRAL's license has been renewed.

We do not wish to go over the same old ground again, but part of the Commission's report on WRAL, contained in a letter to the station's president, touches on a subject vitally affecting listeners and viewers far removed from WRAL's television signal: the subject of network bias, distortion, and misrepresentation.

In a brief filed with the FCC, the Raleigh station had contended that its conservative expressions were in the public interest partly because they served to counterbalance the half-truths and liberal cause-pleading of the national television networks. In its reply to this argument, the FCC complained that WRAL had gone beyond countering specific network misrepresentations and had presented editorials of a general conservative flavor. This, the FCC made clear, would not do. It wanted WRAL to point out which of

its specific editorial broadcasts had sought to correct specific network misrepresentations.

WRAL countered that it had not kept a log of each and every instance in which a Walter Cronkite or an Edward P. Morgan or a Howard K. Smith had smeared Senator GOLDWATER or the Republican Party or, in general, the South. But it had the impression that such smears had occurred over a long span and it did, in fact, recall several specific instances. As for a complete catalog, that was a physical impossibility. The FCC was unimpressed. It wanted a list of names and dates and a transcript, apparently, of each and every network sin. Otherwise, it would refuse to believe the networks capable of such acts.

Is it possible that the men who supervise the television industry are as blind as all that? Is it possible that they are unaware of what every adult in the country knows?

A recent example will serve to illustrate the sort of distortion WRAL probably had in mind. Shortly after the San Francisco convention, CBS Reporter Daniel Shorr reported from Europe that Senator GOLDWATER would launch his campaign from Berchtesgaden, where Hitler presumably made his start. While in Germany, Mr. Shorr implied, Mr. GOLDWATER would keep in close touch with leading Nazis.

This was, it hardly needs saying, a complete fabrication. It smacked, indeed, of a deliberate lie. But When Senator GOLDWATER demanded a retraction, CBS issued a statement saying only that Mr. Shorr had no proof that the Senator had made a conscious effort to enlist Nazi support.

And where, pray, was the noble FCC during all this? Unconcerned, completely unconcerned. And will CBS's television franchise be renewed year after year without the sort of harassment to which Mr. Helms was subjected? You may depend on it.

This, of course, is the real evil the FCC represents. As John Stuart Mill remarked, "Not the violent conflict between parts of the truth, but the quiet suppression of half of it is the formidable evil."

That quotation is from an essay entitled "On Liberty." We would suggest that the FCC look it up.

Men of Little Faith Define an Extremist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, despite Senator GOLDWATER'S full and sensible amplification of his convention remarks on extremism and moderation, we can expect the men of little faith on the far left to continue to twist and distort his views.

And how do these men of little faith define an "extremist?" The Annapolis (Md.) Evening Capital has come up with an excellent answer, and I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the August 24 issue of that newspaper:

TODAY IT'S AMERICAN PATRIOTS BRANDED AS THE EXTREMISTS

"Extremism in defense of liberty is no vice. Moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue."—BARRY GOLDWATER.

We shall hear these words again and again in the months ahead. We shall see them misrepresented, misinterpreted, their meaning twisted and distorted cleverly to suit the purposes of liberals across the country.

We shall see a massive campaign to smear Senator GOLDWATER as an "extremist" as far-left liberals and a predominantly liberal press pick up the torch of intolerance and wave it recklessly in the name of moderation.

The heart of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER'S call for freedom will be a red flag in the face of the twin bulls of welfare statism and Federal intervention.

They will paw the ground, lower their horns, chant in unison their hate-Goldwater slogans, and attempt to gore this honest man, this patriot who flung the truth into their teeth in a new declaration of independence from those who pussyfoot and tiptoe around the hardcore issue of freedom or dictatorship.

The compromisers, the appeasers, the tormented men who seek an "accommodation" with the Communists and with the street mobs, have so compromised their own consciences until they are no longer able to separate fact from fancy.

Their desires so color their comments as to make them full of sound and fury, signifying nothing but an utter contempt for the ability of the people to govern themselves without the "helping hand" of Federal intervention.

These liberals are the Hamiltonians of today. They seek to destroy the individual and replace a free society with a collectivist society in which the Federal Government is the master, rather than the servant, of the people.

They seek a government of men rather than laws. They chant "freedom songs" while militantly subverting private property rights which make freedom possible.

These men of little faith, drawn like moths into the flame of central government power, cannot believe in the free enterprise system because they cannot understand it.

What is their definition of an "extremist"?

To them an extremist is an American who:

Believes that the Russians should get out and stay out of the Western Hemisphere.

Believes that the Berlin wall is a wall of shame and should come down.

Believes that Laos never should have been "neutralized" into the Communist camp.

Believes that an aggressive Red China should be kept out of the United Nations.

Believes that when the Red Chinese hordes attacked American troops in Korea, they should have been punished.

Believes that once the United States is committed to a war, as in Vietnam, we should seek victory rather than compromise.

Believes that the peoples of Eastern Europe should have the right to choose their own form of government without Lenin tanks patroling the polls.

Believes that a Communist is a person who seeks to violently overthrow the Government of the United States.

Believes that what is right is right, what is wrong is wrong, what is just is just, what is unjust is unjust.

Believes that law and order should prevail in the streets of this land and that laws are made to be obeyed, rather than flouted and disobeyed.

Believes that honesty still is the best policy at home and abroad and that the American flag still stands for the greatest and most powerful Nation on earth.

Believes in dying as a free man, rather than coexisting as a slave.

Believes that the United States is a nation conceived in liberty, under God, which has sought and should seek liberty and justice for all.

Believes that George Washington was the Father of our County—and not Franklin Roosevelt.

Believes in the destiny made manifest in the history of the United States—a destiny of freedom under law.

Believes in the Constitution of the United States—and in freedom of speech.

Yes, Senator GOLDWATER, you have waved a flag that has liberal bulls snorting and pawing.

Watersheds: Ten Questions for the Next 10 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, during my first 10 years in Congress I have advocated a program to complete the watershed development program in this Nation as effectively and as quickly as possible to prevent further soil erosion and to clear our streams of the many tons of silt flowing down them daily. Over the past several years I have been developing a program known as Mission 76, which would complete all of the watershed programs in this Nation by 1976. My research team at State University of Iowa and a minority clerk with the House Committee on Public Works assigned to me for watershed activities have been working on this program extensively.

The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, an organization which has been an outstanding leader in pioneering conservation programs, recently featured an article in their August 1964 edition of the "Watershed Letter," entitled "Ten Questions for the Next 10 Years." This article accurately reveals the serious questions which must be answered during the next decade in regard to watershed development.

I commend this important article to the attention of all Members of this body:

TEN QUESTIONS FOR THE NEXT 10 YEARS

What will be the shape of watershed programs in the next decade? This depends on the answers to 10 challenging questions posed by a committee chaired by Dr. Irving K. Fox, vice president of Resources for the Future, Inc. Prepared for the National Watershed Congress held earlier this year, these fundamental questions deserve wider and more deliberate consideration.

No longer is a watershed project conceived as the simple extension of conservation land treatment to larger and more workable areas. The "small" watershed program has become a major, independent approach to the regional development of natural resources. Although largely confined to single purpose stream development in the early years, it has been transformed by citizen needs and by the logic of water management into a more truly comprehensive approach, encompassing land and water development for almost every purpose.

Because of its scale and scope, the watershed program merits the closest possible attention. The following questions raised by the Fox study group are important and require answers far in advance of the end of the next decade. Most importantly, they

need to be answered in a manner that will make the upstream watershed program a more effective instrument for democratic community action.

1. To what extent should watershed funds be used in developing projects to provide flood protection for urban and suburban areas? Some leaders feel the program should be largely confined to rural areas. Others say that towns and cities have problems too, and that stream-valley development is a sensible approach to coordinating conservation efforts.

2. What dividing line, if any, should be established for irrigation projects in the 17 Western States under Public Law 566 and the reclamation laws? Freedom of sponsors to seek both kinds of aid leads to competition and "bargain hunting."

3. Why should local organizations bear the full cost of municipal water supply in water resource projects? Federal assistance is available for irrigation, recreation, water quality control, and fish and wildlife development. Should community use by city dwellers be ineligible for such aid?

4. How can watershed programs be integrated in major river basin planning and development? There is no uniform method for administrative organization of basin planning, and under present legislation, no effective way exists to integrate small reservoirs in basin plans with any assurance that they will be sponsored and built.

5. Should Federal contracting be permitted under Public Law 566 or should the program continue with local contracting? Local participation, speed, and coordination are the issues here.

6. Should public access by required as a condition for Federal assistance for structures that impound water for significant periods of time? Growing recreation demands are resulting in increased pressures for public use of reservoir areas.

7. Should local organizations continue to acquire easements through donation or should all be purchased? Is it fair for some to be purchased and others donated?

8. Should State governments step up appropriations for watershed work? The desirable future role of the States in planning, land acquisition, and operations and maintenance has never been adequately explored.

9. What should be the role of flood plain zoning in flood control? Often discussed but seldom implemented, this technique usually requires action by a host of local governments which possess the necessary authority.

10. How can watershed associations be most effective in developing watershed programs? The best ways of organizing, financing, and supporting such groups and defining their relationships with governmental sponsors of watershed programs need to be found.

These are not the only questions the Fox committee asked. But they are among the most significant ones. They deserve the attention of soil and water conservation district supervisors and all others concerned with resource conservation and development.

Reapportionment of State Legislatures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial comment on the reapportionment of State legislatures which appeared in the Cecil Democrat, July 1, 1964, and the Star-Democrat on August 27, 1964.

The editorials follow:

[From the Cecil Democrat, July 1, 1964]

THANKS, CONGRESSMAN MORTON

Eastern Shore Congressman ROGERS C. B. MORTON has introduced an amendment to the Nation's Constitution which would correct the recent Supreme Court decision saying that both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned according to population.

While it is very hard to have an amendment to the Constitution adopted, this is one which should get some attention. After all, no one knows politics like a politician, and only those people who take a sincere interest in politics realize the magnitude of the recent decision of the Court. The Court, in effect, threw almost 200 years of forming the American political system out the window.

Strangely, the Court has said that the States may not pattern their legislatures after the system used in the Federal Government. Many States have, indeed, patterned their State legislatures after the Federal arrangement. Maryland uses population as the criteria in the lower house, but geography in the upper house. The largest county and the smallest county in Maryland both have one State senator. (Baltimore City is given six senators, due to its size.)

The Court's ruling will eliminate the important check-and-balance system in State legislatures. While it can be pointed out that often needed legislation has been blocked because the small rural counties are against it, it also provides for a guarantee that the interests of the State will not be governed exclusively by the urban sections of the State. It may not be the best system; it may create inequities to a degree; but it has served this country well.

Congressman MORTON deserves credit for initiating this legislation to preserve American politics as we have grown to know them.

[From the Star-Democrat, Aug. 27, 1964]

PROUD OF OUR IDENTITY

It is not surprising that the metropolitan press has given such strong support to the reapportionment of the general assembly. This will mean more votes for the cities and suburban counties—and thus, presumably, more influence for their newspapers. There are, of course, less selfish reasons for this support: the idea of "one person, one vote" has a democratic ring that is appealing.

Let no one lose sight of the fact that the United States did not reach its present stature by legislatures (or a Congress, for that matter) which were dominated by big-city interests. Times change; and we are the first to be ready to change with them where sound reason dictates such a course of action. But change for the sake of change is foolish; and "new" does not always (as some people think) mean "good." In the case of legislative reapportionment, change will not simply mean the change of the number of representatives from a particular area. It will mean a change in basic ways of life.

The counties of Maryland, especially those on the Shore, are proud of their identity—proud of the diversity of thought and opinion that this has produced. The debate and amalgamation of 23 county personalities in the process of making law has possibly taken a bit longer. But, it has also had the added advantage of subjecting new ideas and programs to a breadth of experience which cannot possibly be duplicated in the simple urban-rural split which will result from reapportionment.

We salute Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, our own Congressman MORTON, and others who are leading the fight against this trend to conformity.

Address of Jens Otto Krag, Prime Minister of Denmark, to the 53d Interparliamentary Conference, at the Opening Ceremony in the Town Hall of Copenhagen, August 20, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Copenhagen, where I acted as president of the U.S. national group, I was greatly impressed, as were my colleagues, by the address given at the opening ceremonies by the Danish Prime Minister, Mr. Otto Krag.

Mr. Krag shows a rare grasp of the functions and aims of the IPU and this is something far too few of our own parliamentarians understand. This Conference was the largest ever held, with 75 countries represented and 1,100 present.

The cordiality and efficiency of the Danish Government and the Danish royal family helped make this the most impressive meeting to date.

I asked the Prime Minister's permission to place his speech in the RECORD, which he graciously gave me.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS OF JENS OTTO KRAG, PRIME MINISTER OF DENMARK, TO THE 53D INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, AT THE OPENING CEREMONY IN THE TOWN HALL OF COPENHAGEN, AUGUST 20, 1964

Your Majesty, fellow parliamentarians, ladies and gentlemen, I am used to facing fellow parliamentarians, but this is the first time that I have to face 500 or 600 at a time. That is rather frightening for a Prime Minister who normally has to deal with 179. But I know that today there will be no debates and no voting, and I feel that I am facing a model international parliament whose fine qualities are even improved by the fact that the parliamentarians have brought their wives. We should, perhaps, introduce that custom in all our national parliaments. Maybe the voting on many matters would turn out differently, if we all had our wives sitting next to us when final decisions have to be taken. I am sure that for instance the food prices would be lower if our wives had greater influence. An easy way of achieving that would be to liberalize imports of cheap food products—for instance from Denmark.

You have chosen Denmark for your meeting place this year, which we take as a great honor.

You have chosen a country which cannot boast of being among the very first to adopt a parliamentary system, but on the other hand a country which belongs to a group of nations, the Nordic countries, where the system became deeply rooted once it was finally adopted. And a thousand years or more ago the peoples of this part of the world used to gather at special places, thingsteads, to discuss on an equal footing, the problems of their local area. These local parliaments represented a fairly advanced system of democracy.

But, we are not trying to steal from our British friends the credit of having created the mother of parliaments. I am merely

pointing out that you are visiting a part of the world where there is a traditional and deeply rooted belief in the ideas that are of common interest to everyone present here.

Although we may have different ideas on what parliamentarianism exactly is, we are all parliamentarians in the sense that we are elected by groups of people and that we are representing these people and their interests. At this Conference many hundred millions are represented by you. That carries with it no small responsibility, and it calls for a wholehearted effort to obtain results on behalf of all those we represent, be it at this Conference or at any other meeting where parliamentarians get together in order to do a job.

But what is actually the role of the parliamentarian of today? Is our influence diminishing in a society where technology and science are getting more and more complicated and more and more indispensable every day. How are we going to cope with the increasingly specialized experts in fields where it is impossible for a layman—and the parliamentarian is normally a layman outside the political field—to obtain all the relevant scientific knowledge? What will be the full impact on man's life on earth of all the immense forces that are and will be released, even if for more peaceful purposes?

I think that these questions have important bearings on the future of the parliamentary democracies. To remain countries governed by the people and not technocracies dominated by the experts who command the vast potentialities of modern science, is really a major problem. I can suggest no panacea for the elimination of this problem, but I have found it reasonable to mention it. Maybe it could be taken up for deliberation by the Conference.

I am sure that you will all agree with me that the last few years have seen a considerable relaxation of tension between the great powers. And it seems to me fair enough to assume that the primary reason for this is that the leading statesmen of the big countries are keenly—and realistically—aware that an allout modern war with the terrifying presentday arsenal of nuclear weapons is simply out of the question.

Against this background it has been possible to get closer to one another. Today we are witnessing increased contacts, expanding trade and growing cultural relations between States. I hope and trust that these developments will mark the emergence of a new world picture in which awareness of national characteristics, recognition of the paths which the individual nations have chosen for their material and spiritual lives must lead to the understanding between peoples and the tolerance toward different ways of thinking that would form the basis of a world community enjoying a more fundamental security than that afforded today by the nuclear deterrent.

We must admit, however, that tension and armed conflict are still existing in various parts of the world. While we are gathered here, fellow beings are killed, peoples are driven from their homes, thousands are in distress, and economic values are lost.

There is a certain tendency to view these conflicts in the sole perspective of the old cold war between East and West. But it would, I think, be more correct to admit that they also have their origins in the spectacular development which, in the light of history, will undoubtedly be the overshadowing feature of our century the end of colonialism and the awakening of the new nations to a free, independent life. We all welcome this development which the members of the United Nations agree to promote in every possible way.

It is perhaps unavoidable, but highly deplorable, that this almost explosive revolution should lead to tensions which, from time to time, have released unfortunate aggressive acts. Today we find the points of tension in Vietnam, in Cyprus, and in the Congo, but they exist—in a latent state—in many other parts of the world.

The problems are many and difficult, and more problems are bound to arise when the community of nations is to fit into its new pattern. The responsibility for the solution of these problems rests with us all—with you who are our guests today. We must help the new nations, not only in laying the economic and material foundation of healthy and viable communities, but also in solving the political and international conflicts in the wake of decolonization.

The fact that the Interparliamentary Union has been able to exist for so many years and that parliamentarians from so many nations can meet here today goes to show that it is possible to get together and discuss problems in a peaceful and constructive way.

Therefore, in extending to you, on behalf of the Danish Government and the Danish people, a most cordial welcome, I express the hope that this Conference may contribute to better understanding and greater tolerance among nations and bring us further toward the solution of the many problems ahead of us in our strive to create a world of prosperity, liberty, and peace.

Reapportionment Issue Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union, August 20, 1964:

CONGRESS ACTION NEEDED—REAPPORTIONMENT ISSUE VITAL

As the 2d session of the 88th Congress draws to a close, President Johnson has been granted about 23 percent of his 1964 legislative requests. Only one major item—the antipoverty bill—was initiated by him.

In the adjournment rush, administration pressure will be severe. The most important Johnson proposal still pending is the social security medical care bill.

Despite all pressures to keep the issue alive, it appears quite likely there will be no final approval of the measure. The Senate Finance Committee earlier this week turned down two administration medicare programs tied to social security.

The reasons are obvious: There never has been grassroots support for the plan in its present form; Congressmen are becoming increasingly aware that other, more realistic programs are necessary for medical care.

With medical care apparently relegated to another Congress, the most significant debate will be about various attempts to delay a Supreme Court order for reapportionment of State legislatures.

The Court ruling specifies that membership of each house of a State legislature must be based on population. Heavily populated areas, such as California's coast, thus would have absolute control over all legislation, at the expense of rural sectors, which are so important to the State's development, and which end up with not one voter, one vote—but many voters with no effective vote.

Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN has authored a rider on the foreign aid authorization bill that would postpone for at least one legislative session in each State, enforcement of the High Court's ruling to provide time for States to act on a proposed constitutional amendment overriding the Supreme Court. Such an amendment is asked in the Republican platform.

Various compromise measures have been introduced.

Representative WILLIAM M. TUCK, Democrat, of Virginia, has introduced a measure that would ban Federal court action in any State legislative redistricting. Still another proposal has been offered by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, and Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota. It would put Congress on record as declaring that States should have adequate time to reapportion "consistently with its electoral procedures."

The rash of proposals seeking to block the Court decision is evidence the Congress is deeply concerned in a matter that is creating governmental chaos, and electoral injustice, in nearly every State.

Unless the ruling is nullified by one means or another, the very nature of representative government as it is understood in this country will be changed.

The reapportionment subject is so important to every State in the Union that it cannot be ignored or shelved by the current session of Congress.

Measures to halt this further encroachment on States rights should be given priority over all other pending legislation. Other matters before the Congress pale as insignificant in comparison.

No Rush

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in today's Wall Street Journal is of interest to many of us who have been receiving complaints of the slowing down of mail deliveries all over the country.

Apparently, in transporting mail overseas the Post Office Department is not to blame. No indeed, the courts, always the most helpful of the three branches of the Government, have decided to put a brake on and assist the propjet operators and transport mail overseas in a more leisurely manner.

NO RUSH

If your mail does not get to its destination as fast as you think it ought to, the fault is not always the Post Office Department's. Look at what happened to the Department's proposal to speed airmail across the Atlantic.

Some weeks ago postal officials announced plans to allocate most transatlantic airmail to airlines having all-jet flights. This understandably upset a couple of airlines carrying mail on their propjet aircraft, which of course are slower than pure jets; no one likes the prospect of revenue loss.

So the propjet operators took their case to Federal court, and have won an order forbidding the Post Office Department from making its planned switch to the fastest available means of transportation.

It probably wouldn't be quite fair to say that had the Post Office been under comparable restraints from the start, mail today might be still traveling overseas under sail,

and across the country via pony express. But it does seem the Department has enough slowdown capability of its own, without needing any such judicial help.

Year 1964: How Much Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times, August 30, 1964:

YEAR 1964: HOW MUCH GOVERNMENT?

Trying to identify the differences between Democrats and Republicans has never been easy (some people even insist it's impossible because there isn't a real difference), and this year it looks tougher than usual, at least if you read the two platforms and recent speeches of the two presidential nominees.

BARRY GOLDWATER speaks of an Atlantic civilization toward which we must build. Lyndon Johnson talks about the great society. Despite a lot of quibbling, both parties have acknowledged the need for effective civil rights, enforcement of law and a strong foreign policy to counter whatever the Communist bloc may have in mind to harass or injure us.

In fact, in the areas of civil liberties and foreign affairs, the two major parties have been remarkably close over the past 20 years.

What then is the difference between Republicans and Democrats? The 1964 platforms and the candidates' speeches so far make it clear the difference is in domestic policy.

In 1964, as in virtually every campaign since World War I, the division between Democratic and Republican domestic policy pivots on the relation of Government to the individual. It centers on the role of Government in our economic, political and social life—how much, what kind, and to what end.

The Republican Party, today as in the recent past, adheres to the belief that the proper role of Government is to protect the free exercise of the individual's rights—to protect, not to determine or regulate, our rights to life, liberty and property, our rights to individual conscience, individual ideas, individual work, trade, talent, recreation.

In times of great national danger—particularly from abroad—the Government's function to protect has required an unnatural intervention through regulation, and we have willingly agreed to temporary abridgement of some of our rights.

But since World War II, the Republicans have sought to disengage the real function of Government—to protect—from the emergency measures that have seen more and more regulation of work, trade, ideas, even talent and recreation.

The Democrats, in 1964, as they have since the New Deal days, continue to emphasize Government as the regulator. They insist an emergency environment prevails not only in foreign affairs but in our everyday life at home.

That is the main difference to be disputed—and resolved—between now and November 3.

Loyalty Oaths for Lyndon but Not for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Charles L. Dancey so astutely points out, it must have done wonders for Lyndon's ego to have Hubert Humphrey and Walter Reuther support loyalty oaths for Lyndon having previously opposed loyalty oaths for the United States.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial from the August 27, 1964, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

A FREE PRESS TELLS ALL

(By C. L. Dancey)

The present convention in Atlantic City provides an excellent example of the role of an inquiring press, and the press has done an excellent job—including the TV and radio media.

For they have found the biggest news, and virtually the only real news from this ritual meeting by covering, in effect, the convention that didn't happen.

Unlike the circumstances in San Francisco, where the debate and much of the battle was carried on from the platform or on the floor, and after each debate the issue settled by a rollcall vote of the delegates, in Atlantic City nothing has been permitted to reach the platform but eulogies.

Indeed, not only is the platform reserved for Democratic eulogies, but there has been a total suppression of floor debate. The platform was not only jammed through as written on a voice vote, but it was not permitted to be publicly challenged on the floor.

A supreme effort was made to confine all controversy to the privacy of caucuses and closed committee meetings.

Only newsmen going directly to the source have shown what is going on really in Atlantic City, for all the real political action there is being conducted behind the scenes.

Through the energetic action of newsmen, however, a true picture emerges of caucuses in which big State delegations were whipped into line.

We see Walter Reuther, that great liberal and exponent of civil rights, abandoning critical negotiations between his giant union and General Motors to take time to browbeat the Michigan delegation into accepting the compromise that several Southern States approved to avoid a floor fight over the Mississippi credentials. We see Negro delegates in that delegation weeping as their great "champion" sold them out—sold them out of even an expression of their opinions on the floor of the convention.

Newsmen got some expressions of that opposing opinion, but never as part of the regular or formal proceedings of the convention.

We see the Mississippi delegation, accused of practicing political discrimination and segregation, approved, but asked to take a loyalty oath to President Johnson. The people who came up with this solution, HUMPHREY and Reuther, have over the years violently opposed proposals that public officials take a loyalty oath for the United States versus communism, but they think a loyalty oath to the Democratic party and to Lyndon Johnson is an appropriate requirement of a delegate.

We see the southern delegations, except for Mississippi and to some extent Alabama, accept this compromise, inasmuch as in obvious trade there is introduced into the platform of the party the virtual pledge that the present civil rights bill is final and the end of legislation on this subject as far as the Democratic Party is concerned, plus another platform plank coming out flatly against any kind of "street demonstration" (such as has been the feature of the southern Negroes protest against disenfranchisement, terrorism, and illegal segregation).

Yet, we would have seen none of this struggle had it not been for the diligent work of newsmen of all media, for every effort and lots of political "muscle" was used to prevent it from reaching the floor of the convention in debate, the floor of the convention in actual rollcall vote, or the platform of the convention in any manner.

The casualness with which the convention offered to seat as "honored guests" anybody in conflict as a legitimate delegate has become easy to understand. There isn't any difference in Atlantic City between a spectator and a delegate. Their powers are equal.

The control of the proceedings is so absolute, the delegates don't count. They don't even bother to show up much of the time—about a third being on hand.

The comparison of the two conventions makes the GOP session, unique for the naked power displayed by the GOLDWATER forces, seem Democratic, if you'll excuse the expression, by comparison with the naked power displayed in Atlantic City, where the whole thing is being managed in such a dictatorial fashion that neither debate nor a meaningful voting procedure has even been permitted.

Instead of suppressing differing opinions by an overwhelming vote on rollcall, after debate, as repeatedly happened in San Francisco, the differing opinions and disputes at Atlantic City are being suppressed in the back rooms, throttled in the throats of the disputants, and censored from the actual proceedings of the convention itself.

And we wouldn't have a glimmer of their reality were it not for the essential honesty, inquisitiveness, and skill of newsmen.

Where would we be if the media all came under the same presidential hammer that ruled this convention?

We wouldn't even know what happened. We'd have a pollyanna version like they have in Mexico * * * or Russia, for that matter * * * full of nothing but the exalted praises of our leader and his policies.

The Shoe Import Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the shoe import problem is still very much with us. A recent report from the foreign trade committee for the shoe manufacturing industry shows imports in women's, misses, and children's footware 8-percent higher than the comparable 1963 figure, with significant increases in vinyl footwear imports from Japan.

Imports for June exceed June of a year ago by 26 percent.

Many of these shoes sell in the American market at prices substantially less

than American manufacturers can make the shoes without any profit at all. It is wrong to permit this foreign competition in our market on an unlimited import basis.

The President should give this industry quota relief and he should do this now. He has the power under the Trade Expansion Act without the need for any further act of Congress.

It is long past time that we should guarantee at least a portion of the American market to American industry, despite the howls of anguish from the State Department. Once again we call upon the President for this relief in behalf of this sorely beleaguered domestic industry.

Under unanimous consent I am including in the RECORD at this point a statement of the foreign trade committee for the shoe manufacturing industry together with a statistical report of the total imports of the over-the-foot footwear for January to June of 1964:

IMPORTS OF WOMEN'S AND MISSES' FOOTWEAR AND VINYL SHOES AT AN ALLTIME HIGH—FIRST 6 MONTHS' IMPORTS OF 53,914,026 PAIRS EQUAL TO 14 PERCENT OF A U.S. PRODUCTION OF 389,240,000 PAIRS

Women's, misses' and children's footwear imports totaled over 11,700,000 pairs, a figure 8 percent higher than the comparable 1963 figure. The f.o.b. average value per pair also increased 8 percent per pair, from $1.70 to $1.83. Nearly 90 percent of all the imports in this category were from Italy.

Another significant increase is in vinyl footwear imports. January–June 1964 imports totaled 17,579,046 pairs, which was 199 percent over the comparable 1963 figure. At present rate of importation the total annual figure would be 48,600,000 pairs. The vinyl shoes from Japan are selling at an f.o.b. wholesale price of 43 percent per pair which is 25 percent below the 57-percent average of 1963. The comparable U.S. price is usually 100 percent higher or more. Japan exported 98 percent of the 17.6 million pairs of supported vinyl upper shoes as well as 83 percent of the 16.5 million pairs of sneakers.

Imports of men's, youths' and boys' footwear dropped 3 percent from a year ago to 3,750,719 pairs but wholesale f.o.b. value per pair increased 4 percent to $3.95, thus indicating successful trading up by importers.

The vinyl upper footwear imports from Japan have for the first time, starting in January and for each month since, exceeded importations of rubber canvas varieties, both in pairs and dollar value. Also for the first time the vinyl imports have exceeded the volume of fabric upper footwear with nonrubber soles which have dropped 43 percent compared to a year ago.

Total imports for June 1964 increased to the level where they brought the running total, January through June, imports past the 1963 level by 3.4 percent. Before May, total imports lagged behind a year ago. Total imports for June itself exceeded June a year ago by 26 percent. Thus, the current trend indicates an upswing which if maintained will result in total 1964 imports that will exceed 1963 by a considerable margin.

Total imports of over-the-foot footwear, January–June 1964

Type of footwear	January–June 1964			January–June 1963			Percent change, 1964/1963	
	Pairs	Dollar value	Average dollar value per pair	Pairs	Dollar value	Average dollar value per pair	Pairs	Average dollar value per pair
Leather	16,130,235	$37,083,065	$2.30	19,820,131	$35,555,244	$1.79	−18.6	+28.5
Men's, youths', and boys'	3,750,719	14,822,958	3.95	3,879,750	14,762,244	3.80	−3.3	+3.9
Women's, misses', and children's	11,759,433	21,474,525	1.83	10,850,483	18,403,093	1.70	+8.4	+7.6
Slippers [1]	210,237	345,059	1.64	4,634,368	1,923,218	.41	−95.5	+300.0
Moccasins	350,060	332,204	.95	397,920	373,389	.94	−12.0	+1.1
Other leather	59,786	108,319	1.81	57,610	93,300	1.62	+3.8	+11.7
Shoes of wood	127,314	180,917	1.42					
Fabric uppers [1]	3,604,702	1,874,056	.52	6,310,763	3,358,896	.53	−42.9	−1.9
Supported vinyl uppers	17,579,046	7,643,124	.43	5,881,110	3,367,543	.57	+198.9	−24.6
Rubber-soled fabric uppers	16,472,729	10,067,771	.61	20,150,417	13,310,040	.66	−18.3	−7.6
Total, all kinds	53,914,026	56,848,933	1.05	52,162,421	55,591,723	1.07	+3.4	−1.9

[1] Year-to-year comparisons of data not valid due to change in definition.

NOTE.—Figures do not include imports of waterproof rubber footwear, zoris, and slipper socks.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce; records of the National Shoe Manufacturers Association.

A Constitutional Prayer Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1964, Charles Wesley Lowry, Ph. D. (Oxon.), D.D., president, Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order (FRASCO), offered the following testimony before the Judiciary Committee.

Dr. Lowry is one of the best-known theologians in the country, and no one man could speak on this issue with greater knowledge and understanding.

I hope that all Members will read this statement, and I am sure it must convince them to take the necessary action now to bring an amendment before the House, have it adopted and acted upon at once.

A CONSTITUTIONAL PRAYER AMENDMENT

(By Charles Wesley Lowry, Ph. D. (Oxon.), D.D.)

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the privilege of being before this distinguished committee. For a great many years I have been a close student of the American religious heritage and the realities as well as the problems of church and state. Last January I brought out a new book entitled "To Pray or Not To Pray: A Handbook on Recent Supreme Court Decisions and American Church-State Doctrine."

We are, Mr. Chairman, in the midst of a revolution. I am not sure that this is sufficiently appreciated, though unquestionably many are aware that something very radical and very sweeping is afoot. This is the reason for the murmurings and stirrings at the grassroots. All honor to the Congress, designed to represent the sovereign people of this Nation, that the voice of the great mass of our citizens is heard and that an opportunity for hearings such as these is given.

The years 1962 and 1963 will appear to posterity as years of revolution in the relations of church and state, religion and government in the United States.

The revolution was not one which proceeded from or was accomplished by the American people. It was a revolution from above. It was imposed on the people in two stages through judicial edicts handed down by the Supreme Court in deciding cases before it. The first stage was the decision which struck down the nonsectarian New York school prayer. As this prayer had been uniquely an interfaith effort, developed by and under Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leaders, its demolition created a furor. There was a tremendous outburst of indignation throughout the country. The great power elites of our society were aroused nearly as much as the plain people. For example, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman denounced the decision in no uncertain terms. The eminent Protestant theologian, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, criticized it in the pages of the New Leader.

Bishop James A. Pike asserted that the Supreme Court had deconsecrated the Nation. Another bishop I am told remarked that the Court had enacted an 11th commandment: Thou shalt not pray in school. Not a few Jewish teachers were disturbed, among them Rabbi Bernard Ziotowitz and Prof. Will Herberg.

The atmosphere also in both Houses of Congress was very heated. The most outspoken alarm and anger were voiced. The Senate Committee on the Judiciary pro-

ceeded almost immediately to hold hearings, which were published in a voluminous and informative volume.

Then it was, Mr. Chairman, that something quite singular occurred. A combination educational and public relations campaign was initiated, aimed at explaining the Court, smoothing down the ruffled feathers of the Congress, quieting the fears of the people, developing support for an extreme liberal outlook on issues of religion in the public schools, and generally preparing Americans for a further and more decisive action by the Higher Court.

Members of the Supreme Court themselves got into action to explain their decision—in itself an unusual act. They were joined by various eminent Protestant clergymen, some as individual voices, others in concert. Many lawyers, civic leaders, publicists, and academicians as well as clergy of the major faiths, were drawn into the picture. By the early spring of 1963, when the Supreme Court heard new cases involving the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in public schools it was evident that a far-ranging and concerted movement, involving influential elements of key power structures in the country, was in full swing and that its weight was being directed to prepare and condition the American people for a still more definitive and sweeping development.

The sequel we all know. In June 1963 the Highest Court again struck and struck hard. This time there was no technicality available about State officials having composed a prayer or usurping the role of a church. But this lack did not stay the reformatory broom of the Justices. They again invoked the no establishment clause and forbade as prohibited religious exercises saying the Lord's Prayer and reading from the Bible. Though the rule of confinement to this case alone undoubtedly applies technically, the Justices appeared to sweep with broad strokes and to say in no uncertain tones: "There is no place under the American constitutional system for prayer, reverent Bible reading, or devotional exercises of any kind in the public school. The business of the school is education not religion, the mind not the soul."

This, we repeat, is a very radical decision. It marks, if it sticks, a turning point in our history. It adds up to a major revolution. A tradition is dead that began at least as early as 1684 when the rules of the New Haven Hopkins Grammar School required "that the scholars being called together, the Mr. shall every morning begin the work with a short prayer for a blessing on his laboures and their learning."

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that many will feel I am using strong words. This is because of the gravity of the issue. I believe that I have spoken with precision and exactitude of what has happened and of the situation which presently confronts the American people. It is however incumbent on me to support my view by reference to history and the clear traits of the system which has been handed down to us as Americans.

THE GREAT AMERICAN MIDDLE WAY IN CHURCH AND STATE

There are voices among us, Mr. Chairman, which are wont to cry "extremist" and "reactionary" and "American primitivism" and "rightwing radical," whenever a stanch dissent to the judicial destruction of cherished practices and institutions is registered. I do indeed believe that there is a radicalism of the right, and I deplore it as definitely as I do radicalism of the left. But in the area of church and state, religion and the nation, it must be emphasized that the true radicalism is in the new position which the Supreme Court has carved out and erected into public policy at the behest of a tiny minority of atheists, free thinkers, and extreme secularists.

These people—do not mistake me—should have their rights under the Constitution: freedom to think, speak, and act. I will go as far as Voltaire here. But, Mr. Chairman, it is a calamity and it is not straight thinking to convert legitimate radical dissent into public policy and impose it on the overwhelming majority of the American people, at the same time trampling down ruthlessly ancient prerogatives of local self-government in school affairs. This is indeed a "tyranny of the few."

It is also a rejection of the great traditional American middle way in the sphere of church-state relationships. I regard the durable working synthesis that we had achieved in this delicate area in this country and that has served us so well, as one of the supreme achievements of history.

What is this middle way in church and state? It is holding the ship of state steady in between the pulls of various menacing extremes. One of these is theocracy or the rule of God mediated through priests, presbyters, or divines of some kind and extended to the secular as well as the ecclesiastical order. Another is political absolutism. This may take the form of erastianism or subjecting the church to the rule and domination of absolute rulers, as in the period of the divine right of kings following the Protestant Reformation and penetrating also into Catholic societies. It was a Catholic king, Louis XIV, who exclaimed: L'Etat, c'est Moi.

Or, the absolutism may take the form of totalitarianism, as in our terrible time, with dictatorship establishing itself as the guardian of an idolatrous secular faith and setting itself not only to rule men with a rod of iron but to redeem them from the evil past and the corruption of the private ownership of property and transform them into a new humanity—the new Soviet or Communist man. And this, of course, means the ruthless, utterly unconscionable persecution of all believers in God and in Christ.

When I hear so much talk now about religion being a private affair and a matter for the church and the home but not the school and not Government in any manner, I must own that I become somewhat frightened. I wonder whether our leaders and many of our most prominent and privileged people may not be moving like sleepwalkers toward a destination and a fate they do not and cannot see. At such moments I remember the Soviet decree of 1918 which read: "Religion is a private matter and the State can take no cognizance of the religion of its citizens."

In this connection, I have just come across a remarkable speech by Mr. Henry R. Luce on "The Age of Multiple Revolutions." It was given last December to a group of Time, Inc. executives. In it Mr. Luce said: "The revolution in religion means many things, but most notably, perhaps, the modern agreement that religion is a private affair—that religion has nothing to do with the res publicae—public affairs—or with the guidance of society. Are we taking this assumption for granted too quickly and too lightly?"

What positively is the American middle way? It is not a construct of extreme simplicity, but is a rich synthesis grounded on the Constitution and hammered out in the laboratory of life, experience, instinct, and tradition. It is a doctrine with three articles.

Article 1. A true nation, like a true individual, exists under God and owes the Creator and Supreme Being reverence, acknowledgment, and obedience, especially in relation to the universal moral and spiritual laws commonly summed up as the moral law.

A remarkable historical example of this conviction, which I believe underlies in a central manner the whole history of the United States, from colonial beginnings until now, is the action of our first President, George Washington, in response to a resolution of the first Congress assembled under our Federal Constitution. The day was September 25, 1789 and on that day the Congress first submitted the Bill of Rights or first 10 amendments to the States. It then passed, without debate, a resolution requesting the President to recommend to the people of the United States "a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God, especially by affording them an opportunity peacefully to establish a Constitution of government for their safety and happiness."

Eight days later, on October 3, 1789, the President of the United States issued the first Thanksgiving Day proclamation under the new Constitution. Its second paragraph begins: "Now therefore I do recommend and assign Thursday the 26th day of November next to be devoted by the people of these States to the service of that great and glorious Being, who is the beneficent Author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be."

There are many other symbols and summaries of the American conviction that this is a nation under God. Our foremost papers of state abound in such expressions, nor are these by any means formalistic or stereotyped. They are solemn, thoughtful, sincere, and instinctive. We all are cognizant of the national motto "In God We Trust," the present word of the flag salute, and a much older and immensely impressive creation of religious symbolism, the reverse of the great seal of the United States.

I think, however, that we can hardly find a finer or more forceful presentation of the first article of American church-state doctrine than President Washington's serene, yet fervent and movingly reverent proclamation of a Thanksgiving Day in obedience to the request of the Bill of Rights Congress.

Article 2: It is for the safety and happiness of the people, and the preservation of the blessings of liberty, that church and state be separated.

That, in my own words, is the second article of the American creed in the all-important matter of the relations of church and state, religion and government. Another and more authoritative phrasing is that of the opening words of the Bill of Rights: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Much thought has been exerted, much ink expended, in the effort to exegete with precision those historic words. And yet how well they have served us as a nation and people from 1789 to 1962. What did the architects of America have in mind when they interdicted the Congress from tampering legislatively with an establishment of religion or with its free exercise?

May I respectfully suggest that our third President, Thomas Jefferson, may have been more inspired than he knew, or than many of his admirers across the decades have realized, when he was led to set forth his celebrated gloss on the first amendment in addressing a committee of Baptists from Danbury, Conn., on the first day of January 1802.

Jefferson said, as the learned members of this distinguished congressional committee of course know, that he contemplated "with solemn reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should 'make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,' thus building a wall of separation between church and state."

There is something in this gloss which has escaped, as far as I know, historians and legal exegetes. It is a very simple point and one that should be obvious. Yet it is the simple things which we sometimes miss. Jefferson in this statement shifts gears ver-

bally, so to speak, and speaks of a wall of separation between church and state. He does not say between religion and the state. He does not say a religious activity, regardless of its nonsectarian quality. He could have stuck to language about religion which after all is the specific word employed in the phrase "an establishment of religion" and also, by clear antecedent reference, in the second phrase "the free exercise thereof."

Jefferson instead spoke of separation between church and state, thereby launching a crucial phrase on its historic career. Is not this exactly what he meant and is not this the clear meaning which the first amendment had for its authors and for their successors in the American tradition until very recent times?

The Founding Fathers saw the perils of intermingling the organization and management of ecclesiastical or sectarian affairs, on the one hand, and the direction of the affairs of state, on the other. They wished mutually to segregate church organization and political activity. They did not wish to have a situation in which a bishop or a president of the Baptists would be the Secretary of State. They did not want a condition like that of unhappy Cyprus today where an archbishop is also chief of state. But the general and benign influence of religion was quite another matter. The last thing they thought of, let alone deliberately purposed, was the segregation and separation of public life and public education from common prayer or the reading of the Bible.

Article 3: There shall be maximum freedom in the sphere of religion, both in thought and act, for individuals and for groups.

Such freedom cannot be absolute, as the story of Supreme Court decisions between the Great Wars in this century abundantly shows. For others have rights also. This introduces an unavoidable factor of relativity as the price of society, civilization, and the greatest good of the greatest number. But in our American system we desire, and the Constitution guarantees, maximum protection of the rights of all individual citizens, including religious liberty or the free exercise of religion.

But, it may be asked, is the issue today not precisely the rights of individual citizens, including minority religious groups and even individual atheists? The answer is No. Our forefathers were not unaware of the existence and problems of minorities. Though atheism was hardly conceivable to them, save as an extreme abstraction or exception, they certainly assigned no limits to freedom of opinion. Persecution on account of religious belief or disbelief was abhorrent to them, and they dared under the American system to outlaw such an outrage against human dignity.

But this must not be understood as meaning that the tail of protection of rights should be allowed to wag the dog—that is, the body politic as a whole. It is here, in my opinion, that we have become confused and in consequence have run into serious trouble.

Tolerance, toleration, protection of the freedom of all individuals, is one thing. Public policy is another thing. It is here that a serious fallacy has been embraced by the Supreme Court of the United States, with the result that a whole people is upset and thrown into confusion in an area of the utmost delicacy and sensitivity, namely, religion.

The Supreme Court in Schempp and Murray adopts as the keystone of the arch of constitutionality the concept of strict neutrality, "neither aiding nor opposing religion" and eliminating all religious exercises in any way required by the state or States. Mr. Justice Goldberg in a concurring opinion in which Mr. Justice Harlan joined, expresses some concern about the possible results of an untutored devotion to this concept of neutrality but does not question it fundamentally.

This is the crux of the constitutional issue and the practical issue. The Supreme Court, I believe, has forgotten the solid and unbroken history of the Nation's essential religiousness and commitment to the public acknowledgement of God. This has been and, in many respects, remains our public policy. Prayer and Bible reading in the public schools were simply one of many expressions of this policy. The traditional American position, I repeat, has been one of benevolence toward expressions of religious faith in civil life and public institutions so long as these did not approach establishmentarianism in the semantic and historical sense of preferring or favoring one church or denomination over another. In the words of the distinguished authority, T. M. Cooley, in his classic work "Principles of Constitutional Law": "It was never intended by the Constitution that the Government should be prohibited from recognizing religion—where it might be done without drawing any invidious distinctions between different religious beliefs, organizations, or sects" (pp. 224–225).

This issue is, of course, not new and the Supreme Court had dealt with it long before the post-World War II period with its preoccupation with school problems. Mr. Justice Story in *Vidal* v. *Girard's Executors* (1844) declared: "It is also said, and truly, that the Christian religion is a part of the common law of Pennsylvania." Mr. Justice Brewer in *Trinity Church* v. *United States* (1892) opined: "These, and many other matters which might be noted, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian nation." Mr. Justice Sutherland in *United States* v. *Macintosh* (1931) wrote: "We are a Christian people, according to one another the equal right of religious freedom, and acknowledging with reverence the duty of obedience to the will of God." Mr. Chief Justice Hughes in the same case in a dissenting opinion said: "One cannot speak of religious liberty, with proper appreciation of its essential and historic significance, without assuming the existence of a belief in supreme allegiance to the will of God."

This issue of strict neutrality versus protection of constitutional rights combined with a benign and positive attitude toward religion, was implicit in Mr. Justice Douglas' opinion in a relatively recent case, *Zorach* v. *Clauson* (1952). It is very important to note in this landmark decision not only the oft-quoted aphorism: "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being," but these sentences which go to the heart of what has been the American middle way:

"The first amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of church and state. Rather, it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways, in which there shall be no concert or union or dependency one on the other. This is the commonsense of the matter. * * * When the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions."

This decision in Zorach followed McCollum—a decision that had set forth an interpretation of the first amendment substantially in line with those of Engel and Schempp-Murray. A distinguished Protestant theologian, Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, president emeritus of Union Theological Seminary, expressed last July the view that the significance of the Schempp-Murray decision lay at a far deeper level than the matter of the school exercises proscribed. This new significance was, on the one hand, retrospective: "In its radical recasting of the intent and meaning of the Constitution"; on the other hand, prospective: "In its possible anticipation of far more drastic and fundamental reversal of the historic and established practices of National, State, and local governments with respect to religion." (Letter to New York Times, July 7, 1963; quoted in "To Pray or Not To Pray," Lowry, p. 113.)

This weighty statement from an unusually competent and authoritative source is extremely useful in checking our course and charting the reasons why the current debate on a constitutional prayer amendment is so vital.

WHAT IS THE REMEDY?

So far I have dwelt on the larger background facts. Every student must master these. But the problem left by the stubborn fact that the Supreme Court is the last resort under our system and that it seems to have spoken in uncompromising tones, remains. What is to be done? What is the answer? Is there any remedy? If so, what is it? How satisfactory will it be?

One answer is: Trust the Supreme Court. Leave the interpretation of the Constitution and the settlement of all questions related to religion in public and national life to our highest judicial body.

This is the course advocated or acquiesced in by a large body of opinion. The difficulty with it is the complete uncertainty in which it leaves us with respect to the preservation of the American religious heritage in its fundamentals. This is an area, as we saw earlier, in which the spirit of radical change manifest in many areas of life is making itself felt.

It may be that this revolutionary spirt respecting religion is irresistble and will sweep all before it. On the other hand, it may be that this trend bodes ill for the Nation and that it should be resisted. The issue must be debated and decided on its merits. It is not one per se which the Supreme Court is especially qualified to decide, nor is this the province of the highest Court.

Another problem is that ours is a Government of divided powers. The Congress and the Chief Executive have responsibilities too. Traditionally they have acted in the religious field, as distinct from establishing a particular religion or acting to prohibit the free exercise of religion. It is wrong to think that the Supreme Court is the only branch of Government properly concerned with problems involving religion.

Above all, the people are concerned. It is their children who are the subjects of the educational process. It is their heritage and their children's heritage which is at stake.

A second possible answer is that the Supreme Court—which after all has never claimed infallibility—could take a second and more sober look at the whole landscape and make haste to spell out in a relevant fundamental decision its mind on the limits, if any, of the prohibitory and interdictive implications of the first amendment with respect to religion. How far does the Court recognize and feel responsibility toward the middle way of the past in the matter of religion and government? How far does the guarantee of free exercise of religion go in its applicability to actions of citizens in public schools and other public institutions? For example, is voluntary prayer and Bible reading, that is, where there is no specific law or rule—is such a voluntary religious activity in a public school constitutional?

This is by no means a speculative or merely theoretical question. The whole country is occupied with it in some form. A large number of evangelical clergymen, particularly it would appear in the great Southern Baptist Convention, are convinced that the real meaning of recent decisions by the Supreme Court is to make it clear that truly voluntary activity of a religious character in public schools or anywhere is constitutional.

Many teachers, school administrators, and professors either hold a similar view or are disposed to. A high school history teacher in Maryland called me up to say that he opened his classes each day with prayer and Bible reading and didn't I think, since this was purely voluntary on his part, that the Supreme Court would regard this as constitutional? A State superintendent of public instruction told me emphatically last month that in his State there were no rules about either prayer or reading the Bible, and there wouldn't be any, and consequently they would have no trouble, for there wasn't anything for the Supreme Court to rule on. He stated, in answer to my questions, that in that State teachers and principals were free to follow their own consciences in such matters. Last Sunday (April 26) a letter of unusual interest from a professor emeritus of the American University appeared in the Washington Post. In it Prof. Ralph B. Kennard opposes all current proposals to amend the Constitution in relation to religion on the ground that many people have misunderstood the recent decisions of the Supreme Court. "They believe that these decisions prohibit prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. In fact they do nothing of the kind. There was not a word against free, voluntary, unregimented prayer or Bible reading."

My personal judgment, for what it is worth, is that all these good people are dwelling in a cloudland. Reading carefully all opinions in both Engel and Schempp-Murray against a background of close study of Court thinking in the general field since 1940, I am persuaded, though I wish I were wrong, that the current Court is in a dogmatic frame of mind philosophically. Its intent, perhaps unconsciously, is reformatory with regard to widespread existing practices involving religious worship or devotional overtones in the public schools of the Nation. Unless a miracle intervenes, the "free exercise" clause will not be invoked to save voluntary religious activity.

Miracles, of course, do happen. And the attempt to eliminate all devotional expression among our children and young people in a school context is a bold and sweeping enterprise. I do not believe that it will succeed. It runs too squarely counter to the deep instincts of our people. Tyranny always generates a reaction, and this is certainly not less likely in the case of a "tyranny of the few," even though the tyranny be in the name of tolerance.

So we come back to the remedy of a constitutional amendment. I was originally reluctant to resort to it, because I am such a believer in the Constitution as we have known it and in the classical church-state synthesis under which the American Ship of State has so skillfully woven its way between the Scylla of theocracy and the Charybdis of political absolutism. I am, however, now persuaded that an amendment is the only sure, clear, and definite answer. Without such an antidote, the present confusion and cross-purposes among our people will increase. Ahead on this course lie treacherous morasses and beyond them an unfathomable abyss. In addition, I am persuaded that intolerance in our country is on the upgrade and I would like to see this quieted by the application of proper remedies rather than allowed to fester and become more inflamed.

There are, admittedly, difficulties in the amendment answer. The problem of a simple yet comprehensive wording is a severe one. It is absolutely essential, in my view, to draft an amendment in such a way as to avoid any implication that the current, preposterously broad construction of the first amendment is the American constitutional position.

Bishop James A. Pike of California, who happens to be a friend and former pupil of mine, has made an extremely ingenious suggestion. Indeed, it is a brilliant idea which probably only a trained jurist, such as Pike was and is, would have thought of.

Bishop Pike's proposal is that the first amendment be reaffirmed with an explicatory restatement of the present phrase "an establishment of religion" to read: "the recognition as an established church of any denomination, sect, or organized religious association." My guess is that this will seem to many too narrow a construction, just as the current Court interpretation is too wide. Probably the best hope is to concentrate on the most expert and carefully chosen wording which centers on the issue of prayer, Bible reading, and public reference to Deity.

These are the points which Congressman Becker, who has earned the gratitude of countless Americans for his unselfish labor in this field, has accented in his proposed "consensus" amendment. Using the same focus, here is an alternate wording which may or may not have value.

"Nothing in this Constitution shall be interpreted as prohibiting the voluntary offering of prayers or reading of the Bible, or the voluntary hearing of the same, in a public school or other public institution in the United States, nor shall reference to Deity in a public setting be understood as constituting an establishment of religion."

In any case, it is not an insuperable task to draw up a clear and sound amendment. Let this honorable and respected Committee or some other proper organ of this House put the best brains and skills we have at this task, and then let the Congress and the people decide. Perhaps they will have second thoughts. Perhaps the polls are misleading. Perhaps the debate and discussion that must and should come in the meantime, will change the minds of a large enough minority to prevent the enactment of such an amendment. But, Mr. Chairman, let us not be afraid of the people. The Constitution and our American system rest on the twofold truth that the power is in the people and that this is where it belongs.

I for one am not worried about the future of tolerance and understanding and brotherhood if we remain a free people and if we retain the faith of our fathers in the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Muñoz Marín Steps Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues some editorial comment of the daily press concerning the retirement from the position of Governor of Puerto Rico of the Honorable Luis Muñoz Marín.

It is well known that Governor Muñoz Marín would have been renominated and certainly would have been elected for another term had he allowed himself to be persuaded further to carry the burden of the governorship of Puerto Rico. However, Governor Muñoz Marín having made the decision that he best serves his people with his retirement from the governorship, firmly held his position before the entreaties of a unanimous convention, which insisted on his renomination. It was his considered opinion that the time had come when a change should be made in the governorship, and so open the opportunity for transition and democratic transmission of governmental powers. For this decision Governor Muñoz Marín has been widely praised.

Some editorial comments are herein included:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Aug. 19, 1964]

STATESMAN OF THE CARIBBEAN

Luis Muñoz Marín will not seek in November the fifth 4-year term as Governor of Puerto Rico that is his for the asking. Perhaps because he himself is a poet, lines from the poet, Thomas Gray, come to mind. His lot was:

"To scatter plenty o'er a smiling land
"And to read his history in a nation's eyes."

Plenty is not too strong a word when one compares Puerto Rico today with the Puerto Rico of 1940, when the Popular Democratic Party he founded won power, or of 1948, when he became the island's first elected Governor. Under his leadership Puerto Rico changed from an eyesore into a showcase of American democracy—with the highest living standards in Latin America, an example to be studied by the leaders of other underdeveloped nations.

However, Don Luis (as he is called) did not exactly "scatter" plenty. He made his people work for it, and he taught them how—through his program "Operation Bootstrap." By retiring at the height of his powers and fame he is making his people continue to work—by learning how to get along with someone else at the helm.

Muñoz is avoiding the fatal mistake of many great leaders of democracies—making themselves "indispensable" and thereby inhibiting self-reliance. There is no dearth of able students of Muñoz to take over—notably the present secretary of state, Robert Sanchez, his most likely successor.

Puerto Rico will not be lacking in problems, but, happily, Don Luis is not disappearing. He will be around as a senator and elder statesman and a figure above the mounting tempest of politics in the Caribbean island.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 18, 1964]

(By Don Luis)

From Puerto Rico comes word of a small cloud of worry there lest Luis Muñoz Marín's decision not to run again for the governorship be interpreted on the mainland as a sign of political shakiness, and the selection of a virtual unknown to run in his stead create fears of a new spot of difficulty in the Caribbean. (Plaintively, they say in Puerto Rico that they wish all mainlanders realized that Havana is closer to St. Louis than it is to San Juan.) Any such readings and apprehensions would of course be wholly unwarranted.

Roberto Sanchez Vilella, chosen as candidate of the dominant Popular Democratic Party to run against Luis Ferré of the Statehood-Republicans, is in fact not widely known outside the island, but he has been secretary of state since 1952, when Puerto Rico became a Commonwealth, serving in effect as Muñoz's chief of staff and as Acting Governor in his absence. Sanchez is a quiet, highly competent man of great political acuity. If he becomes Governor, as is likely, his policies on relations between island and mainland will be the excellent policies of his predecessor.

In declining to run for another term of residence at La Fortaleza, Muñoz holds, against the fervent pleadings of the party, that the democratic process in Puerto Rico is in strong and vigorous shape and that the next step is for Puerto Ricans to demonstrate to themselves that their system and their fortunes do not depend on one man.

It is understandable that many Puerto Ricans might have come to think they did depend on one man. Almost a quarter of a century has passed since Muñoz, as president of the insular senate, took the first step toward a rehabilitation of the democratic process—the step of persuading every Puerto Rican of the value of his vote, and thus laying the political base for social and economic rehabilitation. "The people of Puerto Rico possess a great political potential," Muñoz once said, years ago, when to outsiders the total situation of the island looked utterly hopeless. They have justified the faith he had in them then—as he has justified their faith in him—and we can have no doubt that they will justify his faith in them now.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Aug. 18, 1964]

MUÑOZ MARÍN STEPS DOWN

Gov. Muñoz Marín of Puerto Rico is a somewhat uncommon specimen of a professional politician—he believes heart and soul in the democratic principles that he has always proclaimed. And now he is proving it once again by refusing to run for a fifth term as Governor.

His figure is such a familiar one in the United States and Latin America, as well as in Puerto Rico, that it has been impossible to think of the island without thinking of him. The popular Democratic Party he founded won power in 1940. Don Luis, as everyone calls him, became the first elected Governor of Puerto Rico in 1948, and he has been its only one, for he was reelected three times. Nothing could have prevented him from being elected again in November—except his own determination to step aside, which he does at the peak of his power and prestige.

The task he set himself many years ago has been well done. The remarkably successful economic and social program, known as "Operation Bootstrap," was his idea and his accomplishment. The Commonwealth status, whereby Puerto Rico became "associated" under the American flag, with common citizenship and complete autonomy in internal affairs, was conceived and carried through by the Governor.

Although he will remain in the political picture as senator and elder statesman, it would be unlike him to overshadow his successor, who will most likely be the present Secretary of State, Roberto Sanchez Vilella. Mr. Sanchez is not a popularly known figure, but he has been the Governor's closest associate for years and he is rated as an outstanding administrator.

Presuming that Mr. Sanchez is elected in November—which is a safe presumption—there will be no change in policies. Puerto Rico is older in history than the United States. Mr. Muñoz Marín is the 123d Governor since Columbus claimed the island for Spain. But it is also a new island, with a hopeful future for which the retiring Governor deserves much credit.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 18, 1964]

MUÑOZ MARÍN STEPS DOWN

Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín of Puerto Rico has struck an almost unique blow for democracy by refusing to accept a fifth nomination for Governor. Despite an overwhelming demand from the Popular Democratic Party for his continued leadership, the Governor held firmly to his decision. Why? The people of Puerto Rico need to prove to themselves, he said, that they can follow the path of justice and progress without depending upon the leadership of any one man.

The precedent thus set is the more significant because Mr. Muñoz Marín is the only elected Governor Puerto Rico has ever had. Since 1940 he has held the highest elective office in the island, and since he was first elected Governor in 1948 his role as first citizen has not been effectively challenged. Not only has he given Puerto Rico an energetic and progressive administration, he has also laid secure foundations for popular government within the framework of the Commonwealth.

In some respects, however, the greatest act of his career was his decision to relinquish the far-reaching power that the people had placed in his hands. Continued election of one man to the governorship throughout his lifetime might have cast some unfortunate reflections upon the development of democratic government in the Commonwealth. In acting to avert such a danger Gov. Muñoz Marín has demonstrated a high degree of statesmanship.

It is a happy circumstance that he has consented to continue serving his people as a member of the senate and as a teacher traveling through the countryside to enhance the faith of the people in representative government. Fortunately, too, the gubernatorial nomination went to Secretary of State Roberto Sanchez Vilella, who has been the Governor's righthand man and chief of staff for 12 years. Presumably a transition of authority will be made under the most favorable circumstances, and the millions of friends of Gov. Muñoz Marín in this country as well as in Puerto Rico will wish him many happy years in his role as elder statesman.

L.B.J.'s Nomination Recalls His Rise to Power in Ballot Box Scandal

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Republican Congressional Newsletter:

THE MESS IN WASHINGTON, PART III—L.B.J.'s NOMINATION RECALLS HIS RISE TO POWER IN BALLOT BOX SCANDAL

("This race is not a matter of life or death for me. If I lost by one vote in an honest count, the heavens wouldn't fall in. But some half million good solid Texans voted for me as their Senator (against Lyndon Johnson) and they have been defrauded and robbed."—Coke R. Stevenson, former Governor of Texas, commenting on the U.S. Senate race he lost to L.B.J. by 87 votes in 1948.)

Few of the good solid Texans who recall the special election which sent Lyndon Baines Johnson to the U.S. Senate in 1948 amid vote fraud charges and to the Vice Presidency in 1960 amid similar charges would be surprised at the wheeler-dealer climate which has permeated Washington since.

For in a thoroughly documented study of Johnson, "A Texan Looks at Lyndon" (Palo Duro Press), Texas Historian J. Evetts Haley states: "Throughout Texas * * * among those who have no political axes of their own to grind, and of every political point of view, there is deep suspicion and distrust of the man who is now President of the United States."

And again: "Federal bureaucratic pressure, State demagogues, the intellectually elite, labor, money, and criminal tactics combined to elevate [Johnson] to high office in Texas." And, Haley added, the same elements plus Johnson's "special talents as a wheeler-dealer and political fixer" put him in the Senate in 1948. In that bit of political fixing, Johnson also had the help of President Harry Truman, himself no stranger to scandal, and of Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black, the famous police court judge and former Klansman.

The story of how Lyndon Johnson became a U.S. Senator begins July 24, 1948, the date of the first Democratic primary. He was opposed by former Texas Governor, Coke R. Stevenson, a conservative who was hated by the New Deal crowd whom Lyndon served. In the primary, Stevenson got 477,077 votes to Johnson's 405,617, but because there were others running and Stevenson lacked a majority of total votes, a runoff between Stevenson and Johnson was necessary. It was held August 28 after a bitter 4-week campaign during which Johnson reportedly spent huge sums. Nevertheless Stevenson apparently won by 113 votes.

Johnson then went into action. He called on George B. Parr, wealthy political dictator of Duval County and a county judge who had been convicted of income tax fraud. Parr indicated he might pick up the needed votes in precinct 13 at Alice. The returns were "recanvassed" by Parr's men and the count was "corrected" to supply Lyndon with 202 more votes. Johnson thus "won" by 87 votes and earned the title "Landslide Lyndon."

"I was beaten by a stuffed ballot box." Stevenson charged. "And I can prove it."

Stevenson then began three lines of investigation—one conducted by his campaign managers, a second ordered by a Federal district court and a third ordered by the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. Johnson, fighting desperately for his political life, got the help of President Truman who was then crossing Texas on a whistlestop campaign train. Wanting the more liberal L.B.J. in Congress, Truman repeatedly passed the word to the party faithful as he journeyed through Texas that it must be Johnson at any price.

Meanwhile, Stevenson's investigation turned up these facts: (1) the new names which the "recount" in precinct 13 had been written on the lists in blue ink, whereas black ink had been used on the main list; (2) the new names were in alphabetical order, though it would be a mathematical miracle if 202 voters showed up at the polls alphabetically; and (3) all were in the same handwriting, though the writing on the main list varied.

After the discovery, Carr ordered the lists locked up in his bank at Alice. Stevenson's men, however, enlisted the services of a respected Texas ranger captain and were finally allowed to see the records. Although they were not allowed to make notes or copy names, they did succeed in memorizing the names of about 15 persons. A checkout on the names turned up some who had been long dead, and at least two who testified they had not voted at all.

To this testimony, Johnson's attorneys offered no rebuttal. They had none. The U.S. district court at Fort Worth then ordered an investigation of the ballot box tampering in Parr's district, a move which panicked Johnson, who flew to New Orleans to petition the fifth court of appeals to dismiss the district court's order. When it seemed that the appeals court decision might come too late, Johnson bypassed the court, and took his case directly to Supreme Court Justice Black in

Washington. Black promptly overruled the district court, and Johnson was home safe.

Stevenson's last effort, an appeal to the Senate subcommittee, also failed. For when the Senate investigators arrived in Texas, the ballots in question had disappeared. Johnson went on to the Senate in the general election in November.

Thus began Johnson's career which carried him past the Senate to the Vice Presidency—and last November 22 to the Presidency. But L.B.J.'s swift footwork at the polls was noted again in the presidential election of 1960 when he was No. 2 on the Democratic ticket. A subsequent issue of the Newsletter will look into how more than 100,000 Texas voters were disfranchised by Democratic shenanigans in that election.

Trouble After the Party

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

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration's transparent attempt to create a public impression of unanimous professional support for its economic policies badly backfired last week. The exercise made crystal clear some of the hazards involved in trying to use honest professionals to advance partisan political ends.

The occasion for the row was an unprecedented meeting called by the present Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Walter W. Heller, with his four predecessors. After what was to have been a private conversation, the press was called in and—apparently at the request of President Johnson himself—Chairman Heller was asked to brief the newsmen on the results of the meeting. Dr. Heller reported, among other things, that a consensus existed among the economists on the state of the economy and its outlook and the direction which future Government policy should take.

Those who attended the meeting were not long in responding to Dr. Heller's remarks. As the New York Times reported on August 26, three of those who were present expressed their dissent with Dr. Heller's consensus through letters to the editor or other means. One participant, Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of President Eisenhower's Council, wrote the New York Times and announced that Dr. Heller's statements to the press were entirely his own.

As Dr. Burns said, the public interest is not served by giving the impression that there are no clouds on the horizon. Another former Eisenhower Council Chairman, Dr. Raymond Saulnier, expressed a similar opinion. He is reported to have said, "I don't think any of us are being served very well by continually being told that everything is hunky-dory and that we're all on the same bandwagon."

Mr. Speaker, the interests of America's working men and women are not going to be served by the administration's attempt to create a state of national euphoral over the economy and its prospects. We continue to have serious economic problems—unemployment, balance-of-payments deficits, mounting private and government debt, increasing price pressures—which we ignore only at our peril. Much can be forgiven during an election year, but partisanship must have its limits. In this affair, the administration regretfully exceeded those limits.

Under unanimous consent, I include the articles from the New York Times of August 20 and August 26, from Time Magazine of August 28, and Arthur Burns' letter to the Times of Aguust 25, all dealing with this incident, in the RECORD at this point.

ECONOMIC ADVISERS TO PRESIDENTS AT ODDS

(By Edwin L. Dale)

WASHINGTON.—A storm with political overtones has been brewing over an unusual economic meeting at the White House last week that began with the weather fair and the participants smiling.

The meeting, the first of its kind, brought together the five men who have served as chairmen of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, under Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson.

The storm has arisen following a briefing of the press on the meeting by Walter W. Heller, the present Chairman of the Council, at which he reported that "the general feeling of broad consensus was to me the dominant note of the meeting."

Through letters to the editor and other means, three of those present have publicly expressed their dissent with this conclusion of "consensus." They are Arthur F. Burns and Raymond J. Saulnier, chairmen under President Eisenhower, and Edwin G. Nourse, chairman under President Truman. Leon H. Keyserling, the other chairman under President Truman, stands fully by Mr. Heller's report.

There is even a dispute as to whether the Heller report should have been made at all. Mr. Burns is quoted as saying that "the reporting of this meeting violated every professional code."

As a result of personal conversations with four of those present—Mr. Burns could not be reached today—an account of what actually transpired at the meeting can now be put together.

The trouble started, it is now generally recognized, with a snap decision of President Johnson's.

As the 45-minute session concluded, the President called in the White House photographers. Using their ordinary instincts, the reporters followed, and no one stopped them.

The President saw the reporters and, after the picture taking was over, he suddenly turned to Mr. Heller and told him to fill in the press on what had occurred at the meeting. Mr. Heller was visibly surprised and somewhat shaken by this.

He turned to Mr. Burns and asked him to join in the briefing, but Mr. Burns declined. Mr. Heller then proceeded to the lobby of the White House's west wing and gave his now controversial report, with its emphasis on consensus. Much of it was in response to questions by reporters.

He said that "all the members expressed confidence in the present economic picture and outlook."

He said all agreed that the huge tax cut earlier this year had been "effective" in stimulating the economy.

He said they also had agreed that, "We would again in a year or two face the prospect of having another fiscal dividend to declare." But he made clear there was no agreement on what form this "dividend"—arising from the prospective rapid growth of Federal revenues if the economy goes on expanding—should take.

Some members, he said, felt there should be further tax cuts. Others favored an expansion of Federal Government programs or a possible distribution of more funds to the States.

But there was agreement, he said, that the revenue growth could be so large that a combination of all these things might be possible.

Finally, he said, there was agreement that "if there were strong pressure on the economy or a threat of inflation," the appropriate policy would be to use the growth of revenues to retire the national debt.

However, he added in response to a subsequent question, "no one expressed fears of overheating or excessive pressures at present, meaning through the end of this year."

At the meeting, it is now known, the first to speak after opening remarks by the President was Mr. Burns.

PRAISED TAX CUT

He applauded the tax cut and suggested that there could well be further tax cuts in the future. He said the Government was faced with a delicate problem in monetary, as distinct from fiscal, policy. While he did not see overheating of the economy or a threat of inflation at present, he thought such a threat was possible next year.

In addition, Mr. Burns had a suggestion for the President in his dealing with the problem of price increases by key industries, such as steel. He opposed public statements of opposition to price increases and advocated, instead, a more discreet, private approach.

Mr. Nourse came next. He registered his dissent with Mr. Burns on the idea of future tax cuts and indicated his disagreement with the tax cut that had already been enacted, though he conceded that it had had some stimulative effect. He told the President that if Mr. Johnson's goal of a "great society" were to be achieved, it could be done only through the expansion of public—meaning largely Federal spending programs.

CONCERN EXPRESSED

Mr. Saulnier, who came next, said he had been concerned that the tax cut would seriously overheat the economy unless Federal expenditures were restrained. He told the President that, in his opinion, the favorable situation of the economy was due in large part to the expenditure restraint that had been achieved. He advocated the idea of regular Federal tax cuts in the future if this expenditure curb could be maintained.

Mr. Keyserling then took a position similar to that of Mr. Nourse, stressing the need for expansion of public programs. He doubted that stimulus of the economy through tax reduction would solve the Nation's unemployment problem.

In the course of the exchange that followed there was discussion of how great the prospective Federal revenue growth would be, with some questioning Mr. Heller's estimate that it would be $6 to $7 billion a year.

However, all agreed today that there was consensus at the meeting on three points.

The immediate outlook for the economy is good.

There is no immediate problem of overheating or inflation.

If the expansion continues, the growth in revenues would produce a surplus in the budget at the present level of expenditures.

CONSENSUS ON ECONOMIC POLICY APPEARS TO BE LESS THAN SOLID

(By M. J. Rossant)

The consensus favoring the Johnson administration's economic policies is not as broad or as solid as it is cracked up to be.

Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has been discovering that many economists harbor strong reservations about the administration's prescription for maintaining economic expansion.

The dissidents are on both the left and the right of the administration's middle-of-the-road position. Leon H. Keyserling, for example, who served as head of the CEA under President Truman, favors increased Government spending to keep the recovery going strong. Raymond J. Saulnier, who occupied the same post during the Eisenhower administration, feels that increased restraint over spending and credit may be needed.

They are not the only economists who question Dr. Heller's idea that there is "heartening evidence of a growing consensus on economic policy," a consensus that supports the mix of generous tax reductions and mild spending restraints pursued by the administration. In fact, many economists think that open discussion and debate must be carried on to insure that there is no freezing of policy or complacency about the problems that may arise.

Dr. Heller, who had observed that extreme liberal or conservative views had been losing ground even before extremism became a political issue, is all for economists getting together to discuss policy. Last fall he held a meeting with four former CEA Chairmen, Democrat Edwin G. Nourse and Republican Arthur F. Burns as well as Mr. Keyserling and Mr. Saulnier, for a private airing of views in Washington's Cosmos Club.

The group met again just 10 days ago, this time in the White House with the President in attendance. When the meeting broke up, the press elicited from Dr. Heller the view that "the general feeling of broad consensus was to me the dominant note of the meeting."

But the confusion about who said what at that meeting indicates that the consensus was a limited one. They agreed that the short-term economic outlook, covering the next 6 to 9 months, was bright. They also agreed that inflation was not a present danger.

This is not surprising. Almost every economist, either in business or in academic circles thinks that the expansion will continue into 1965. With most indicators of activity rising, it would be a real surprise if substantial differences over short-term outlook did exist.

There is considerable disagreement, however, about the policies that should be put into effect to sustain long-term growth. The kind of policies likely to be adopted by the Johnson administration may well have the support of a majority of the economic fraternity, but they arouse so many objections that there is no real consensus.

What troubles many economists is that the administration may sit on its laurels for too long. They are afraid that nothing will be done until it is too late to make much difference.

INFLATION FEARED

In general, the more conservative economists are concerned about the threat of inflation. They would prefer the administration to take prompt and decisive steps to counter a new wage spiral that could conceivably be touched off by too generous a settlement in the auto negotiations.

Liberal economists are much more worried about the possibility of a recession. They would like to see spending increased in order to make sure that it can be avoided, and they belittle the notion that inflation is a threat.

The administration also draws the fire of conservative, free-enterprise economists who are supporting Senator GOLDWATER. But Dr. Heller never included them in his consensus.

Both Dr. Saulnier and Dr. Burns, who were identified with the more moderate policies of the Eisenhower administration, are unwilling to endorse the formula hit upon by President Johnson.

They both favor tax reductions and a hold-down on spending, which is the administration's policy. But they are unwilling to concede that the expansion can be kept alive with more of the same.

OTHERS UNHAPPY

Some liberal economists are just as unhappy if not more so. Mr. Keyserling, for instance, is definitely opposed to another round of tax reduction if it involves a "quid pro quo of holding down or reducing spending." He much prefers an increase in spending to achieve a sustained rate of economic growth that can eliminate excess unemployment.

Mr. Keyserling, a vocal and voluble supporter of Government intervention in the economy, is one liberal who is prepared to make public his disappointment with the trend of the administration's policies. Many others, who have been advocates of increased spending in the public sector, are far from enthusiastic about the definite hold-down on spending, although they are willing to admit that it has contributed to the good showing of the economy.

The fact that business activity has advanced for over 3½ years and is now moving ahead faster than ever, has persuaded some economists to go along with the administration's policies. Like most businessmen, economists favored tax reduction to stimulate growth.

Yet critics of the administration contend that tax cuts, desirable though they may be, will not do all that the administration has said they will. Economists note that they are not proving very effective in either reducing unemployment or eliminating the deficit in the Nation's balance of payments.

Thus a sizable number of economists doubt that a mere continuation of the administration's present policies will sustain the expansion once it begins to lose steam.

GROWTH OF MONEY

According to Mr. Saulnier, the expansion in economic activity has been accompanied by a very big growth of money and credit, which "may not be able to be continued if it produces inflationary pressures."

Mr. Saulnier says that inflation is not discernible at present. But he is joined by many other economists in thinking that it could become a problem if the administration is unwilling to exercise greater restraint, either on spending or on credit.

Certainly, there is little support among economists for the administration's wage-price guideposts as a means of maintaining price stability. The general feeling is one of skepticism due to previous experience in using the psychological weapon of "open mouth" policy to restrain the private sector.

Economists on the conservative side of the fence are dead set against Government intervention in the affairs of business or labor. Some liberal economists would prefer much more direct interference, even though they are against any wage or price control. But both groups are united in their doubts about the administration's guideposts approach.

Mr. Heller's hopes of getting economists together to elicit their views and arrive at a consensus has been made more difficult by the flap that developed after his last meeting. With Mr. Burns quoted as saying that Mr. Heller's report "violated every professional code," there is little prospect of an early reunion unless firm ground rules are spelled out beforehand.

CONSENSUS HELD UNLIKELY

Even if that was done, a consensus is still unlikely to develop. There is just too wide a gap between Mr. Keyserling's stand in favor of greater spending and lower interest rates and the tighter line favored by Mr. Saulnier and Mr. Burns.

Mr. Saulnier is not against further discussions. But though he says that he does not want to seek disagreement, he suggests that a dialog, conducted with decorum and mutual respect can be more productive than the consensus sought by Mr. Heller.

Liberals feel much the same way. They want a chance to air their disagreements and press for policies more in the line with their ideas of what is needed to maintain expansion.

Mr. Heller, of course, had no intention of shutting off debate. Evidently, he was convinced that the overwhelming majority of economists favored the flexible approach that has been practiced, so that discussion about future policies could center on differences in degree rather than kind.

But the uproar that took place after the meeting with the President suggests that support for the administration's past policies does not extend to the future. Economists are prepared to discuss what should be done, but they are as divided as ever over the policies they favor.

TROUBLE AFTER THE PARTY

It was nearly as risky as inviting Hedda Hopper, Sheilah Graham, Lolly Parsons, and Dorothy Kilgallen to tea together, but Chief Economic Adviser Walter Heller thought he could pull it off. For months he worked to arrange an unprecedented meeting of four past chairmen of the Council of Economic Advisers with President Johnson. Though economists are a notably proud and prickly lot, Heller felt that the meeting would indicate that the former chairmen generally support the major points of the administration's economic policy, and he hoped that acrimonious debate could be avoided. Last week President Johnson joined Heller and Economic Advisers John Lewis and Gardner Ackley in the Oval Room to welcome the four past chairmen: Republicans Arthur Burns and Raymond Saulnier, who were Dwight Eisenhower's men, and Democrats Leon Keyserling and Edwin Nourse, who worked under Harry Truman.

MORE DESIRABLE

Everything went smoothly at first. Sitting in his rocker, his feet on a footstool, Lyndon Johnson was at his best. He deftly mentioned that he had looked at a recent speech by Burns, prominently displayed a copy of Keyserling's latest economic tract on monetary policy, and at one point replied to an expression of optimism by Saulnier by saying: "Mr. Saulnier, you're making this nomination seem more desirable all the time." Basking in this euphoria, the visitors generally agreed that the economy's short-term prospects did indeed look good.

The meeting lasted 45 minutes, and the trouble began as it ended. To the surprise of Republican Burns, who had presumed that the session would be unpublicized, Johnson proposed that the press be briefed immediately. As if on signal, reporters and cameramen rushed in. Burns refused Heller's request to join him in the briefing, and Heller went on to say that the main note of the meeting had been "a general feeling of broad consensus." Since this seemed to imply a general consensus in support of the administration's economic policies, Burns and Saulnier felt that they had been used for electioneering purposes. Snapped Burns later: "Mr. Heller spoke of a consensus where none existed. The reporting of this meeting violated every professional code—and when that happens to me, I'm independent enough to get dam mad."

NOT ON THE BANDWAGON

In fact, although Burns had agreed that present fiscal policy is "sound," he warned the President that he was tampering with

the free market in ways that "could seriously injure the economy," also suggested some tightening of credit to head off inflation. "Steve" Saulnier believed that it was far too early to measure the final results of the tax cut—but Heller told the press that the visitors had agreed that the cut has been a success so far. Later, Saulnier said: "I don't think any of us are being served very well by continually being told that everything is hunky-dory and that we're all on the same bandwagon." The Johnson wagon may be moving smoothly, but not all the economists have hopped aboard.

ECONOMISTS HAIL BUSINESS PICTURE—ADVISERS TO FOUR PRESIDENTS PREDICT FISCAL DIVIDEND WITHIN A YEAR OR TWO

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The five men who have been chief economic advisers to Democratic and Republican Presidents since 1946 reached a wide measure of agreement today on the state of the economy and its outlook, and on what the general direction of future Government policy should be.

The occasion was a meeting in President Johnson's office of the four former chairmen of the Council of Economic Advisers and the present chairman, Mr. Walter W. Heller. Mr. Heller summarized the 45-minute meeting later for reporters.

"The general feeling of broad consensus," he said, "was to me the dominant note of the meeting."

Those present were President Johnson; Edwin G. Nourse, Leon H. Keyserling, Arthur F. Burns, and Raymond J. Saulnier, all former chairmen; Mr. Heller; and Gardner Ackley and John P. Lewis, the other two members of the present council.

Mr. Nourse and Mr. Keyserling advised President Truman, and Mr. Burns, and Mr. Saulnier advised President Eisenhower, Mr. Heller has advised President Kennedy and President Johnson.

Mr. Heller listed for reporters a number of areas of agreement, and one of disagreement. All the economists, he said, "expressed confidence in the present economic picture and outlook" and agreed that the tax cut had been effective.

For the future, Mr. Heller said, the group agreed that because of the rapid growth of Federal revenues, "we would again in a year or two have the problem of another fiscal dividend to declare."

Some of the group, he said, thought this should take the form of another tax cut. Others favored either an increase in Federal spending or a larger distribution of funds to the States.

Though there was disagreement on this matter, Mr. Heller said, the group agreed that the growth in revenue would be so large that there might be a combination of tax cuts and expenditure increases.

Finally, the group agreed according to Mr. Heller, that if there were "strong upward pressure on the economy or a threat of inflation," part or all of the revenue growth should be used to retire some of the national debt. This would amount to a policy of surplus in the budget.

None of the group, Mr. Heller said, "expressed fears of overheating or excessive pressures" for the rest of this year.

The President opened the meeting with a brief statement in which he said he wanted to get advice from all sources. The discussion, according to Mr. Heller, was constructive and brisk.

Despite the agreement expressed at the White House, a strong note of dissent appeared largely by coincidence, as Mr. Kevserling released today a long study sharply criticizing the Government's monetary policy under both Republican and Democratic administrations for the last 11 years.

Mr. Keyserling's criticism was directed essentially at the Federal Reserve Board, which is quasi-independent of the Administration in power. The criticism concerned monetary, not fiscal policy.

He argued that, since 1953, rising interest rates have imposed "an excess interest cost of $15.8 billion upon the Federal budget, $2.3 billion upon States and localities and $32.1 billion upon all private borrowers, for a grand total of $50.1 billion."

Mr. Keyserling said the Federal Reserve policy had held back the economy and had produced an "inequitable" shift of income away from the poor toward the rich.

Mr. Keyserling's report was from the Conference on Economic Progress, which he heads. It is a nonprofit organization that includes labor leaders, industrialists, and heads of farm cooperatives.

HELLER DISPUTED ON OUTLOOK—EISENHOWER'S ADVISER DENIES HE SHARES VIEWS ON ECONOMY

To the EDITOR:

The New York Times of August 20 carried a report of the meeting that President Johnson had with the present Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers and his predecessors in that office.

As one of the participants, I regret that this meeting, which was intended to be private, was followed by a press conference. This circumstance compels me to add that Dr. Walter W. Heller's statements to the press, on which the article in the Times was based, are entirely his own.

Our economy is prosperous and there are grounds for optimism. The public interest is not served, however, by conveying the impression, as Dr. Heller did, that the experts conferring with the President see no clouds on the horizon.

Of course there are some clouds and it would be foolish to ignore them. One is the rapid expansion of credit and the official reluctance to restrain this expansion. Another is the tendency of high Government officials to interfere in the pricemaking process of our market economy. Although these matters were discussed with the President, Dr. Heller apparently did not see fit to say a word about them.

On the other hand, Dr. Heller did announce, according to the Times, a consensus to the effect that "we would again in a year or two have the problem of another fiscal dividend to declare." No careful economist would ever make such a statement.

Whether or not such a problem or opportunity arises next year or the year after will depend, first, on whether the economy continues to expand during the next year or two; second, on the rapidity of the advance if any; third, on the behavior of prices and incomes during that period; fourth, and not least important, on what happens to Federal expenditures during that period. Economists are analysts, not prophets; and their hopes must not be mistaken for predictions.

ARTHUR F. BURNS.

ELY, VT., *August 22, 1964.*

Guidelines for the Future of the American Railroad Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a brochure entitled "Guidelines for the Future of the American Railroad Industry," which impressed me very much. These are the recommendations of a conference of businessmen, bankers, educators, industrialists, railroad management, and government representatives, sponsored by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen:

GUIDELINES FOR THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN RAILROAD INDUSTRY

FOREWORD

(By Charles Luna, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen)

Today is a period of constant change that affects every aspect of life—social, political, economic. No person or institution is immune—the railroad industry included.

But despite changing transportation patterns, the American railroad industry is, and will continue to be, vital to American welfare both in peace and in war. That being so, American leadership should plan now for the future, so that the American public may continue to enjoy the advantages of a healthy, growing, and financially stable railroad system in the days ahead.

To this end the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, interested as it is in the welfare of the country, the industry and its own members, recently planned and sponsored a conference of some 30 experts drawn from the fields of business, banking, industry, education, railroading, and Government to explore railroading's future and provide guidelines for its maintenance and development.

Herewith presented are the recommendations arrived at by these experts after joint discussion at the Harvard Faculty Club, Cambridge, Mass.

Since there has been no opportunity as yet to present these findings to the Brotherhood membership for such action as they may wish to take, they should not be considered as necessarily representing official Brotherhood policy and point of view. Nevertheless, they represent so thoughtful, challenging, and considered a concensus of varied leadership opinion that we are delighted to present them herewith for the information, interest, discussion, and possible action thereon of the American people and their Government.

PROCEEDINGS

Joseph O'Donnell, director of the Harvard trade union program, associated with the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, and Charles Luna, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, gave the opening talks.

Following the opening address conferees divided into three groups. Membership of each group was drawn from all the fields of interest represented at the conference.

Each group, aided by previously prepared background papers, discussed in depth the five major topics presented for overall conference consideration: (1) "Future of Railroad Technology," (2) "National Transportation Policy," (3) "Emergency National Transportation," (4) "Financing," (5) "Railroad Marketing and Services." After consideration of each topic a group opinion consensus was recorded.

Following group discussions the entire conference body was reconvened in final session. Thereat the findings of the several groups as to each major topic were considered by the conferees as a whole. Those to which any objections were raised were eliminated. The remaining points, being approved by all present, were adopted as the recommendation consensus of the conference. These are presented on the following pages.

In line with the policy established by the American Assembly at Arden House, New

York, to insure free and open discussions without reserve, members of the press were not invited to the sessions but were provided with release material thereon following conclusion of the conference.

CONFERENCE FINDING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Future of railroad technology

1. The railroad industry needs an expanded, effective research facility with scope of interest vastly greater than at present, extending over the whole range of problems which confronts the field.

2. Federally supported research should supplement industry research by focusing on: (a) policy implications of Government action; (b) industry needs in the future; (c) the implications to the industry of new technology.

3. To improve the competitive position of the railroads, definite changes are needed that require intercompany and management-union cooperation. These include short, fast, frequent trains, shorter and quicker turnaround, less yard time, and more effective use of specialized equipment with better control and no storage utilization. Also there should be a review of intraindustry price arrangements such as per diem, payment for us of joint facilities, and the like.

4. Through the agency of the Association of American Railroads and other appropriate agencies, there should be greater cooperation to implement automatic controls, both mechanical and data handling, and to improve car control.

5. New passenger technology and greater coordination between railroad and highway movement of traffic should be developed.

6. Because the application of new technology creates substantial problems of human welfare in institution practices, new consultation facilities should be set up to promote continuing discussion of such problems between the railroads and the brotherhoods.

B. National transportation policy with regard to the future of the railroads

1. The new labor management consultation facilities recommended above should work for the establishment of a national transportation policy to cover rates, tariffs, employment, national emergency needs, and related matters.

2. Nondiscrimnatory tax policies affecting railroads should be applied on local, State, and Federal levels.

3. National transportation policy should provide for greater reliance on competition, less on regulation. Specifically the conferees endorsed the suggestions in President Kennedy's message of 1962 for few regulations in order to free the railroads to compete in the marketplace.

4. In reviewing mergers, governmental agencies must reach judgments based principally on criteria of social costs. Although increased size may lead to lower costs in some cases, other criteria of economic welfare must also be considered, such as the effect on communities, income, employment, and entry into industry.

5. It is of critical importance to the railroad industry and to the United States as a whole, that decisions on rate cases by regulatory agencies be rendered more promptly than has been the case in the past.

6. The national transportation census, now under a pilot study by the Bureau of the Census, should be expanded by adequate funds to a full and continuing program.

7. Railroad management and labor should cooperate through the instrumentalities heretofore recommended toward the development of a national transportation policy, directed toward the improvement and expansion of railroad services and employment opportunities, all geared to the national public interest.

C. Emergency national transportation

1. Responsible government agencies should research more fully the need for specialized equipment and the capacity of the railroads under emergency conditions, and should work out any remedial solutions needed, including financing.

2. Railroad management and labor union representatives should meet often to discuss emergency transportation needs.

D. Railroad industry financing

1. Because present railroad depreciation practices are delaying optimum use of technological capabilities, and so that railroads can modernize and improve their services, the industry should attempt to secure Government permission to depreciate property for tax purposes in a way that will reflect economic and technological obsolescence comparable to practices prevalent in other industries.

2. Railroads should be permitted to treat all improvements to physical plant and right-of-way as depreciable items in order to provide treatment comparable to the industrial economy.

3. Independent outside accountants should be retained by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Internal Revenue Service to study railroad accounting procedures as used for tax and regulatory purposes, together with their effect on reported railroad profits, in order to bring these procedures in line with accounting practices in other industries.

E. Railroad marketing and services

1. More railroads must establish effective, knowledgeable marketing programs closely coordinated with other railroad departments. Marketing has been the most neglected area of the railroad industry. Only in the last half dozen years have railroads become aware of the importance of marketing to their general welfare and their long-term viability.

2. Railroads are to be commended for the beginning of a new customer-oriented philosophy in providing specialized services for customer needs. This area of customer orientation should be recognized as the concern of everyone connected with the railroad industry. For effective implementation of this philosophy the railroads should adopt the most sophisticated forms of modern marketing organization and practices, such as sustained market research, product line marketing management, effective advertising, and public relations.

3. In addition to the individual efforts of management and labor to improve the public image of railroading as an industry, there should be coordinated effort between labor and management to the same end.

4. Care must be taken to assure that special purpose car acquisition programs are geared to the long-term requirements of the shippers, and that such programs generate sufficient profit over the long period to justify the investment.

Gov. Muñoz Marín's Tribute to the People of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter by Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín, of Puerto Rico, which appeared in the New York Times of August 27, 1964. Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín's letter is a great and well-deserved tribute to the people of Puerto Rico. The Governor points out, "the epic of Puerto Rico in the last 25 years is not that of one man, or of a few men, but of a whole people rising to a great challenge, deploying enormous energy and creativity to break out of the vicious circle of underdevelopment." I urge all my colleagues to read this eloquent letter:

The Governor's letter follows:

EPIC OF PUERTO RICO: GOVERNOR PAYS TRIBUTE TO ENERGY OF ISLANDERS, U.S. BACKING

To the EDITOR:

Your very generous editorial ("Muñoz Marín Steps Down," Aug. 18) is one which I will cherish. Allow me to point out that the epic of Puerto Rico in the last 25 years is not that of one man, or of a few men, but of a whole people rising to a great challenge, deploying enormous energy and creativity to break out of the vicious circle of underdevelopment.

And if there is one thing of which I am intensely proud, it is that the Puerto Rican people have done this without resorting to the constraints of regimentation or the trappings of dictatorship. They have dramatically raised their own living standards while actually reinforcing democratic processes and in complete respect of the fundamental dignity of people.

Their great accomplishments to date would have have impossible without the understanding and support of our fellow citizens in the United States, who have had the vision and confidence to invest in Puerto Rico in the largest sense of the word, not just economically but also spiritually. I believe they can be equally gratified and proud of the fruitful results already visible, which I am certain will be increasingly evident under the leadership of a most able and dedicated man, Roberto Sanchez.

CREATIVE ASSOCIATION

Contemplating the great challenges now facing the United States, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT recently stated: "We must strive, in the face of unprecedented need, toward unprecedented acts of political creativity * * * we must move toward broadening forms of association more nearly appropriate to the interdependence of the world than the sovereign Nation-State."

I submit that the experience of the people of the United States and those of Puerto Rico in just such a creative association may prove to be one of the most significant political events of our century. The Commonwealth relationship has certainly already shown that when two peoples share a common passion for democracy and the dignity of man, they cannot only differ in their cultural background, but also draw mutual strength and advantages from these differences.

I believe that this is an important lesson, not only for the United States and Puerto Rico, but for men everywhere who seek to adapt appropriate political institutions to a world which technology has shrunk to a point where all men are next door neighbors.

I also believe that in such political creativity lies the best hope for graduating from the straitjacket of 19th-century style nationalism, thereby establishing a new and far more propitious base for achieving the greatest of all needs: world peace.

LUIS MUÑOZ MARÍN.

SAN JUAN, P.R., *August 24, 1964.*

Non-Service-Connected Pension Programs For Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the recent enactment by the House of H.R. 1927 was an important step forward in equalizing veterans' benefits for those who served in all wars. One of the most foresighted men who are concerned about protecting the interests of those who fought for our country is Melvin D. Eddy, national senior vice commander of the Veterans of World War I. No one worked any harder to bring about new legislation in this field. This spring, for example, he testified before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on this problem. In view of the passage of recent legislation and in view of Mr. Eddy's untiring efforts, I think it would be appropriate to include Mr. Eddy's statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT BY MELVIN D. EDDY

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to present a statement relative to proposed legislation concerning non-service-connected pension for veterans. I would like to say that this committee is to be commended in its concern for the problems of veterans, especially the veterans of World War I and/or widows and dependents.

Realizing that there are over 150 bills pertaining to veterans, widows, and dependents benefits, I as a veteran of World War I serving overseas, am naturally concerned with veterans problems and the bill H.R. 2332, sponsored by the Veterans of World War I organization and introduced by the Honorable Congressman WINFIELD K. DENTON.

This bill, as you know, is an attempt to provide a separate and distinct pension for veterans of World War I and/or widows; an increase over section 3 of the Economy Act, as well as increasing the payments under Public Law 86–211 to $100 a month for veterans and $75 a month to widows who qualify under the provision of $2,400 for a single veteran or widow, and $3,600 to be paid for a married veteran, widow with dependents, or a single veteran with dependents. This bill is only a vehicle and can be amended or added to by the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee or by the Members of the full Congress when they are given the privilege to decide its merits.

After exploring all possible avenues of getting the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to make a report to the Congress of the United States, and after a statement by the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee that no further hearings were needed on H.R. 2332 because the committee had all the information and facts it needed, it was finally reluctantly decided to file a discharge petition. In view of the advanced age of the veterans of World War I, and the fact that they are diminishing in greater numbers every year, we had hoped that Congress would provide something now, before it is too late.

Never can it be said that I, as a veteran of World War I, would hinder any benefits, hospitalization, nursing care for veterans, widows or dependents, or in fact parents or dependents of veterans who have given their lives for their country.

Regardless of any statements made trying to discredit the veterans of World War I in the newspapers as Treasury raiders, I wish to state that the veterans of World War I are a proud segment of this great country, having served our Nation in 1917–18, supplied our sons and daughters in World War II and Korea, and our grandchildren in the cold war in all parts of the globe.

Our desire to obtain a separate and distinct benefit program is not merely to set ourselves up as a special group, as has been stated so many times. It is based on the traditions and history of this Nation from George Washington's time, and up to the present.

No one can deny that it was the veterans of World War I who made it possible for the veterans in World War II to receive the GI bill of rights and later the Korean veterans. No one to my knowledge has ever questioned or suggested that these veterans were not put in a separate and distinct class. Suffice it to say we are proud that our sons did not have to sell apples to exist, nor have they had to march on Washington for recognition.

We were criticized because other veterans organizations did not support our program, with the implication there that it would have been better for us to remain with the old established organizations. Basically, the reason for forming the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America was to create a media through which the veterans of World War I could meet together to discuss and to resolve the problems immediately concerning themselves and peculiar to their situation as veterans of a war that is almost forgotten, an organization which would speak up and would try to formulate programs, both legislative and otherwise, which would be of immediate help to the veterans of World War I and their families. These activities were not practical in a group containing younger veterans, who, as you know, have no time for the older generation.

I earnestly trust that the subcommittee and the full committee will consider H.R. 2332.

Thank you again for this opportunity to present my views concerning non-service-connected pensions.

Free Enterprise Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House an editorial from the pages of the Cape Cod Standard-Times, which will recall to them a commendable resolution filed by the distinguished Member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], designed to give official recognition to the fifth of our great freedoms.

I refer, of course, to the American tradition of free enteprise, a system which has done more than anything else to make this the greatest Nation in man's history.

Representing the birthplace of American free enterprise, the historic Aptucxet Trading Post in Bourne, Mass., I wholeheartedly support this resolution calling for the designation of October 5, each year, as Free Enterprise Day. It would be a fitting tribute to the great concept most often attacked by our ideological enemies and the feature of our society that does the most to arm us—economically, militarily, and philosophically—in our fight against the forces of world communism.

FREE ENTERPRISE DAY

A joint resolution has been introduced in the House at Washington to designate October 5, annually, as Free Enterprise Day.

In introducing the resolution, Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL of Iowa reminded his colleagues that he had spoken to them last year of "a grassroots movement" in Falmouth toward observance of a Free Enterpriso Day.

In the interim, he said, he had given much thought to the subject and had talked to a number of American businessmen on the topic.

"They agree with me," SCHWENGEL said "that free enterprise is an idea and an ideal that needs to be much better understood and appreciated in America."

Congressman SCHWENGEL described free enterprise—freedom of movement of goods and men—as an American fifth great freedom. The other great freedoms, of course, are freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

The Congressman termed free enterprise as a "fundamental idea underlying our greatness as a nation."

Besides the Falmouth grassroots movement, the Cape has another major interest in free enterprise—the Aptucxet Trading Post in Bourne, regarded by many as the birthplace of free enterprise in America.

It would be fitting if, centuries later, the Cape were to be regarded as the region which gave impetus to a nationally proclaimed Free Enterprise Day.

Firm Vietnam Decision Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the American people generally recognize the difficulties under which our Government, as the leading world power and main target of Communist hostility, must operate in the area of international relations. Our people have acceped their burden of heavy taxation, of disappointment and frustration over military reverses, and also tragic announcements of casualties with admirable fortitude. They ask only that their sacrifices serve a worthwhile purpose; point toward an attainable goal. But they do object to pouring tax dollars, and American lives, into a bottomless quicksand, in Asia, in Africa, or anywhere else. Evidence of dissatisfaction with a policy that accepts a long-drawn-out and costly stalemate is contained in an editorial published in the State Journal, of Lansing, Mich., August 25, 1964.

By unanimous consent and under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include this temperate, reasoned statement of what I believe is the present attitude of most Americans toward our operations and policies in Vietnam:

FIRM VIETNAM DECISION BY UNITED STATES IS LONG OVERDUE

A Central Intelligence Agency officer's "serious doubt that victory can be won" in

South Vietnam probably is shared by many other Americans in spite of the optimistic views expressed from time to time by various spokesmen for the Johnson administration.

The conclusion that no military end to the war against the Communist guerrillas in the southeast Asian country is in sight was voiced by Willard Matthias, a member of the CIA's Board of National Estimates, in a June 8 paper on "Trends in the World Situation."

Matthias said at that time that the Communist Vietcong had stepped up their offensive while the counterguerrilla effort "continues to flounder" under poor prosecution by the Saigon Government.

In other words, the trend in the part of the world situation in South Vietnam was unfavorable, in Matthias' view, as of last June. There are no indications it is any better now.

Stating that "the guerrilla war in South Vietnam is in its 5th year and no end appears in sight," Matthias continued:

"The political mistakes of the Diem regime inhibited the effective prosecution of the war, which is really more of a political contest than a military operation, and led to the regime's destruction.

"The counterguerrilla effort continues to flounder, partly because of the inherent difficulty of the problem, and partly because Diem's successors have not yet demonstrated the leadership and the inspiration necessary."

The CIA official said there is a chance that future development "could lead to some kind of negotiated settlement based upon neutralization," an idea that has been advanced by French President Charles de Gaulle but coolly received by the U.S. administration.

Matthias also said continued large-scale U.S. support of the antiguerrilla campaign and an end to "further political deterioration within South Vietnam" could at least achieve "a prolonged stalemate."

Neither alternative is palatable for the administration, some of whose spokesmen, following repeated but apparently futile visits to the strife-torn country, concede that the struggle will be long and hard but hold out hope for eventual victory.

The CIA officer's 50-page assessment of the situation was made available by administration sources when they learned it would be published in a Chicago newspaper.

This raises the question of whether it would ever have been made known to the American people upon the initiative of an administration which does not share, publicly at least, the pessimistic views expressed by Matthias.

One thing is clear. The unsatisfactory situation in South Vietnam confronts the administration with the responsibility of deciding without more delay upon a policy designed to bring the war to a successful conclusion or to accept a policy of neutralization, unattractive as the latter alternative may be.

As we see it, the administration should make a determined effort to avoid a prolonged stalemate in which Americans would continue to die and more millions of dollars in U.S. resources would be expended.

Nuclear Navy and Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, I reported to the House that the first nuclear task force of the U.S. Navy had begun a world cruise on July 31. My remarks prompted the Boston Traveler on August 12, 1964, to publish an editorial on "Mobility at Sea" which I believe merits the attention of my colleagues; so I consider it a pleasure to insert it in the RECORD.

In addition, I am including another editorial which was published in the Boston Traveler 5 days later, on August 17. This one, entitled "Passing Us at Sea," is almost a sequel to the first—because, as the second editorial stresses, history has proved that our superiority in fighting ships must be supported by a strong merchant marine. Indeed, I am hopeful that we may soon have a program, long overdue, to assure that needed balance.

As the second editorial says—

Somehow the message must be put across in Washington, that the Russians are out to control the seas.

Yes, somehow this message must impress us all of the importance of strengthening our merchant marine as well as ever improving our nuclear and conventionally powered Navy.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I trust that those who read these Boston Traveler editorials will not overlook the concern expressed about the possible closing of our naval shipyards in the light of the needs of the other aspects of American seapower. The editorials follow:

MOBILITY AT SEA

(Editorial in the Boston Traveler, Aug. 12, 1964)

Early last week, Representative WILLIAM H. BATES, reminded his colleagues in Congress that the Navy has just dispatched the world's first nuclear-powered task force on a round-the-world cruise.

He linked this event with the fact of giving "assurance to people everywhere that the United States will continue to be supreme as a maritime nation."

The start of the cruise drew little public attention, for it took place on July 31 when virtually everybody's interest was pinned on the successful moon shot of Ranger 7. But while the rocket was getting the big play, the nuclear warships *Enterprise, Long Beach,* and *Bainbridge* departed from Gibralter. During the next 2 months, they will cover 30,000 miles and circle the earth without refueling.

The fact that our nuclear ships are engaged on such a voyage in one part of the world while conventional ships of ours are engaged in a shooting fracas half a world away, in Tonkin Gulf, should provide solid evidence to all nations of our maritime mobility and supremacy. We have the ability to go anywhere at any time with whatever sea power is needed to keep the peace.

Our task, though, is to maintain that supremacy and keep it revitalized.

That cannot be done if we go around off handedly wiping out naval shipyards. If we are to keep mobile at sea, we must retain the yards that make that mobility possible—the Boston yard, for example, which has put the guided missile cruiser *Boston* in shape for her present critical duties in the tense Mediterranean.

The demands for our seagoing influence come from all quarters of the world. Naval shipyards keep that influence at the ready.

PASSING US AT SEA

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler, Aug. 17, 1964]

There is a strange blindspot in our national attitude toward Soviet Russia that causes us to blink at her threatening growth as a great maritime power.

We seem to see imperative importance in defeating the Russians at everything from wheat production to the Olympic high hurdles but we look with indifference at the fact that they're about to pass us on the oceanic trade lines.

Today, with 1,075 ships, the Soviet merchant marine ranks fourth in the world. They plan to top us in merchant tonnage by 1966, and then to double that tonnage by 1971. Anyone who thinks that they won't do this is invited to chew on the fact that today they are building 350 new merchant ships while we are building 35.

Meanwhile our Navy remains the strongest in history, but the Soviet naval strength is climbing rapidly. This climb began in 1938, when Stalin announced plans to make Russia a great sea power. His answer to opposition from conservative Russian admirals was to have six of them lined up and shot.

But despite our superiority in fighting ships, we have learned from our history that a navy in time of war must have the support of a strong merchant marine. Today our merchant marine is sick and getting sicker.

This state of affairs is particularly alarming to us here in New England, where U.S. seapower was born, for we understand better than most Americans the importance of maritime leadership. We can foresee the economic shock that will result if that leadership passes to the Soviets, permitting them to control shipping rates and labor costs.

Somehow the message must be put across in Washington, that the Russians are out to control the seas.

Kenneth E. BeLieu, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, puts it this way: "The peaceful-looking Soviet-bloc merchant ship as an instrument of the decisive military, political, or economic importance now looms large and lethal. Our merchant marine is not prepared to meet the challenge and, worse, it gives little sign of improving."

Meanwhile we talk about shutting down shipyards.

Lost Youngsters Found by Salesman Volunteer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, so often in this day and time we read about tragedy and not often enough do we hear about the unselfishness of many of our citizens who make it possible for tragedies to be averted. In my home city of Gainesville, Fla., recently three little boys were lost in a dense scrub near their home. An army of police and volunteer workers turned out to search for the boys, but they were found by Tom Nobles, a salesman who had no official connection with the searching party. Hearing about the efforts to find the boys, Mr. Nobles volunteered because, in his words, "I felt a part of the Highland Court Manor community."

I am sure the little boys and their parents and friends will never forget the unselfishness of a fellow citizen who wanted to help neighbors in need. I enclose the complete article about this historic event

as it appeared in the Gainesville Daily Sun, Gainesville, Fla., July 7, 1964.

The editorial follows:

LOST YOUNGSTERS FOUND BY SALESMAN VOLUNTEER

(By Jim McGu!rk)

Three little boys—lost in dense scrub near their Highland Court Manor home since early yesterday evening—were found safe and hungry just after 9 o'clock this morning.

The boys are Tim, Tom, and Dennis Weber, sons of Mr. and Mrs. Dennis Weber of 2817 Northeast 12th Street. Tim and Tom are 7-year-old twins; yesterday was Dennis' fifth birthday.

An army of police and volunteer workers—including two airplanes—turned out for the search, but the boys were actually found by Tom Nobles, a salesman who heard about the search on the radio this morning and volunteered "because I felt a part of the Highland Court Manor community."

Nobles, 31, of 2841 Northeast 10th Drive, a sales representative for Ring Power Corp., said he just moved here last week.

He had already started for work when he heard of the missing boys, Nobles said.

"I feel like it is my community now and I want to do my part," he said.

So he went back home, changed clothes, and joined Gainesville Police Officer Kenneth Brown in another search of extremely dense brush that had already been combed the night before by rescue workers.

Searchers had continuously found themselves unable to penetrate a mass of scrub palmetto and brush between the Highland Court Manor Pool near the Weber home and North Main Street.

"I sat down to rest," Nobles continued, when a police car with a public address system cruised by, calling out the names of the children.

"I heard some kids yell—it was faint—I thought maybe it was some other kids playing around," Nobles said.

Then the loudspeaker called the boys names again and once more Nobles heard a faint answer.

"I walked in that direction and just for the heck of it I called out.

"They weren't 20 feet from me."

Even though they had spent the night alone in the woods and were scratched, mosquito-bitten, and red-eyed from crying, the boys were cautious, demanding to know if Nobles was a police officer.

Nobles explained himself—apparently satisfactorily—to the boys, called for Officer Brown who was nearby, and together they brought the boys out.

The boys' father, Dennis, a 30-year-old graduate student of the University of Florida, said the boys were swimming at the Highland Court Manor Pool last night when another of the Nobles' six children told them to go home.

Instead, they went on what was apparently a "scouting expedition" of the woods they'd been warned to stay out of.

Nobles said he and his wife, Shirley, got worried by 7 and spent the next 2 hours cruising the northeast section of Gainesville hunting the boys.

Police help was called. Lt. Courtnay A. Roberts of the Gainesville Police Department said his entire 15-man afternoon shift of officers turned out voluntarily at midnight last night for the search.

This morning, they were joined by three to four carloads of men from the Alachua County sheriff's office, plus two search planes and a number of volunteer workers like Nobles.

The boys weren't found last night, although rescuers passed within feet of them, calling their names.

"They apparently were fast asleep from exhaustion," Roberts theorized.

This morning, their father said they were eating eggs and toast, red-eyed from crying, and subdued.

"I guess they've been punished enough," he said.

Chicago Leads World in Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of pride to the people of the district I represent that urban renewal as we now know it started in the Hyde Park-Kenwood community in the heart of the great Second District. I take this opportunity of calling the attention of my colleagues to the national attention that currently is being given Chicago in this connection.

I am extending my remarks to include an Associated Press dispatch that starts on the first page of the Baltimore Sun of August 31, 1964, under the three-column headline "Chicago's Renewal Pays Way After 17 Years, $210 Million." The dispatch is continued on page 3, and illustrating the text is a four-column cut of Thomas P. Melone, of Chicago's general plans commission, pointing out the site of Chicago's civic center now being built in the downtown area as part of the dynamic plan of Mayor Richard Daley to lure suburbanites back into town and to make Chicago the model city of the universe. The article follows:

CHICAGO'S RENEWAL PAYS WAY AFTER 17 YEARS, $210 MILLION

CHICAGO, August 31.—After 17 years and $210 million urban renewal is paying its way in Chicago. As an added bonus, city officials say, it is bringing suburbanites back to the city at a better than expected pace.

By the late 1940's, Chicago's white citizens—like millions of others throughout the country—were streaming to the suburbs while slums spread in their wake. Assessed tax valuations of real estate and tax revenue were dropping.

The battle to reverse the tide began in 1947 with the Hyde Park-Kenwood conservation project, first of its kind in the United States. More than $36 million in city, State, and Federal funds was spent in the next 10 years to build new homes and apartment buildings, renovate old units and tear down dilapidated ones.

THIRTY PROJECTS LATER

Now, 30 projects later, city officials estimate that the developments, which extend into almost every part of the city, eventually will increase the valuation of the involved real estate by more than $48 million.

D. E. Mackelmann, deputy commissioner of urban renewal, yesterday estimated the increase in tax yield at 115 percent since the urban renewal programs were initiated. The city should be able to pay off the millions invested by 1975, he said.

"Don't forget," he said, "the increase includes not only the projects which are developed privately, but also many that do not increase the tax returns, such as parks and playgrounds. But nonprofit community works are part of the urban renewal program."

FROM PRIVATE FUNDS

Plus the public funds, an estimated half-billion dollars has been invested in the future Chicago from private funds and the University of Illinois, which hopes its $150 million 4-year Chicago campus will be ready for classroom use by next spring. The school will occupy a 105-acre site on the West Side that was cleared with urban renewal funds.

One recent urban renewal project considered a glowing success is Carl Sandburg Village, striking and ultramodern housing development in Old Town, a near North Side area known for its quaint shops, houses, nightclubs and entertainment.

The village, eventually to be a 2,000-unit development with six 27-story towers, was constructed by a real estate firm, Arthur Rubloff & Co., after the land was designated a slum and cleared with urban renewal funds.

TREMENDOUS MARKET

Rubloff & Co. bought the 16 acres of land in 1961 for a record $9.17 a square foot.

Stanley Goodfriend, a Rubloff vice president, said 12 percent of the tenants moved back from the suburbs to take advantage of "intown living" atmosphere of the village, with its landscaped plazas and long malls.

"We didn't realize the attraction was going to be as big as it turned out to be," he said. "There's a tremendous market if you can build the right thing."

Lewis Hill, assistant urban renewal commissioner, agrees. "It's working out better than expected," he said.

ONE OF THREE

"The village has given impetus to the whole North Side, in terms of reconstruction and remodeling," Hill added. "New high-rise buildings are going up east of it and prices, taxes and land values are all up."

The village, named for the poet Carl Sandburg, is one of three major building developments where land was cleared by city agencies and developed by private industry.

The others, Prairie Shores and Lake Meadows, both on the South Side, report up to 10 percent of their 3,800 living units are occupied by former suburban dwellers. And, Frank Livingston, manager of Prairie Shores, says, "the figure is on the increase."

Rents in the developments are high, ranging from $85 to $135 for a studio apartment to $210 to $435 for a three-or four-bedroom unit.

Guaranteed Annual Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an editorial by Mr. Robert C. Ingalls, of the Corvallis Gazette Times, Corvallis, Oreg., entitled "Guaranteed Annual Income," which I believe will be of interest to Members of the House:

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME

Social security benefits are going to be increased—and they should be. Military pay has been increased—and it should have been. Most Federal workers have received an increase—and many of them should have had one. Now, what is next? Well, it won't come this year and it may not come in the next five, but there is considerable talk among the extreme liberals for a guaranteed annual income.

And what is a guaranteed annual income? The figure now being discussed is $3,000 and

it goes to everyone—more than that for some—whether they work or not.

The idea is that computers and labor-saving machines are destroying jobs faster than the economy creates them. This promises, according to these dreamers, two disastrous results: (1) "catastrophic social tensions because of conflict between society's stress on work and the disappearance of jobs," and (2) "a big economic slump soon, partly caused by joblessness, partly by other imbalances."

The money to pay for the guaranteed annual income is to come from a drastically cut defense budget. This in turn is to be possible because of a far-reaching disarmament program. (Wonder if Russia will cooperate?) The cost of the program is estimated to be $11 billion a year—a large share of this would go to the poor, especially to Negroes.

The proponents of guaranteed annual income insist their main concern is for the individual and they claim there is only one way to save him: relieve him completely from dependence on the machine, pay him the guaranteed annual income to do the things he finds rewarding, "build human society outside machine society."

This whole idea sounds like a combination of Marx and Freud—a worse mixture we can't imagine. "To each according to his needs," is the old Marxist idea and now it is to be reoutfitted in modern dress and the cause is automation. Freud would contend that society is the cause of individual behavior and reaction and thus all of us are to blame because many will not be able to support themselves.

It has yet to be proven that automation will cause overwhelming unemployment, and most economists do not believe that any big slump is in the cards.

Get ready, though. The big government boys, the regimentationists, and the leftists insist we complete our drive to the welfare state. Hail the workless world. Hail to peaceful coexistence with communism—until they take us over.

Toward Uniform Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of my colleagues to an editorial from the Cape Cod Standard Times of August 22. There is certainly a great need for uniformity of time throughout the United States in the portion of the year when daylight saving time is in effect. The disadvantages of our present haphazard system are multitudinous and cause needless hardships to a great number of our citizens. It is important that attention be given by Congress to this problem before another summer rolls around.

TOWARD UNIFORM TIME

The Nation finally seems to be moving toward settlement of the vexatious daylight saving time problem. Committees in both Houses of Congress have approved bills that would bring some order out of the present chaos.

The need for such a law is made evident by even the most cursory glance at the situation today. Some States have daylight saving time in the summer; some don't. Some communities have it; some don't. Various places that do go on daylight saving time start and stop it at different times.

The bill just moved out by the House Commerce Committee is aimed at creating a uniform time system. It falls short of this because States and communities would not be forced to comply. But those that did agree to have daylight saving time would have it uniformly, from the last Sunday in April to the first Sunday in October. All Federal agencies and interstate transportation would be required to comply.

The permissive nature of the bill, so far as States and communities are concerned, is its one chief flaw. The chances are, however, that few areas would hold out very long against the obvious advantages of uniform summer time.

This legislation, or something very like it, should be passed. Enactment in the closing days of this session is unlikely, but there is a good chance that a new summer time law can be placed on the books before next spring.

The Poverty Index

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 8, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported that Knox County, one of 30 counties within the First Nebraska Congressional District I represent, was the poorest in the State.

The Department made this finding on the basis of a statistical chart or a poverty index rating that ticked off financial conditions in each county. The chart was compiled by the Nebraska State Education Department's school lunch office.

The following quartiles were used in compiling the poverty index:

Per capita index: $1,385 or less, 10 points; $1,386 to $1,573, 5 points; $1,574 to $1,780, 2 points; $1,781 and above, 0.

Percent of household under $2,500 per year: 41.4 percent and more, 10 points; 35.7 to 41.3, 5 points; 28.8 to 35.6, 2 points; 28.7 and less, 0.

The percentage of population receiving public assistance was added to the above factors to arrive at the poverty index.

After publication of the index many Nebraskans were suprised to find themselves suddenly poor. And although some of our agricultural counties are not rolling in wealth, they do not believe they are poverty stricken.

As a consequence, many of them have expressed sharp disagreement with the USDA findings and understandable resentment.

One of the more articulate mediums through which this resentment was voiced is the Norfolk (Nebr.) Daily News. It is edited by a former Washingtonian Mr. Emil Reutzel. Mr. Reutzel experienced in dealing with bureaucracies and conscious of the Democrat effort to measure human standards by slide rule and indexes, speaks out against this practice calling attention to the fallacy in this belief.

Therefore, under permission to extend and revise my remarks I would like to offer the following editorial from the Norfolk (Nebr.) Daily News. and do hereby recommend it to all my colleagues for thoughtful reading and contemplation. The editorial follows:

THE POVERTY INDEX

While the people in Nebraska's prime agricultural areas are not rolling in greenbacks, neither are they destitute. As a consequence, they are likely to be surprised at a Department of Agriculture listing which indicates them to be poverty stricken.

A special poverty index prepared by USDA shows Knox County to be the most destitute in Nebraska. It ranks highest on the scale of the poor. And while there is hardly a year when crops, or prices, in some areas of that vast county couldn't be improved upon, the area has enough well-maintained farmsteads and good-looking towns to make the poverty label ridiculous.

If America's poverty were of the category of Knox County's, the Nation would indeed be in an enviable position.

USDA's chart—prepared on the basis of financial conditions to determine eligibility of schools for the Federal hot lunch subsidy—also lists other Nebraska counties in this area on the poverty side of the scale. Among the counties so listed are Antelope, Boone, Cedar, Holt, Pierce, and Stanton.

It is likely that the poverty tag will be accepted more with resentment than with gratitude event though the listing is going to mean a slight increase in Federal hot lunch subsidies where this is applicable. Pride remains in this area and resentment about being described as poverty stricken is still a characteristic of residents of farming areas.

If the USDA index does nothing else, it should provide an example to Nebraskans of how meaningless and farfetched can be the Government's determinations of poverty.

Role of Air Force Reserve Forces in Maintaining Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1964

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, in the September 1964 edition of the Officer, a publication of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, an article appears by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, with respect to the use of Air Force Reserve Forces in periods of crisis.

General LeMay is one of the greatest military men of our time. His distinguished record of service to the United States and the free world is unsurpassed. His article in the September edition of the Officer describes the vital role of the Air Force Reserve Forces in maintaining the peace. I feel the article will be of great interest to my colleagues:

THE USE OF RESERVES IN FUTURE CRISES

(By Gen. Curtis E. LeMay)

Since the turn of the midcentury, the United States has been involved in a series of crises, growing out of repeated challenges by international communism—the most serious of which have required military action. Each of these crises has been unique. Each has required a tailored response.

During the Korean conflict it was necessary for the Air Force to bring 187,000 reservists back on active duty. In the case of Berlin, we recalled 27,000 men, and sent 11 Air Guard jet fighter squadrons and 1 tactical control group to Europe. During the Cuba crisis we called up 8 Air Force Reserve troop carrier wings and 6 aerial port squadrons with a total of 14,000 men.

Today we face a new crisis. And tomorrow there will be others. These, too, could demand rapid reaction and possibly radical adjustments in organization, equipment, and tactics. The adjustments we have made to date during times of crisis, and those we may have to make in anticipation of future threats, have an especially severe effect on reservists. I would like, therefore, to discuss several Air Force policies regarding the Reserve Forces to help reservists better understand the actions taken by headquarters, USAF, and to help them to make the smoothest adjustments possible in disruptions that might lie ahead.

First, we fully expect to call on Reserve Forces units in future crises. Our experience over the past 12 to 15 years has proved beyond question the great value of strong Reserve Forces. By carrying out their duties with speed and effectiveness during the crises that occurred during that period they helped influence the Communists to accept adjustments favorable to the United States. It will be our policy, therefore, to call on our Reserve Forces again, whenever crisis circumstances warrant such action. At the same time, it will be our policy to recall reservists only when we absolutely need them and to return them to inactive status as soon as their capabilities are no longer vital in meeting Air Force obligations.

Second, we will be constantly striving to raise the level of readiness of Reserve Force units and individuals. The value of the Reserve Forces is in direct proportion to their readiness.

GOAL IS "READY—NOW"

Our goal is a "ready now" Reserve—nothing less. It will continue to be our practice to measure the readiness of Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve units, exactly as we measure the readiness of active duty units. I am fully aware that some units score somewhat low on our Operational Readiness Tests because of a lack of sufficient aircraft and personnel, and that there is little the unit can do about their supply of either. But the Reserve Forces may be assured that I have not forgotten that it was an Air Guard unit with a C–3 rating—because it did not have a full complement of F–102's—that took home to Pennsylvania in 1963 the top honors in the William Tell rocket competition.

Third, we will be attempting to find better ways of utilizing our Reserve Forces between crises, as well as during crises. It does not make sense to use the capabilities of the Reserve Forces during times of crises only, and to ignore them at other times. We took a major step toward the proper utilization of our Reserve Forces in July of 1960 when we assigned the responsibility for training and inspection to the major air commands. The commands responded by bringing realism into the training programs to insure that the Reserve Forces were ready to carry out their role in times of crises. Now, we must emphasize training programs that will insure that these units contribute their full capabilities toward the accomplishment of the standing missions of the major commands. The solution to this problem is to design programs which place responsibilities on the Reserve Forces units that are normally executed by units of the Regular Force.

I am constantly badgering our Air Force commanders about this point. My argument is twofold. These units possess capabilities that can help significantly in carrying out regular missions. And second, the work performed by Reservists represents money in the bank for the Air Force.

"LIVE SCHEME" TRAINING

Although we have made considerable progress since mid-1960 toward the full peacetime utilization of the Reserve Forces, we still have room for improvement along this line. An excellent example of what I want more of can be seen in the activities of the Air National Guard units attached to the Ground Electronics Engineering-Installation Agency (GEEIA). Their training program is referred to as "live scheme" training. This means that when the personnel of those units come on board for their 2 weeks of active duty training, they are sent to an Air Force base which needs certain communications equipment installed or repaired. And they do the job. Last year Air National Guard GEEIA personnel put in 125,666 man-hours, representing a saving to the Air Force of $766,709.

A similar example of Reserve Forces units helping the Air Force get its daily mission done—and at a large saving—can be found in the activities of our Reserve and Guard air transport units. Last year they satisfied 12.9 percent of the Air Force's overall exercise airlift requirement. In addition they carried 12 million pounds of MATS cargo overseas, and provided more than 50 percent of Air Force support for Army paratroop training.

An extremely valuable service performed by five of the Air Force Reserve squadrons—though its value cannot easily be measured in money—is that of air rescue. Our Reserve air rescue squadrons fly the trusty HU–16B (formerly the SA–16B) Albatross. During the Berlin crisis of 1961, two crews from each of the five squadrons volunteered for 60 days of active duty to patrol the Atlantic routes that were being flown by 200 combat aircraft of the Air Reserve Forces. These crews operated out of Prestwick, Scotland; Goose Bay, Labrador; and Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. On this occasion, as on many others, these Air Force Reserve rescue squadrons proved again their dedication to their country and to their mission, "That Others May Live."

THE INDIVIDUAL'S CONTRIBUTION

Individual Air Force Reservists, as well as those assigned to units, can—and in many cases do—contribute valuable service to their major air commands. R. & D. and information reservists, for example, who work in small flights are often assigned special projects of significant worth to their commands. Our Reserve lawyers offer legal assistance to some of our outlying Air Force units whose T.O. does not warrant a full-time JAG officer. And our Reserve engineers are frequently used as consultants on engineering projects that are either too large or too specialized for the local installation engineering office.

The performance of these units and individual Reservists—and the many others that could just as easily have been cited—has helped to build in our commanders a growing confidence in the Air Reserve Forces.

Only a few years ago, there were many military and civilian voices calling for the elimination of the Reserve Forces on the basis that they probably could not be counted on, particularly in a crises.

During the buildup of the Cuba crisis, for example, the argument was frequently heard throughout the Pentagon that we should call up the Reserve units immediately, so that they would have time to really get themselves ready. I expressed the opinion that the Air Reserve Forces were ready and that they should not be called until they were actually needed. There were skeptics around. But the Joint Chiefs of Staff did hold off the call. On the night of Saturday, October 27, 1962, the order went out from the Pentagon at 2100 hours to selected Air Force Reserve units. At 0900 hours the next morning, these units reported they were manned at 93 percent, with an optimum in-commission rate on aircraft of 75 percent. At the 30-hour mark the Secretary of Defense declared them "operational and deployable."

M'NAMARA: "FANTASTIC PERFORMANCE"

At a press conference in December, Secretary McNamara called it a fantastic performance. "This is the standard," he said, "that has been built into the Air Force's Reserve and Guard program."

I am pleased to note that the Reserve Forces are not resting on their laurels, but are continually raising the levels of their proficiency. Reports frequently reach my desk of new records of accomplishments by Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve units.

In the Berlin crisis of the fall of 1961, for example, the 117th Tactical Reconnaissance Wing of the Air National Guard deployed its RF–84's to Europe from their stateside bases in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Alabama. The jets used the island-hopping technique to reach their base in France. Their deployment time was 5 days. This was hailed as a record performance.

Last summer, in Project Minuteman Alpha, this same wing sent its RF–84F's on a nonstop 3,500-mile flight to Alaska. Their flight time was 8 hours. The wing teamed with ANG refueling groups in Illinois, Ohio, and Wisconsin in setting this new standard for long-range deployment. The wing logged 300 hours of reconnaissance flying over Alaska in 5 days, and then returned to their bases. A very high in-commission rate was maintained while this unit was deployed. This proof of the constantly rising levels of professional airmanship reflects the highest credit on the Air Reserve Forces.

But records of readiness and technical capability do not tell the whole story. Military commanders are constantly looking for another characteristic in their units. It is that difficult-to-measure element called esprit. To me, the Air reservists gave wonderful proof of true spirit when, during the Berlin and Cuba crises, they appeared in one's and two's at their nearest Air Force installation, asking simply if there was anything they could do. These men were among those not required at the moment. But they felt, nevertheless, that they might be of some value, and they wanted to offer their services.

Nothing makes a Chief of Staff prouder than that kind of evidence of spirit in his Reserve units.

The Air Force needs Air Reserve Forces that are ready and able, with great pride of service and a strong sense of mission. That's what we have and what we intend to keep.

The Turning Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, so many articles from the foreign press unfavorable to Senator GOLDWATER have been reprinted in the United States that the impression has been given that our friends abroad unanimously look with fear at the prospects of a Goldwater administration. That this feeling is far from universal is borne out by an editorial called "The Turning Point,"

written by Mr. Daniel E. Woodward, president and publisher of Canada Week, Ltd., of Montreal.

The editorial follows:

THE TURNING POINT

(Source: Canada Month Magazine for August 1964. Published by Canada Week, Ltd., 2135 Bishop Street, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Daniel E. Woodward, president and publisher. He is also the author of this editorial.)

"Believe me, the tide is turning."

These were the words of Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN as he placed BARRY M. GOLDWATER in nomination for President of the United States. The tide now flows toward where "government must be the servant, not the master, of the people."

By a malicious and remarkably ignorant press, Canadians had been badly misinformed about the significance of Senator GOLDWATER'S imminent triumph. Somehow, we had been led to believe, a sinister conspiracy had isolated the Republican convention delegates from public sentiment. Americans would never rally to this hero of monsters. These delegates, cunningly cornered, one by one, in dark places, had had some sort of voodoo spell worked on them, upon which they would themselves reflect in horror when the drunken orgy of the Cow Palace was over.

Truth is that in November millions of Americans, perhaps enough to elect him, will vote for BARRY GOLDWATER. We have heard that some Republicans will bolt their party. We have not been told of the legions of Democrats who see in GOLDWATER the instrument of a return to national self-respect.

It is not of much importance here that such men as James M. Minifie of the CBC and George V. Ferguson, editor of the Montreal Star, will soon seem, at best, silly. It will not be of great account to recall of many of our pundits, some months hence, that in their extremity, lies festooned their lips.

What is more than gratifying is that for the first time in most of our memories the immensely pervasive and evil ideas of two dead men are in retreat. Karl Marx (material solutions to all important human problems) and Sigmund Freud (man is helpless against the pressures of his environment) have held the field in America for a third of a century, with the help of most of our professional intellectuals and multitudes of amateurs parroting the slogans of Utopia.

Now the libertarian ideal is reemerging. In place of contempt for our fellow beings (helpless creatures tossed by sociological tempests, strained mercilessly on racks of exploitation) we may begin to view each other, each one, as a vessel of promise and hope. We can believe each man capable of courage, grace, and nobility. It will be in order to expect these things, in some measure, of every man.

The cocktail-party philosophers who have fed their egos on a phony and presumptuous concern for humanity will, dozen by dozen, fall silent. They will be forced to find something more substantial to justify their membership among us.

Brutally misled though we have been by our intellectual elite there is no cause to despair that the libertarian torch burns afresh only in another land. The ideal of indivdiual human worth is not the special property of Americans or of any political faction or party.

Canadians, old and new alike, have as much mettle, as much courage and will to throw off the web of fraud and contempt that has entangled us these many years.

We have begun already, in Saskatchewan.

In one or other of our great political parties (we can cast aside the useless splinters) there can, and there must, be a resurgence of true respect for every living man and woman, oblivious color, creed, and land of origin. We must be ready to honor the differences among people above their sameness.

The old guard, the Marxians, the authoritarians, the self-satisfied supermanagers of humanity, will bite and scratch and shrill as they go down. But go down they will. To be true to our deepest principles, when firm purpose has removed these men from power and influence, we must grant them peace in retirement.

But we will resolve never again to let their poison be carried on the north wind.

The trials of being alive will not be over, nor will they ever be. But we can face those trials, as individuals and as a proud nation, with renewed faith in ourselves and in our fellow men.—D.E.W.

More Progress Toward Eliminating School Dropouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have often said that I am proud to be representing Chicago, one of America's most dynamic and progressive cities, in the Congress of the United States.

Chicago once again is in the forefront in providing new solutions to old problems—in this instance, the problem of school dropouts. The Chicago Board of Education has set up an experimental program this summer whereby youngsters of 3 and 4 years of age are being sent to school to prepare them for, and hopefully, to stimulate them to a new awareness of a formal education.

This decision was brought about by our increasing community interest in preventing school dropouts and in salvaging this terrible waste of our basic human resources. The problem of school dropouts is not indigenous to Chicago, but Chicago is leading the way in devising possible solutions to this problem.

Radio station WIND in Chicago broadcast an editorial summarizing the basic ideas behind this decision and predicting an optimistic future for the program if it is allowed to continue.

I congratulate station WIND for its contribution toward publicizing this program and wish to call my colleagues attention to the methods with which similar programs may be adopted in other cities throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

MORE PROGRESS TOWARD ELIMINATING SCHOOL DROPOUTS

The old saw about an ounce of prevention being better than a pound of cure holds true in the latest experimental program of the Chicago Board of Education. This summer normal 3- and 4-year-old children are going to nursery school. Previously only physically handicapped children could attend school before they were 5.

The new program seeks to overcome—or at least partially offset—the retarding influence of poor home environment for children from slums or public housing projects. Sociologists and educators believe that children who are culturally deprived in the very early years are the ones who later fail in school or drop out of classes. These difficulties experienced during school-age years, they say, are due to poor experiences in the home environment from infancy. It is claimed that one big-city child out of every three now is culturally deprived and that by 1970 the number will rise to one-half.

The new board of education program has one hundred and sixty 3- and 4-year-old children attending prekindergarten classes 5 days a week—and the mothers of these children are also being involved in the program in order to extend its benefits into the home situation.

Such training is very costly, but as we said at the beginning, the ounce of prevention is less likely to cost as much as a pound of cure—and probably will be much more effective. We're anxiously awaiting reports on results of this effort to prepare small children for school—paving the way for them with teaching in skills of communication and laying the ground work for teaching the three R's. Unfortunately, it may take some time before results can be measured—for the children's records can be measured only after they have been enrolled in regular classrooms in 2 to 3 years from now.

We commend the board for its foresight in such experimentation and we hope to see the program continued long enough to secure some substantive findings which may serve to guide us in future efforts to cut the toll of school dropouts.

Constitutional Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is presently faced with a grave constitutional crisis. This is not my opinion alone but the opinion of many of our greatest authorities on the Constitution. The question is one of usurpation of powers by the Supreme Court and there is deep and honest division on this matter even on the Court itself.

Although I fully subscribe to the need for and desirability of fair apportionment, particularly in the lower houses of our State legislatures, and would welcome our full share of representation in the Virginia General Assembly, after careful study of the constitutional principles involved I cannot countenance the achievement of this end by the means that have been employed, no matter how desirable and just that end might be.

Upon entering the House of Representatives of the United States at the beginning of the 83d Congress and at the beginning of each subsequent Congress to which I have been elected, I swore a solemn oath to defend the Constitution of the United States and that I would bear true faith and allegiance to that document. This oath, to me, is my highest duty in the execution of my office and all other duties and obligations are therefore subservient to this oath, no matter what the consequences may be of any decision I make predicated upon my understanding of this primary obligation. I cannot and will never prostitute my belief in this duty for reasons of expedi-

ency or to be on the popular side of an issue among some of those I may represent.

H.R. 11926, a bill introduced by Representative TUCK, of Virginia, to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases has passed the House of Representatives by a record vote of 218 to 175. I supported this measure that would in effect overturn recent Supreme Court rulings upholding lower Federal court decisions in which they assumed jurisdiction in reapportionment matters.

The confrontation thus resulting between the courts and the Congress has now raised this momentous constitutional question. This question is not whether northern Virginia and other areas will receive greater representation in the State legislature but whether the Supreme Court has improperly usurped powers reserved to the Congress and to the States.

It is my firm and honest belief if these decisions stand unchecked and unchallenged, the courts have then amended the Constitution by decree. The courts have assumed powers not given them by the Constitution nor intended for them to have in that document. The courts have usurped legislative power in declaring to the several States that they must either legislate or the courts would legislate for them. If this doctrine is allowed to stand, we pass from a constitutional Republic into a State of judicial autocracy.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, one of three dissenting justices in the first of these historic cases, *Baker et al* v. *Carr et al*, 369 U.S. 186 (1962) stated:

> The Court today reverses a uniform course of decisions established by a dozen cases, including one by which the very claim now sustained was unanimously rejected only 5 years ago. The impressive body of rulings thus cast aside reflected the equally uniform course of our political history regarding the relationship between political and legislative representation—a wholly different matter from denial of the franchise to individuals because of race, color, religion, or sex. Such a massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past in asserting destructively novel judicial power demands a detailed analysis of the role of this Court in our constitutional scheme.

The Constitution, not the decisions of the courts, is the "supreme law of the land" and decisions conflicting with the Constitution, such as decisions seeking to exercise power never granted the courts by the people, are by definition null and void. For 175 years the Constitution, as upheld by the Supreme Court in at least 12 cases, has stood as a bulwark against the usurpation of powers in matters pertaining to the States, the people, and their legislatures. The Court possesses no power to change the meaning of the Constitution by "changing its mind" about its meaning, which is controlled by the original intent of the framers and adopters of each provision. Instead, the Supreme Court has been given power only to clarify (not make) law by interpreting the Constitution in keeping with the controlling intent of those who framed and adopted each provision.

In these words of a Supreme Justice, a framer of the Constitution, and a signer of the Declaration of Independence, James Wilson admonished all Americans that:

> Nothing is more to be dreaded than maxims of law and reasons of State blended together by judicial authority. Among all the terrible instruments of arbitrary power, decisions of courts, whetted and guided and impelled by considerations of policy, cut with the keenest edge, and inflict the deepest and most deadly of wounds.

In Defense of Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I just returned to Washington after 10 days in the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio. I spent 5 of the 10 days, from 8 o'clock in the forenoon until about 6 o'clock in the afternoon.

Excepting only the problem of maintaining world peace, more people were concerned about the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court on apportioning of the legislature of the State of Ohio than about any other single problem or issue.

In view of such concern, I am pleased to recommend to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette of July 28, 1964.

The editorial follows:

IN DEFENSE OF HOME RULE

Maybe it cannot be done in time. The U.S. Supreme Court delayed its opinion in the matter until neither Congress nor State legislatures had enough untroubled hours left in the year to permit such extended consideration as great issues need.

Yet Arizonans would do well to take their minds off the outcry of the national and State election campaigns long enough to decide whether to support a move in Congress to nullify the Supreme Court's recent series of decisions requiring States to approach both houses of their legislatures strictly on a population basis.

Two proposals are pending in the House of Representatives right now to give back to States what had always been considered their constitutional prerogative until the Court said otherwise last month—the right to determine the makeup of their own legislatures. A House Judiciary Subcommittee is hearing testimony on a proposal—1 of about 60 similar measures—which would amend the Constitution specifically to safeguard the rights of States to apportion 1 house of their legislatures on other bases than population.

In addition, Ohio Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH has announced he will introduce a bill taking away from State and Federal courts for a period of 7 years any jurisdiction over apportionment of one house of a State legislature. This would give the people, through their representatives, time to consider the proposed constitutional amendment without meanwhile having to bow to the Supreme Court's arbitrary ruling.

The Supreme Court's order was capricious and without precedent, a patent attempt to rewrite the Constitution without going through the "cumbersome" channels of amendment as that document itself provides. We happen to believe also that the theories of democracy expounded by the Warren Court in its legislative opinions are full of holes, but that is beside the question whether the Court can actually change the meaning of the Constitution without anybody's by-your-leave. We believe that if it takes an amendment to the Constitution to protect the Constitution, then it should be amended.

If you agree, you might let Representative MCCULLOCH (House Office Building, Washington, D.C.) know how you feel. The time is short.

The Cotton-Wheat Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a news item from the Providence Journal, Providence, R.I., dated August 14, 1964, and one from the Evening Bulletin, Providence, R.I., dated August 19, 1964:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Evening Bulletin, Aug. 19, 1964]

FOGARTY SAYS LEGISLATION ON COTTON, WHEAT FAILED—DIDN'T REDUCE PRICES

WASHINGTON.—Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY today said his predictions that the cotton-wheat agriculture bill passed by Congress last spring would not reduce the price of cotton or flour have come true.

In a statement prepared for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Rhode Island Democrat said the "solemn pledges" from advocates of the legislation have turned out to be bunkum.

Mr. FOGARTY voted against the bill last spring. The legislation was designed to eliminate the two-price system under which domestic mills paid more for domestic cotton fiber than foreign mills, and to stabilize wheat supply and prices.

Today, Mr. FOGARTY said, price of flour is up as much as 80 cents per 100 pounds, and bread is costing 1 or 2 cents more a loaf.

Further, he said cottonmills are Government subsidized at the rate of 6½ cents per pound of cotton used but are making a profit of nearly 1 cent more on every pound of cotton processed.

"Why isn't cotton down 6½ cents, or nearly that?" he asked.

He repeated charges made by a Textile Workers Union of America spokesman last week that the cotton bill was a $300 million windfall to the mills and that none of the subsidy has been passed along to the consumer or textile worker in any way.

Mr. FOGARTY, whose opposition to the bill earlier this year was only quietly expressed, said he wanted "to warn those who would seek next year to renew this legislation that I will fight much harder to defeat the efforts of those who would foist again this kind of bunkum onto the consumers of this Nation."

He said U.S. farmers want to and can produce food and fiber more efficiently than any farmers in the world but "they can do it—and the consumers can benefit—only if we stop tinkering with farm programs; only if we return to sanity."

The legislation was unneeded in the first place because the Secretary of Agriculture already had the authority to drop cotton price supports from 8½ cents to 4 or 5 cents, Mr. FOGARTY said.

"That would have been the easiest way to help solve the problem," Mr. FOGARTY said.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Aug. 14, 1964]

UNION ASSAILS MILL OWNERS

WASHINGTON.—The Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, which strongly supported the recently passed one-price cotton bill, accused textile employers yesterday of pocketing 75 percent of the savings they are getting under the bill.

And Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, the only Rhode Island Congressman to oppose the one-price cotton legislation, said yesterday that his opposition had been based on the belief that such would happen.

The executive council of the union, meeting in Asbury Park, N.J., said the bill had been designed to reduce the cost of cotton and thus reduce textile prices, stimulate sales and increase jobs and worker pay.

The union said that unless management "immediately" improves wages, fringe benefits and bargaining conditions, the TWUA will withdraw its support of the one-price cotton legislation. The law comes up for extension in 1966.

Commenting on the union statement, Mr. FOGARTY said he had always felt the law would act as a subsidy to the industry and would not increase employment or reduce prices. But he said the administration could have, and still can cut the price support of cotton and thus lower costs to the mills and help the taxpayers, workers and consumers as a result.

Since the law became effective last April 11, cotton mills have paid 6½ cents a pound less for cotton which could have resulted in a 10 percent cut in prices, the union said.

Instead, Government figures show that the average wholesale price of cotton products has dropped only 2.4 percent since June, the union statement said.

Overkill and Undersize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been much talk over the phenomena of "overkill." In the Washington Post on August 30, 1964, Art Buchwald, one of America's greatest humorists, suggests a solution to the overkill problem. I suggest that all my colleagues read the following article which should make us think about the absurdity the arms race has created:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 30, 1964]

BIGGER, BETTER KILLS—CITIES TOO SMALL TO TAKE MOST POWERFUL NUCLEAR BOMBS

(By Art Buchwald)

The problem of handling nuclear weapons will be one of the issues of the coming campaign. Everyone is arguing about how many megatons of bombs and missiles can be delivered against the enemy in the next 10 years.

The public is being asked to decide whether tactical nuclear weapons should be placed in the hands of generals in the field and whether we should give nuclear stockpiles to our allies.

We were very fortunate to interview Prof. Max Kilaton, who has been working on the problem of nuclear weapons for some time.

"The most important thing I discovered," he said, "was that while the Russian and American nuclear bombs are large enough, the targets for most of them are too small. We must build bigger targets to fit our bombs."

"I don't understand."

"Well, you see you have small bombs now that are 5 or 10 times more powerful than the ones dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and you have larger bombs and missiles 100 times more powerful. But you have no cities whose growth has been comparable to that of the bombs. Therefore, if you dropped a large bomb on a major city, there would be a great deal of waste. In order to compensate for this, I am advocating the immediate building of larger targets."

"You mean make the cities bigger?"

"Exactly," Professor Kilaton replied. "We must start an immediate building program to enlarge our cities so the radius of our most powerful nuclear weapons will fall within them."

"Would the Russians go along with this?"

"They would have to. They could not let our targets get bigger than theirs. It would be too much of a blow to their prestige."

"How could be make our targets worthy of the nuclear weapons which have been stockpiled?"

"We must build up urban centers between our large industrial cities and more or less connect them. The cities would have to be large enough to take a hit of the most powerful nuclear weapon that the Russians have. They in turn would have to enlarge their cities to accommodate our nuclear bombs."

"But what would this accomplish?"

"It would solve the major problem of nuclear weapons, which is overkill. If your targets are large enough for your bombs, you would eliminate the problem of overkill. That is, you would kill exactly the number of people the bomb was designed to kill. As it stands now, most of the larger nuclear weapons can destroy only one-twentieth of their potential. This is sheer waste and certainly works a hardship on the economies of the nuclear powers."

"What about tactical nuclear weapons?"

"You have no problem there. A good tactical nuclear weapon can destroy an average city with a bare minimum of overkill, perhaps 2.5 percent. Most targets are suitable as they stand now for tactical nuclear weapons."

"One more question, Professor. Do you think we should give nuclear weapons to our NATO allies?"

"I certainly do. If Greece and Turkey both had nuclear weapons at their disposal, I believe the problem of Cyprus would have been solved weeks ago."

"A Texan Looks at Lyndon"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a Texas author and historian, Mr. J. Evetts Haley, gave a press interview in Los Angeles today in which he discussed his most recent book entitled "A Texan Looks at Lyndon."

It is reported that some 2 million copies of Mr. Haley's book, dealing with the public life of President Johnson, have already been sold. It is a book that ought to be read by every American.

The statement issued by Mr. Haley at his press conference follows:

"A TEXAN LOOKS AT LYNDON"

(By J. Evetts Haley)

I have been asked to come to you to explain some of the background of the publication of my latest book, "A Texan Looks at Lyndon," which is a study in illegitimate power, and how it came to be written.

This book was conceived, researched, and published as a sound, historical study, not as a campaign document. No group, no organization, and no party has had anything whatever to do with its inception, financing, or circulation. I conceived it, I wrote it, and I alone financed it from the very first and I'm still financing its publication.

Briefly, in this book, "A Texan Looks at Lyndon," I have:

1. Set forth the illegitimate pressure and power by which, in a constitutional republic, Johnson was originally put into the U.S. Congress as a protege of extreme liberal forces of the original New Deal.

2. I have briefly set forth the fraudulent nature of his claim of a distinguished World War II record, and how he returned to his "plush-lined foxhole" in the House Congressional Building in Washington as a lieutenant commander in the Navy.

3. I have told with irrefutable and unchallengeable proof how he, and his political henchmen, and their confederates stole a closely contested U.S. senatorial election in Texas in 1948; a story with all the tragic aftermath of continued fraud and presumed assassinations.

4. In this book, which is a study in illegitimate power, I have proven the false, the shallow and shoddy nature of the claim that the origin of the Johnson family's multimillion-dollar fortune was founded on his wife's inheritance. It was, instead, laid with the acquisition of a radio and television monopoly in Austin, through the illegitimate use of power to ruin the owner of the station, which fell as an over-ripe plum into Lady Bird's lap, to put her husband and his family on their way to immense wealth.

5. I have detailed the methods, the men and the means by which Government contracts and political favors on one hand, and protection from tax problems and Federal harassment on the other, were used to enrich Johnson's big corporate backers in Texas, like Brown & Root of Houston, while on the other hand oppressing and even destroying those of humble origin and status who, with sufficient character and courage, have resisted his illegitimate power.

6. I have pointed out Johnson's intimate connections with such wheeler-dealers as Billie Sol Estes. One man after another, with intimate knowledge of the fantastic fraud, or with close connections with the principals involved, died sudden, mysterious, and violent deaths, while the profitable, tangible assets of the Estes empire were, without financial risk, handed virtually as a multimillion dollar gift to a friend and supporter of Johnson.

7. In this "Study in Illegitimate Power," I pointed out that a Pecos citizen, a locally prominent, successful doctor who discovered, and exposed this gigantic fraud by printing the story in a Texas county newspaper, was ruined financially and professionally, while Billie Sol Estes, with more than $18 million in Federal tax judgments against him and with two prison sentences for fraud imposed by Texas courts, is still free, living in a plush $50,000 home, driving a 1964 Cadillac, and living high off the hog of political influence.

8. I have again brought attention—with added detail—to Johnson's close connections with Bobby Baker. In this connection, I have presented evidence of his undoubted ability in Senator FULBRIGHT's apt phrase—"to manage Congress"—and to suppress any

inquiry anywhere on Capitol Hill, from that of Billie Sol Estes to Bobby Baker.

9. I have factually detailed the ruthless, vindictive and dangerous nature of this power-mad man, elevated through malevolent fate into the most powerful office in the world at the most critical period of America's history. All I have done is to bring my years of knowledge of the Texas scene and my ability as an academic investigator and historian to dig deep into the intimate and reliable sources of information. Having done this, I stand unafraid of what may follow—even the most ingenious and most effective technique that illegitimate power has historically invoked—because I believe in the sancity of the printed word, well-knowing that when I commit the honest judgments of history to the printed page, they are for the author, whether fortunate or hapless, beyond recall.

Between the Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Indiana editors and political analysts have a knack of stripping away the irrelevant and insignificant and presenting just the facts, uncluttered by bias, self-interest, or intimidation.

Of all the interpretations of the recent political conventions and the present situation in the United States, few have come through with the clarity, insight, and courage in his beliefs as have two columns published in recent days by the Daily Clintonian, Clinton, Ind.

The author of these articles is Mr. George L. Carey, editor of the Clintonian, and one of Indiana's foremost newspaper figures.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the two columns in entirety.

The columns are as follows:

BETWEEN THE LINES
(By G.L.C.)

The two presidential nominating conventions have just about passed into history and they have left little to strengthen our faith in the survival of strong government by the people in these United States.

One might ask himself just what was the necessity for holding a Democratic convention. The delegates who attended had little or nothing to say about who was to be nominated. In essence, everything was settled by just one man—Lyndon B. Johnson—although he, of course, had some advice from a small and exclusive group of party leaders gathered in some of those famous smoke-filled rooms.

There was never the slightest doubt as to who would be the next Democratic candidate for President. Probably there has been no doubt about the identity of the vice-presidential candidate for weeks. To all but the most stupid it must have been evident that L.B.J. did not reveal that it was Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, until the last minute, merely for effect and to add a little spice to the convention.

As far as the individual delegates were concerned, they could have saved a lot of money by not going to Atlantic City. If they thought they were going to help select their party's nominees for President and Vice President, they could have had just as much effect on the decision by discussing the matter with the boys at the corner drugstore back in Apple Corners.

Actually, there wasn't so much difference at the Republican convention. Those in the know, knew well in advance that it would be BARRY GOLDWATER and it was BARRY GOLDWATER who selected his running mate for Vice President, but at least, the delegates were allowed to vote. The whole point is that, in either case, those present had the ones they selected, selected for them.

Some of the scenes at the Democratic convention were almost without precedent and made one wonder if mob rule is just around the corner for America as mob rule has come to be accepted in many South American and Asian countries. It is not pleasant to consider that, while speakers inside the hall assured the delegates that the Democratic Party had bathed the country in peace and prosperity, outside, chairs were being hurled, mobs ran here and there and injured persons were carted off to hospitals.

It was not pleasant, either, to see legally elected delegates denied their seats because they refused to pledge themselves to being rubberstamps. It added no confidence to see illegal delegates seated by leadership, compromise rather than lose the votes of a few radicals.

Regardless of what one may think about the racial situation in Mississippi, the delegates of the Freedom Democratic Party were entirely illegal and had no official status. They should have been firmly told so. Instead two were seated and the others made honored guests of the convention. It was a disgusting gesture of weakness.

Somehow the presidential nominating conventions of both political parties always leave me feeling a little sick. Nothing in this Nation is of more importance. They should be solemn, thoughtful conclaves, but they are the direct opposite. They are conducted in a carnival atmosphere complete with phony demonstrations, funny hats, noisemakers, booze by the barrel, and general hell raising.

In these days of worldwide television one wonders what the citizens of truly civilized countries like Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and Denmark must think when they see all the buffoonery and listen to all the drivel that mark our political conventions. No wonder they think of us as an immature Nation that feels too big for its britches and is too juvenile to grow up.

BETWEEN THE LINES
(By G.L.C.)

It's interesting to see how a public image can change. Back when John F. Kennedy won his nomination for President of the United States, he was opposed by one Lyndon B. Johnson, whom his forces quickly swept aside.

They conceded that L.B.J. was a slick politician but he was painted as a rather unprincipled character, with little vision or intelligence. He would do for Vice President, though because that office didn't mean anything and he could handle Congress.

Then an assassin's bullet cut down President Kennedy and his mantle fell on the man from Texas. Almost within minutes, the huge Government publicity machine had worked a transformation. Johnson overnight was a changed man. He still retained his homely virtues as a son of the South or the West or the Southwest—whichever suited the purpose—and he still worried about saving the taxpayers money to such an extent that he went around the White House turning off unneeded electric lights, but he grew immeasurably in wisdom. He became the wise and fearless leader, whose vision was not to be questioned and whose honor was as rockbound and pure as the air of Texas.

But halos and wings have a way of slipping where politics is concerned and folks began asking questions. There was a fellow named Bobby Baker who made a shady million dollars or so as secretary of the Democratic majority in the Senate. Folks recalled that he had been a protege of Senator Lyndon Johnson. An effort was started under President Kennedy to investigate this Bobby Baker and it ran into a lot of snags. After J.F.K.'s murder, the whole thing was quickly hushed up.

Then it developed that President Johnson, who had been a man of very modest means when he went to the Senate, was now a very rich man indeed, just how rich it was hard to determine. Those who tried to find out discovered that much of his fortune was hidden in relatives' names and holding companies. It developed that much of it had come through his wife who was supposed to operate radio and television stations which had been very fortunate indeed in squeezing out competition, apparently through political pressures on the FCC.

So, what the Washington correspondents have known all along is slowing beginning to leak out: L.B.J. isn't such a saint after all. He's not averse to a fast buck nor to using his political power to enrich himself. He's even spending more of the taxpayers' dough than any President who has preceded him, including President Kennedy.

There have been some bitter comments, but the bitterest I have ever seen was contained in an editorial from the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette. It was written by W. L. White, son of the great William Allen White and is thought-provoking even if it may be a little more rough than necessary.

Fred Hays, who brought it in, thought you might be interested in reading it. Here it is:

"SO WHO CARES

"(By W. L. White)

"A public office, we used to say, is a public trust. Is it now accepted that it should be a place to line your pockets while you can?

"This week various publications are probing into the Lyndon Johnson family. Before Mr. Johnson ran for Congress, this family could be accounted poor in the goods of this world. But during his terms as a Congressman, as a Senator and as Vice President, a small sum inherited by his wife has been parlayed up to a fortune estimated at as low as $7 million by the Washington Star, and as high as $14 million according to Life magazine this week.

"Both publications report that little of this is openly in Lyndon Johnson's name. Most is held either by his wife or daughters, or through a network of holding companies whose purpose seems to be to conceal true ownership and to protect Lyndon Johnson from public criticism. The important thing, however, is that most if not all of this fortune seems to have been made not only while Lyndon Johnson was a public servant, but because he was a public servant. He seems to have been serving himself at least as generously as he served the public.

"But, these days, who cares?

"Well, there are still a few of us. The President of my boyhood was Theodore Roosevelt, who was poorer when he left public office than when he entered it. No one has ever accused either William Howard Taft or Woodrow Wilson of having made a thin dime out of the Presidency.

"Was Warren Harding corrupt? In a way: he did not care if his friends made money out of Government. But he made none for himself. When he died, the only important item in his estate was his stock in his newspaper, the Marion, Ohio, Star.

"No one ever accused Calvin Coolidge of making a cent out of public office. The same is true of Herbert Hoover, with the additional difference that he took not one cent

in salary while in Government. Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman also have spotless records.

"Dwight Eisenhower lived on his salary as general and President, and left office with nothing but his savings, plus the profits from his book which have gone into his Gettysburg farm.

"You can say that John Kennedy was too rich to need to steal, so we will never know. I can answer that, rich or poor, I hold this Irishman to have been money-honest.

"We come down now to Lyndon Johnson. If a man uses public office to get financial favors to himself, then by any definition, this is corruption. And on this definition he is the most corrupt man ever to have entered the White House in my time.

"And yet who cares?

"Attorney General Robert Kennedy, during the lifetime of his brother, started an investigation into the Bobby Baker case. Lyndon Johnson's connection with it was so clear that the Kennedys were about to dump Johnson as Vice President as a liability they could not afford to carry. But at this point the telescope rifle of Lee Oswald intervened, with the result that all investigation into Bobby Baker was dropped, and it was Robert Kennedy who got dumped by Lyndon Johnson.

"Will these facts, now being disclosed, help BARRY GOLDWATER? Maybe some, but probably not enough. Because there are, in our electorate, too high a percentage of people who don't mind ef ol' Lyndon's ben-agittin' his, effen he sees I keep on a-gittin' mah lil ol' govmint check.'

"What about the left-intellectuals, those ordinarily shrill watchdogs of our public morals? Well, they are too busy mincing and weaving about the place, squealing that BARRY GOLDWATER is a 'dangerous fayshist,' so a little matter like common honesty could not interest them less.

"Therefore, who cares?"

Democrat Propaganda Will Insult Voters' Intelligence, but They Will Not Debate Face to Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Charles L. Dancey, in the August 31, 1964, issue of the Peoria Journal Star emphasizes the fact that the American people are entitled to hear the real issues. If Lyndon Johnson does not have guts enough to stand up and debate, Mr. Dancey points out that if he continues to stand in the corner and shout irresponsible and inflammatory statements, Senator GOLDWATER will look better all the time.

Under unanimous consent, I include the aforementioned editorial:

MISREPRESENTING GOLDWATER

(By C. L. Dancey)

It is devoutly to be hoped that the coming campaign will see at least some discussion of the issues between the contestants rather than the hokey baloney and misrepresentation that was featured in both conventions.

Thus far, the Democrats have been shouting and campaigning vigorously against a BARRY GOLDWATER they have invented and studiously ignored the actual charges the Senator has made.

They are energetically building an "image" of their own choosing for the challenger instead of facing the issues he has raised squarely.

All they want to do is holler that GOLDWATER wants to "get rid of social security" and that he is opposed to social security and opposed to benefits for old folks, for example.

What has GOLDWATER's position consistently been? It has been that citizens of retirement age are entitled to a program that assures them security, and that the social security program falls short and will fail worse as time goes by, at heavy cost, unless its "scatter-gun approach" is corrected.

He points out specifically that social security benefits are forced upon virtually everyone whether they need them or not. They are paid to retired millionaires, to retirees with substantial annuities, retirees with liberal private pension plans, retirees with large incomes from investments, etc.

The cost of the program is already prearranged to absorb "10 percent of the payroll of the United States" in direct payroll taxes, he says, and this price is too high for what people are getting under such a free-wheeling approach. It should do a better job for those who really need it, and be corrected accordingly.

That has been the social security issue GOLDWATER has raised.

Maybe the figures just don't fit his concept. Maybe he's haywire.

But the way to find out is to meet his argument head-on, not with propaganda designed to convince people that he wants to turn back the clock and abolish the system. Such baloney is patently dishonest, and gives credence to GOLDWATER's charge that the President's refusal to debate the issues, and the Democrats' insistence on just calling him names, is the coward's way out of facing the real issues.

The same thing applies to the convention oratory about control of nuclear weapons. The awesome power of hydrogen bombs as carried by aircraft and intercontinental missiles has been repeatedly described in horrific tones, and then the charge made that GOLDWATER wants to let many people throw these around carelessly.

This is another subject that isn't a matter of direct challenge, or even exaggeration. It is pure misrepresentation. GOLDWATER has never proposed anything of the sort, and the Democratic national leaders making such remarks know it very well.

GOLDWATER has proposed that the basic infantry weapons that use atomic power (weapons that do not even remotely compare in either explosive force or range with airborne H-bombs), that are now the chief hope of a defense by NATO forces in the event of a Red attack on Europe, should be usable, instantly, in the event of such an attack, on the prompt order of the NATO commanders, based on their military situation.

If the Reds knew NATO had this authority, he maintains, they would not attack Europe, and would not apply military pressure at Berlin, etc.

It is a position shared by a great many very able and loyal and responsible Americans, by many professionals who have been clubbed into silence by the politicians who rule them, and by many experts. There are excellent arguments that are to the point and deal with this specific problem, for and against.

But we haven't heard these arguments.

We have heard only a lot of emotional appeals based on a misrepresentation that GOLDWATER is talking about H-bombs on Moscow, and talking about him causing our babies in their cribs to be slaughtered.

The American people are entitled to hear the real issue, and the real problems on which it is based.

This violent and extremist talk about a proposal to take control of weapons of long range and massive destructive power away from the President to endanger the lives of our babies in their cribs is not only dishonest, but the kind of inflammatory irresponsibility that places the candidate for President in undeserved, shocking, personal danger at the hands of some poor misled and frightened crackpot.

Such, so far, is typical of this campaign, including GOLDWATER's position, reason and purposes, in regard to organized labor where he wants more voting under independent NLRB supervision, including strike votes, to insure the right of every union member to an honest count.

He finds it a little strange that our big, "democratic" unions, unlike any other form of truly democratic organization in the world, has such a strange habit of electing a president for life * * * not in just one instance, but in most instances.

The cold fact is that the international head of a major union in this country today, on the record, can apparently never be replaced except by death, incapacity and retirement, or imprisonment. And that is based on the actual record of our biggest unions.

GOLDWATER thinks this suggests that the rank and file do not always have the truly democratic means of making their wishes felt.

Does anybody want to debate that subject in detail with him?

No, they just smear him as antilabor. On the word, and sometimes the orders of these same lifetime bosses.

What are his real suggestions as to an effective United Nations?

What are his real proposals regarding foreign aid?

Nobody wants to debate them. They just want to throw bricks, label him as blankety "against," and charge that he wants to turn back the clock, which is silly gamesmanship.

As we wtached the GOP convention, we tend to think that Johnson looks pretty good. Then, as we watch the Democrats, GOLDWATER looks much better.

What this campaign really needs if it is to be a mandate for anybody, and have any meaning, and be any kind of sensible choice, is the very face to face, honest debate that the President has so artfully ducked.

Then, maybe we could all make sense out of it.

Representative Patman Has an Unusually Constructive Record of Accomplishments—Letters to Editor of the Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of the House was amazed by an editorial in the Washington Star on August 17 which seized upon one paragraph of a 9,000-word speech, "The ABC's of America's Money System," delivered in the House on August 3 by the gentleman from Texas, Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN of the Committee on Banking and Currency, in order to try to prove that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] had been guilty of "unadulterated demagogy." The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has strong

views on many subjects and expresses them vigorously, and I doubt if any member of the committee agrees with him 100 percent on all issues at all times. I know I do not. Along the same lines, I am sure he does not agree with every position I take, just as I am sure that no Member of the House agrees with any other Member on all issues. But the gentleman from Texas' [Mr. PATMAN] record for being right on complex issues is remarkable.

And, as John W. Edelman, chairman of the board of directors of the National Consumers League, pointed out in a letter to the editor of the Washington Star following publication of the editorial attacking the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the dean of the Texas delegation in the House "has an unusually constructive record of accomplishments." Mr. Edelman has spent many years observing the operations of Congress at first hand as one of the most highly respected of legislative representatives for the labor movement, and before that was one of the architects of the housing legislation of the New Deal.

LETTERS FROM JOHN W. EDELMAN AND JAMES PATTON

Mr. Edelman's was one of two letters appearing in the Washington Star on August 26 expressing indignation over the Star's editorial condemning Mr. PATMAN. The other was by James G. Patton, president of the Farmers Union.

Mr. Speaker, I have always felt most privileged to serve on the Committee on Banking and Currency, since the start of my second term in the Congress, and I have felt particularly privileged to have served under the chairmanships of the gentleman from Kentucky, Brent Spence, and of the gentleman from Texas, WRIGHT PATMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] works as hard as any Member I have ever known, and the record of legislation bearing his name attests to his great effectiveness. Moreover, he is a student of government whose booklet on the subject is one of the most popular documents ever issued by the Congress. He has just published a primer on money which I believe will also win widespread popularity as a reference work.

Mr. Speaker, any good newspaper—including the Washington Star, which is certainly an excellent newspaper—is entitled to an occasional error in judgment on its editorial page as long as it tries hard to present the news fairly and objectively, which the Star strives to do. The Star demonstrated its desire to be fair when it printed the rebuttals of Mr. Edelman and Mr. Patton, and I submit those letters for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

UNADULTERATED DEMAGOGY

SIR: Your August 17 editorial accusing Representative WRIGHT PATMAN of "unadulterated demagogy" was an unfair attack on a man whose inquiries and insight in our Nation's money system have produced creative proposals for improvement.

You said PATMAN "devotes much of his energy to an effort to undermine the Federal Reserve System." But Business Week, certainly no revolutionary or subversive publication, noted July 11 that "one of the main objects of PATMAN's proposals is to promote the coordination of the Federal Reserve's monetary policies with the economic policies of the rest of the Government." Of PATMAN's two proposals to accomplish this, said Business Week: "There is merit in both ideas."

As Business Week declared, "there must be coordination of monetary policy with the broad economic policies of the administration—or there will be chaos." Surely PATMAN's proposals to achieve such coordination deserve more thoughtful comment than your assertion that he seeks "to undermine the Federal Reserve System."

Your editorial also accused PATMAN of making "wild charges" against the "bankers' lobby" while offering no proof of its operations. You must have missed PATMAN's documentation. In the same speech in which you said "he ranted against the bankers' lobby," PATMAN described how the lobby worked just recently "to kill legislation that was very much sought by savings and loan associations and many bankers, particularly small town and small city bankers."

The bill would have raised the maximum insurance on individual bank accounts from the present $10,000 to $20,000.

Representative PATMAN has an unusually constructive record of accomplishments. Disagree with him on the merit of his proposals, by all means, if you believe his recommendations are faulty. But to label him a "demagog" is unfair.

JOHN W. EDELMAN,
Chairman of the Board of Directors,
National Consumers League.

SIR: Your editorial "Unadulterated Demogogy," August 17, completely misrepresents plain truths and simple facts. Your ill-conceived, biased attack on Texas Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN'S House speech of August 3 must not be permitted to stand without some attempt to correct the false record you have created.

A brief reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 3, 1964, pages 17253 to 17262, will clearly reveal more than what you termed "wild charges against the ABA (American Bankers Association) and the bankers' lobby."

It shows for one, how the ABA killed legislation very much sought by savings and loan associations, particularly small town and small city banks, which would have increased insurance from $10,000 to $20,000 on individual accounts.

Further, and the main point of Congressman PATMAN'S speech, which your editorial completely ignores, it's time that our citizens who are interested in protecting the public interest in national monetary matters act get behind the kind of responsible leadership which Congressman PATMAN is giving.

The Nation Farmers Union, which I have headed since 1940, strongly endorses the efforts of Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN to reevaluate our Nation's monetary policies which, among other things, are costing Americans $75 billion in gross interest charges this year alone.

What this Nation needs is more Congressmen like WRIGHT PATMAN and fewer editorials like yours of August 17.

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, Farmers Union.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board of independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska.*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind.*
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah.*
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.* — 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.* — Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J.*
Church, Frank, *Idaho.*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H.*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo.*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*
Eastland, James O., *Miss.* — 5101 Macomb St.
Edmondson, J. Howard, *Okla.*
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C.*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark.*
Goldwater, Barry, *Ariz.*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska.*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y.*
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C.*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C.*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho.*
Keating, Kenneth B., *N.Y.* — 2809 Dumbarton Ave.
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio.*
Long, Edward V., *Mo.*
Long, Russell B., *La.*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak.*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*
Mechem, Edwin L., *N. Mex.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.* — 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa.* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah.*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine.*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis.*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I.*
Pearson, James B., *Kans.*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I.* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*
Salinger, Pierre, *Calif.*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala.* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C.*
Tower, John G., *Tex.*
Walters, Herbert S., *Tenn.*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del.*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex.*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio.*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Edmondson, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case, Hickenlooper, Curtis, and Keating.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McGovern, Edmondson, Walters, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Cooper, Boggs, and Mechem.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Humphrey, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Beall, Goldwater, and Case.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Bennett, Tower, Javits, Simpson, and Dominick.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, and Beall.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Hartke, McIntyre, Beall, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Smathers, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, and Mundt.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Pell, Ribicoff, Brewster, Salinger, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, Miller, and Pearson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Walters, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, Mechem, and Dominick.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy, Bayh, Burdick, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, Fong, and Scott.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy, Metcalf, Goldwater, Javits, Prouty, Tower, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Carlson, Fong, and Boggs.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Nelson, Salinger, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Miller, and Pearson.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

The Case for Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district can count among their blessings one of America's outstanding newspapers. The Kansas City Star, in the best traditions of journalism, has, since its first edition 84 years ago called the shots as it has seen them. As a consequence its voice is a respected one in my city, my State, and indeed in my country. I have not always agreed with the position it has taken on various issues and, as it points out from time to time, it has not always agreed with my stand on various legislation. However, I have enjoyed the valuable support of this outstanding newspaper for some years.

In its customary cogent fashion it has examined the issues confronting the American voter this fall and has drawn certain conclusions. I commend to my colleagues this careful analysis and its logical conclusions.

I offer for the RECORD the editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Star on August 30.

AS WE SEE IT: THE CASE FOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON

These are dangerous and still troubled times for all of us, times that demand the most careful and prudent leadership both in our affairs at home and in the world.

Abroad, the family of nations grows. New countries emerge in the ferment of freedom, often without the sense of responsibility that is essential to world stability.

On new battlegrounds and old, freedom continues its struggle against communism in that spasm of history that is called the cold war. The drama plays on, with the ominous threat of nuclear holocaust ever a part of the plot.

At home our great struggle is over what loosely is termed civil rights. But the term is an oversimplification. It is a problem of race. It touches upon traditions and a way of life. It borders on economics and the persistently high rate of unemployment that particularly affects Negroes. There has been no internal challenge of such proportions since the Civil War.

Abroad and at home, it is a time in which national decisions must be weighed carefully and made judiciously. We refer not only to the decisions that our elected leaders may make, but also to the millions of individual decisions to be made by the voters in November. As citizens, they have a meaningful duty to discharge.

Believing this in all conscience, the Star is making its decision, as each of its readers must do. The conventions are past, the platforms written. The issues are joined. Unhesitatingly, this newspaper supports the candidacy of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

We are convinced that the cause of world peace would be better served by Mr. Johnson and his foreign policy, with its roots deep in both Democratic and Republican administrations. It would be safer to keep his finger on the nuclear trigger than to place the awesome responsibility on Senator GOLDWATER. We frankly fear that the Goldwater philosophy, transformed into presidential policy, might plunge the world deeper into the uncertainty of greater international tensions.

Of course, no one can be wholly satisfied with the rate of progress toward peace and world understanding. All of us share the frustrations of this atomic era. But inch by inch there has been progress. In the Goldwater makeup, in the GOP platform, in the candidate's statements, we see every reason to fear an end of such progress and, in fact, a period of retrogression with increased tensions.

Let us put it another way, and bluntly: We believe that to entrust the peace to a Goldwater administration would be an unnecessary and undesirable gamble for the Nation to take.

On the domestic front, civil rights is the overriding issue. It is pointless to hope that it can be kept out of the campaign. It is dangerous to ignore the explosiveness of the issue. And it is unduly optimistic to see any lasting solutions for years to come.

Here, then, is a point of the utmost relevancy to the Goldwater candidacy: Should he win, he would unquestionably do so with the support of the extreme segregationist groups of the South and with the backing of those groups, North or South, that place the Negro inside their circle of hate.

We believe that BARRY GOLDWATER is as determined as any other man to solve this problem. But as President, could he? We are not at all certain, for his election itself could create division, not unity. Support from the extreme racists would inevitably transform itself into pressure on the President—pressure for actions that could destroy the uneasy bridges of understanding between the races.

By contrast, President Johnson has been a strong leader in the civil rights cause, despite his Texas background. Because of that background, he has a kinship to the whole South and is better equipped to understand its problem. Regardless of the convention outbursts from the South, the Star believes that, for the long pull, Mr. Johnson would be much more effective in solving the racial problem than would his opponent.

We recognize the American tradition of rallying around each new President. Undoubtedly there would be, in the terminology of politics, a "honeymoon" of sorts for BARRY GOLDWATER, should he be elected. Nevertheless, we foresee many difficulties for him. Above all else, he would face world and national leadership with the forces of hate from both extremes intensified rather than lessened.

Moreover, it seems to us that Lyndon B. Johnson deserves election on the record he has made in the months since an assassin's bullet tragically struck down John F. Kennedy. What a crisis Mr. Johnson faced at that time. He has, we believe, dealt with it masterfully.

This is not to say that we go along with everything Mr. Johnson has done or says that he will do. Most certainly we do not.

But we were impressed in the days of transition from the Kennedy to the Johnson administration and we have continued to be impressed. In the manner of an old pro, L.B.J. convinced the 88th Congress, which had been on a virtual sitdown strike in its first session, that certain actions were essential in the national interest. Mr. Johnson got the country moving again.

In the foreign field—and in this area we were admittedly uncertain of his leadership—the President has demonstrated his ability to serve effectively as the Nation's spokesman. All in all, his performance as a chief executive thrust suddenly onto the world stage has inspired confidence both in Lyndon Johnson and in the United States.

The latest test of the Johnson leadership came in Vietnam, when Communist PT boats attacked U.S. ships not once but twice. In the first instance, there was a Presidential warning; when that was ignored and the attack was repeated, the United States struck back with a pinpoint demonstration of military power which left no doubt that this country meant business. And even as the bombs were falling, the White House had started the diplomatic moves designed to keep local confrontation from becoming world conflagration.

It was firmness coupled with prudence. And that word, we suggest, belongs without qualification with another essential word of our times: preparedness.

It seems significant to us, too, that Mr. Johnson's critics have made such a point of assailing him as a man who tries to work both sides of every political fence, to be all things to all people. Particularly at this time, we believe his talent for compromise to be an asset. We cannot afford a divided country, and Mr. Johnson has displayed an ability to draw Americans together, to be the President of all the people.

Thus, the case for Lyndon Johnson. What of the case against BARRY GOLDWATER, as we see it?

Certainly we do not dislike the Senator. We cannot accept the line of those who say he is a phony or a demagog. Unquestionably, Senator GOLDWATER is totally sincere. He is entitled to his views. In our judgment he means what he says. And frankly, we think he has said too much.

We are bothered by that unbending insistence that he is, in all cases, absolutely right, that he has simple answers to all questions. We have seen nothing that indicates moderation on the part of BARRY GOLDWATER—and we do not except that unity meeting in Pennsylvania. Such inflexibility, as we see it, does not belong in the White House. He has shown no comprehension of the art of compromise which is essential to the functioning of Government. Consider, if you will, the Senator's record:

He stood with the very few lawmakers who voted against ratification of the test-ban treaty that was a first if feeble step toward the distant goal of real peace.

He voted against the tax bill even though a large majority of his own party favored the measure.

In the cloture vote and in the final action on civil rights, BARRY GOLDWATER was in the "No" column—again, one of but a very few in the GOP.

We cite merely a part of the record. But there is, here, evidence to prove that this is a very opinionated man who sticks by his opinions, whatever the cost. Now we have

heard a lot of quibbling over word meanings and the like since the Republican convention, and it probably hasn't meant much. But it is one thing, we suggest, to have convictions; it is another to be opinionated. The latter describes the man in whom there is conviction carried to a potentially dangerous extreme.

You may, of course, admire conviction when it is described as political guts. But you may also see in the record of consistent opposition a demonstrated inability to work with people to get things done—even with members of the Senator's own party. How, we wonder, could BARRY GOLDWATER work with other world leaders? Where would such a lone-wolf attitude take us?

We regard this election as the Nation's business, not Europe's. Nevertheless, the Star can see why the Western nations should get the chills at the mere nomination of BARRY GOLDWATER. Without falling back on the overused cliches—"shooting from the hip" and the like—we see, in the Goldwater philosophy and method of operation, a recklessness that gives us the chills too.

One instance in point. When Castro shut off the water to the Guantanamo base, the Goldwater reaction was to send in the Marines. In fact, Washington had prepared for such an emergency. Today the water has not been turned on. The base is self-sufficient. The United States has not retreated. Nor has it unnecessarily risked nuclear war.

We would not place undue stress on one incident. But there have been many others of like nature. And there is the Goldwater approach, reflected in the platform he virtually dictated at San Francisco. Should that platform become reality in the Goldwater spirit, we would foresee a setback in the search for peace. It seems to assume that it is impossible to work with the Communists in any way or to negotiate with them. It raises questions on cooperation even with our allies. It places the major stress on military might, not on firm but prudent diplomacy.

Similarly, that defense of—or apology for—extremism in the acceptance speech made us wonder precisely what road this Nation might be forced to travel with BARRY GOLDWATER as its leader. Here, we must note that on the surface, the Senator seemed conciliatory at Hershey, with his profession of faith in the Eisenhower way. But was it the real GOLDWATER? Or was the real GOLDWATER the man who left San Francisco flush with the victory of the rightwing takeover of the party? The man who made that amazing acceptance speech?

We need not debate whether the speech—and the defense of extremism was, of course, the real essence of it all—was a political blooper. But this we do know: The unity conference at Hershey was necessary because the words of the nominee at San Francisco were so open to adverse interpretation. We cannot buy a presidential candidate who so consistently uses language that he needs later to explain—or others need to explain for him. Clarity of mind, expression, and thought are essential for a President. We cannot afford a Chief Executive who, later, would have to explain precisely what he meant. In this world of cold war, that would be dangerous indeed.

Thus, the choice is proposed, and the Star has made its choice. In taking this position, we believe that we are in line with the traditional thinking of this newspaper, even though the Star has generally supported Republican candidates for the presidency.

The Star has never made any pretense at being a liberal newspaper. We have believed consistently that the country could be served best by a philosophy of moderate conservatism.

In the distant past, this newspaper opposed populism when it was on the move throughout our territory. It supported sound money principles and the gold standard through the years of William Jennings Bryan. In 1912, when business seemed to be gaining too much power, we did not hesitate to follow the Bull Moose of Theodore Roosevelt.

In the New Deal era we stood fast against extreme liberalism and left-wing extremists. Consistently, we have opposed Ku Kluxism, that frightening symbol of internal hatred, even as we have spoken out against John Birchism and the hate groups of today.

On civil rights, we have supported that movement in the name of justice and morality, while denouncing lawlessness on the part of any racial group, white or Negro. We will continue to speak forthrightly, whether in criticism of the reckless white segregationist of the South or the reckless Negro integrationist of the North.

Let it be known that in supporting President Johnson, we are not buying the Democratic Party as such, nor its platform. The Star will continue to make its decisions on State and local candidates as it sees each situation, irrespective of the national election.

We do not condone the Bobby Baker scandals, any more than we did similar scandals of the Truman and Eisenhower administrations. We believe that Congress has been woefully neglectful in protecting itself against a repetition of such sordid affairs. We are not convinced that the Baker investigation has been as thorough as it ought to have been.

We will go even further: We wish the Johnson family were not in the television business. Not that there is anything wrong with that business. Undoubtedly, by placing his properties in trust when he became Chief Executive, the President in his own mind removed any possibility of a conflict of interest. Nevertheless, the Presidency is such a precious thing in our system that it should at all times be above reproach or even the slightest whisper of undue advantage.

Having said all this, and promising frank criticism of Mr. Johnson's campaign and administration when we feel it necessary, we restate the case: On the record and on his demonstrated capacity for leadership both at home and abroad, the Star believes that the President deserves 4 years more in the White House.

As a newspaper, we hope that the campaign will be conducted without a spewing of hatred by extremists on either side, without bitter divisiveness, without damage to the national morale that might take so many years to repair. We hope that the campaign somehow will leave a nation strong and united, not weakened and divided.

For obviously there are many things on which all of us can agree. We know that any sacrifice must and will be made in defense of freedom, and we know that our Nation must be strong militarily, economically, and spiritually. These are truths for this election and for any election.

And there is another truth to which we hold with firm conviction: Each candidate should be given a full and fair hearing. Let the campaign be hard hitting, as determined as each contender would make it. But we hope that it will at no time degenerate into brawls, disorderly demonstrations, picketing, and the like. This is a vital election to be held in the American way. The American way means fairplay for both men.

On our part, while we support President Johnson, we shall do everything possible to print the news of the campaign fairly and objectively. We will, in statements of editorial opinion, call the shots as we see them. That is our duty as a newspaper. And that, too, is a part of the American way in an American campaign.

Tribune to C. D. Ulrich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, since the middle of July, practically every newspaper has published accounts of speeches in which the Federal Government has been attacked and derided. Under these circumstances, it is heartening to read in the August 24 issue of the Arkansas Gazette that Mr. C. D. Ulrich, a citizen of Bryant, Ark., and 92 years of age, has willed all his property to the U.S. Government, to express his gratitude for the opportunities he has had in this country. Those who are so ready to condemn their Government might learn a lesson from Mr. Ulrich, if they would only begin to think in positive terms, rather than in negative ones.

I commend Mr. Ulrich for his good citizenship and his sense of responsibility to his Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Arkansas Gazette be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

C. D. ULRICH, 92, REVERSES TREND—WILLS ALL HIS MONEY TO UNCLE SAM

(By George Bentley)

Christian Daniel Ulrich at 92 has no one in the world to care for but himself and he said Sunday, while observing his birthday, that because of this he had decided some time ago to will everything he owns to the U.S. Government.

In the past, he has confided to friends that his reason for willing his property to the Government went beyond this—that it was born of his gratitude for the opportunities his country had given him.

He also has mentioned that, since he has drawn a $100-a-month pension as a veteran of the Spanish-American War for a number of years, he thought he ought to return to the Government what he had left.

Because of his age, Ulrich is shy and reluctant to discuss openly the value of his estate and the arrangements he has made to leave it to the Government. His plan would be unusual any time but seems especially so in a day when it is more popular to condemn the Government and want to take from it rather than give to it.

Ulrich lives at Bryant, a quiet community of about 700 persons about 2 miles south of the Benton Highway, just south of the Pulaski-Saline County line. His modest frame cottage at the end of a dirt lane is grown up in weeds and isn't very tidy inside either, which would lead one to the mistaken conclusion that he just makes ends meet and is hardly in a position to provide for the Government.

But Ulrich, who practiced his trade as a carpenter for many years, has several thousands of dollars in bonds, some property at Vimy Ridge, a few miles to the east, plus his home and the income from some property he sold at Jacksonville about 3 years ago. He keeps the bonds and any cash in the bank.

Ulrich takes an interest in his Government. He reads the Gazette every morning and receives the American Legion magazine

(he is a member of the Legion) and follows the political news.

He was reading the Sunday paper when his lawyer, Clayton Freeman of Little Rock, a reporter, and a photographer called on him to wish him a happy birthday. Since he was reading about the starting of the Democratic National Convention, what did he think of the presidential race? "I'm for Johnson," Ulrich said simply. He added that he was a lifelong Democrat but supported Theodore Roosevelt, a Republican.

He said he "knew" Roosevelt during the Spanish-American War but never spoke to him. Ulrich, a native of Brookville, Ind., enlisted May 6, 1898, at Indianapolis and served in Company B, 23d Infantry Regiment. He was discharged August 14, 1899, at Jolo, in the Philippines.

His discharge shows that he was born August 23, 1872, which makes him 92, but he insisted that it was his 93d birthday. But during the interview he conceded two or three times that, "My memory is gone," when he couldn't reach back into the past for answers to some questions.

Ulrich came to Arkansas in 1910 and lived at other places in central Arkansas before retiring at Bryant 8 years ago. He never married. He said he came from a family of seven boys and two girls and he was the fourth oldest. He said he knew all the members of his family were dead with the possible exception of two brothers whom he lost touch with years ago. He was the only one to settle in Arkansas.

"I came here because I like to hunt and fish," he said. He keeps a pole in his living room and still likes to go out to a stream.

He seems to be in remarkably good health for his age. He has no ready answer for the usual question, "What is your secret for living to a ripe old age." He said he neither smoked nor used alcoholic beverages but he thinks that retiring and taking it easy in later life was the main reason.

He is small and fragile from age and he has some trouble hearing. His eyes are a pale blue and are weak and he has several pairs of spectacles around the house for reading.

VISITED CAPITAL

In September 1962, Ulrich made a pleasure trip to Washington and was struck by a car as he was crossing a street. He spent some time in a hospital there.

Freeman has known Ulrich about 25 years and has made his will several times. Due to his forgetfulness, Ulrich has mislaid or lost his wills several times. He always wills everything to the Government and he had made a will in February 1962 a few months prior to the Washington trip. Freeman persuaded Ulrich to leave this will with Freeman to be filed in probate court after his death. He named Freeman executor of the estate.

TRIPS TO LITTLE ROCK

Although he doesn't travel far from home very often, Ulrich makes unexpected visits to his lawyer's office in the Glover Building, across the street from the Pulaski County Courthouse. Sometimes he drops in at the Secret Service office in the Federal building for a friendly visit and to let the agents know that he is saving everything for the Government.

USE OF MONEY

What becomes of property that is willed to the Government? An official of the Internal Revenue Service said that a Federal law provided for gifts and donations to be accepted directly by the Secretary of the Treasury to be placed in a special account that eventually is used for general public purposes. Any real estate donated to the Government is placed with the General Services Administration to be sold or disposed of as deemed in the best interests of the Government. Property donated specifically for park purposes is turned over to the Department of Interior.

HE'LL VOTE FOR L.B.J.

Ulrich said he hadn't voted in a long time but he said he planned to go to his precinct November 3 just so he could cast his ballot for President Johnson.

Asked why he never had married, Ulrich chuckled and said, "I guess it's because I never had a regular job."

Ulrich said that he didn't get out very often "but I've got to walk down to the post office tomorrow for this month's pension check."

The walk is just a few blocks and shouldn't be much of a strain. Freeman said Ulrich left his office in Little Rock not long ago, telling him: "I've missed my bus but I'll just walk on home." That was about a 25-mile walk and he made it.

What Dun & Bradstreet Says About Dual Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, during recent years, more and more manufacturers have undertaken to engage in business—not just as manufacturers—but also as wholesalers and retailers. Since these manufacturers are operating in two or three different levels of distribution, they are said to be engaged in dual distribution; and since they compete against many of their small business wholesaler and retailer customers, serious competitive problems are brought into play which, in some cases, appear to threaten the ability of the wholesalers and dealers to remain in business.

During this Congress, the House Small Business Committee, through one of its subcommittees under the chairmanship of Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, has held extensive hearings regarding this matter.

Representatives of approximately 50 different industries sought and obtained permission to explain to the members of the subcommittee how dual distribution was crippling or eliminating small businesses from their particular industry. Their stories fill eight volumes of printed testimony.

The current issue of Dun's Review, published by Dun & Bradstreet, contains a most informative article by Thomas J. Murray which discusses various competitive problems stemming from dual distribution. Under unanimous consent, I place this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

DUAL DISTRIBUTION VERSUS THE SMALL RETAILER

Since he first set up shop in 1948, hard-working August G. Huchting has built up his Ontario, Calif., paint store into a tidy, profitable business. Year by year the customers of the small store on a pleasant, tree-lined street in this town of 30,000 grew in number, year by year the sales ledgers steadily grew fatter.

Then, suddenly, not so long ago Huchting's business suffered a setback; his major supplier, a top-ranking manufacturer, opened its own retail store outlet close by and began selling identical lines of paint. Worse, it sold them at a price with which Huchting could not possibly compete. "Out of this new store," says the soft-spoken Huchting bitterly, "They have been selling the larger paint contractors the same materials we handle, at our cost, thus making it impossible for us to compete for the contractors' business."

August Huchting's predicament is no isolated piece of bad luck; it is just one symptom of a fast-moving marketing method—called dual distribution—that has already hurt numerous independent businessmen and menaces thousands more. This dry, unevocative term is the marketing industry's label for any form of sales competition between an independent businessman and his own suppliers.

Right now, dual distribution is hurting the small marketer at every level; manufacturing, wholesaling and retailing. For instance, an independent fabricator of structural steel fights a severe price squeeze forced by his own major raw material suppliers, the metal mills, which are also selling the same products to the same customers; a candy wholesaler loses business when a big supplier begins to sell its chocolate bars directly to many of his largest retail customers.

But it is the independent retailer who is hardest hit. For in the past few years the number of big manufacturers who are setting up or expanding their own strings of company-owned retail outlets has reached alarming proportions. Not only that, small merchants point to the damaging volume of direct factory-to-customer selling: mail-order sales of books and records, bulk selling of office machines to corporations, big orders of appliances sold directly to builders of large-scale projects, and the like.

To make matters worse, the small merchant finds that competition from the manufacturer is frequently far more damaging than that from a rival independent. For the manufacturer can squeeze the small retailer badly by keeping the wholesale price of his goods inflexible while he himself sells through the company outlet at a retail price equal to, only fractionally above or sometimes even below the independent's cost price.

Dual distribution, of course, is nothing new in itself. For several decades now oil companies and tire manufacturers have owned substantial numbers of their outlets. And for many years paint manufacturers have retailed a large proportion of their own goods. What is new, however, is the recent surge in the growth of dual distribution and the spreading of the practice to completely new industries.

There is no single reason behind this surge. Rather, there are several underlying causes that together form a major threat to independent retailing:

Intensifying competition in many industries has spurred manufacturers to open their own stores in markets where no suitable outlet already exists.

Manufacturers are learning the value of running a number of their own retail stores for testing both products and new merchandising techniques. President Michael Daroff of Botany Industries, for instance, claims that the firm's 75 retail outlets serve as a retail laboratory and that they have aided the company immeasurably in learning about style trends, costs, and merchandising. "This information," he says, "makes us better manufacturers because it has put us in a position to know what retailers need and to act quickly on those needs."

The hardening of the Justice Department's attitude towards external expansion through merger has left many giant manufacturers with vertical integration—such as a move

into retailing—as the only major expansion route.

In recent years large companies have been piling up internally generated cash—frequently more than they know what to do with. Consequently, the financing of their own retail chains is no problem today.

The massive shift of retailing from city to suburb has dealt a blow at the would-be small retailer, who often cannot raise sufficient capital for a stake in the new shopping centers. Consequently, many big manufacturers are opening their own stores to provide an outlet for their goods.

Finally, and increasingly attractive as competition gets rougher, there is the old lure of extra profits that can be made through cutting out the middleman and selling directly to the final customer.

Under the spur of such incentives, then, it is not surprising that company outlets are increasing at a brisk pace and that several new industries are turning to dual distribution. A major new entry, for example, are the appliance makers, some of whom are bypassing their dealers with millions of dollars worth of refrigerators, washing machines, and cooking equipment sold directly to homebuilders. Too, plumbing fixtures are being sold for the first time through manufacturers' retail outlets; microfilm manufacturers are selling in volume directly to large corporations; and within the last 10 years dual distribution has spread to the marketing of numerous other goods, ranging from plywood to records and photographic equipment.

One of the areas where dual distribution is currently threatening to hurt badly is in the men's clothing field. To be sure, it is no newcomer there, but in the past few years it has spread rapidly. Only recently, for example, such leading makers of men's wear as Genesco, Louis Roth Co., and Hat Corp. of America have expanded their own retail chains, and all the signs point to further converts to dual distribution.

A typical victim of this trend is Proprietor J. Gerald Saul, whose Long Island store has become a profitable local market for several lines of quality clothes. Only recently, Saul declares, a leading supplier took over a store less than one block from his own and began to sell the same lines. "I can't accurately measure the injury we suffered," Saul laments, "but it sure didn't do us any good. And the real harm is still to come."

CHORUS OF COMPLAINTS

Indeed, the complaints of independent businessmen are heard on all sides. R. E. Eubanks of B. & E. Paint Co. in Shreveport, La., states flatly that competition from suppliers (including Sherwin-Williams Co., Glidden Co., and Pittsburgh Paint Supply), both through company outlets and direct sales from factory locations, forced him to sell out his business. Morris F. Hoffman, of Hoffman Glass Service in Joliet, Ill., asserts that after 22 years of operating at the same location, one of his major suppliers, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., opened a retail outlet in the same marketing area and approached longstanding customers of his with prices equal to his costs. Says Hoffman, "They make it impossible for me to compete."

Moreover, worse may be yet to come. J. Gerald Saul speaks for many when he declares that he and others like him face risks ranging from the retailer's supply line being chopped off to total manufacturer domination and even, perhaps, eventual extinction as independents. Says Benjamin L. Finn, executive director of Independent Shoemen, largest dealer organization in the shoe industry: "This trend has accelerated to the point where it has now become a move to dominate the industry and control distribution."

And Federal Trade Commission Chairman, Paul Rand Dixon, himself acknowledges that dual distribution has placed many smaller concerns at a distinct competitive disadvantage. As an independent, says Dixon, "you are subject at all times to being cut off by your supplier."

The small retailers' fears of dual distribution are scarcely allayed by the manufacturers themselves. "We envision a steady growth of both the number and sales volume of our retail leased departments in department stores," says Executive Vice President James C. Taylor of Brown Shoe's Wohl Division. And from other giants of this industry, International Shoe Co., Genesco, and Endicott Johnson Corp., comes similar reports of expansion in their own retail activities.

The story is the same in the tire, paint, and gasoline industries. And in the men's wear field. Hart Schaffner & Marx, Botany Industries, Hat Corp. of America, Louis Roth, and others have all been adding to their chains of retail outlets. Says Cluett, Peabody & Co. retail stores division president, Thomas Macleod: "This aspect of our operations will continue to grow at a normal rate. In the past couple of years our retail outlets have gone up from 30 to 44."

In brief, while there is no way of measuring dual-distribution sales in terms of dollars, the evidence is overwhelming that it is forcing significant changes in the structure of retailing. Many independent retailers are feeling its effects only marginally, but many others are being seriously damaged, and a number have actually been put out of business.

The independent businessman has few weapons to fight back with. Dual distribution is, of course, an entirely legal practice, and a manufacturer is at liberty to compete with the retailer to whom he also sells his goods—and at any price he wishes. Neither is it illegal for the manufacturer to refuse to sell to whomever he wishes. The Federal Trade Commission has no mandate to protect independents from such competition where "unfair methods" are not involved, and the Justice Department is not currently attacking dual distribution as a specific antitrust problem.

Be that as it may, the independent merchant has a number of important factors working for him. In the first place, a large proportion of small retailers are simply not threatened by dual distribution at all. "Manufacturer-owned stores," explains marketing expert Prof. Leonard W. Prestwich, "are feasible only for companies that produce full lines of related products or products that are of a relatively high unit value. Otherwise, adequate sales volume cannot be realized in a single retail store without buying products from other manufacturers to round out the line." Consequently, such retailers as the local tobacconist, newspaper vendor, florist, dry-goods store, and small variety shop would appear to be free of the potential threat of added competition from the opening of retail outlets by their own suppliers.

In addition, a number of leading manufacturers hold that dual distribution is purely and simply bad business. Good managers, they feel, are hard enough to come by without spreading them even more thinly through a venture into retailing. Even more compelling is the desire of such firms to retain the goodwill of the independent retailing force that is already working for them. Such a concern is the Maytag Co., which flatly condemns dual distribution. "I'm enough of a businessman," declares Maytag Marketing Vice President Claire G. Ely, "to know that my future is wrapped up in the sale of my products through normal distributive channels—by sales through dealers to the ultimate consumer. I know that I can't serve two causes at the same time. I can't forever work both sides of the street."

Occasionally, a manufacturer will even move in the opposite direction—away from dual distribution. "I know of one company," relates Prestwich, "that, after a study lasting several years, decided to distribute entirely through industrial distributors rather than directly to large customers and through industrial distributors to small customers as they had been doing. Management felt that the dual policy jeopardized their entire distributive system."

Moreover, dealers in the appliance industry have been making headway against one damaging form of dual distribution. Direct sales of appliances by General Electric, Westinghouse, and others to builders for installation in large housing projects and apartment buildings have been infuriating the independents for the past few years. In defense of the practice, Edward L. Stehle, general manager of GE's major appliance division's distribution sales operation, recently asserted: "It is simply a hard fact of economic life that many of these customers * * * buy little, if any, of their material requirements in the retail market."

Nevertheless, a number of manufacturers have been pressed into making some adjustments to their sales programs. Philco Corp., for instance, recently eliminated direct sales to builders from its distributors in three cities. Then, too, some of the companies have taken steps to correct an abuse whereby builders have been reselling these appliances at retail in direct competition with the independents.

HELP COMING?

Above all, however, small retailers have been looking to Washington for help—not, to be sure, against dual distribution per se, but at least against such practices as below-cost sales by manufacturers, or the ploy whereby manufacturers encourage an independent to go into business selling their goods and then, when the market is fully developed, cut off supplies, and launch a company outlet instead. And, stirred by mounting protests, Congress finally moved to investigate.

Last year hearings were held by a subcommittee of the House Select Committee on Small Business, chaired by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, a longtime campaigner on behalf of small business. Into these sessions paraded representatives from over 35 industries to give testimony of abuses of dual distribution by suppliers. The subcommittee's report, which is expected to stress the pervasiveness of dual distribution, and its adverse effects on small business, should appear late this summer.

The report has excellent credentials. Last March highly placed staff members of the Small Business Administration, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Justice Department's Antitrust Division met together. Their goal: to correlate the findings of the House hearings and a number of other investigations and to coordinate the approach to be used in the final report and recommendations of the subcommittee. To most retailer organizations, this concentration of governmental forces in their interests seems to bode well for the future.

Clearly, Congressman ROOSEVELT hopes that this report will improve the chances for passage of a bill proposing that firms practicing dual distribution disclose each outlet's operating data; and, even more significant, provide the impetus for an FTC drive against the abuses in dual distribution.

Meanwhile, a group of independent businessmen have started their own drive against dual distribution. Just last June President Lawrence Schacht of Schacht Steel Construction joined with some 150 independent businessmen to form the Conference on Dual Distribution, a body that has the blessing

of Congressman ROOSEVELT. Its immediate aim: to attract a membership of around 40,000 firms in a drive to help the bills now pending onto the floor for action, and, ultimately, to bring about some Government control over manufacturer-supplier competition.

Schacht, an independent fabricator of structural steel, is himself fighting a severe price squeeze caused by his own suppliers, the major metal mills. They generate this pressure, he explains, by keeping his raw-material costs high and simultaneously selling the same finished products at his prices or below them. "Dual distribution," he likes to say, "is nothing less than domestic dumping."

But in spite of all this activity, independent merchants are not optimistic about the future. To them it seems inevitable that dual distribution must spread. And the spread, they believe, will be explosive, because when big manufacturers turn to retailing they use no half measures. As Congressman ROOSEVELT puts it: "When a large manufacturer makes a decision to go into distribution, it is improbable that he will open one retail outlet. He is more apt to arrive on the scene with a great number of outlets or to rapidly build up a distribution network over a short period of time."

—THOMAS J. MURRAY.

The Problem of the Nonvoter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the American Legion magazine for August 1964, published an excellent article by the outstanding national commander of the Legion, Daniel F. Foley. The article is entitled "The Problem of the Nonvoter." Commander Foley emphasizes reasons why going to the polls and casting one's ballot is the first and most concrete answer to the question, "What can I do for my country?"

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE PROBLEM OF THE NONVOTER

(By National Commander Daniel F. Foley)

Beneath the noise and color and excitement of current political campaigning, consider this:

In the next 3 months more than 100 million Americans will be asked to decide with their ballots the future course and leadership of the Nation.

If the 1960 pattern is repeated, more than one-third of the electorate will take no part in the decision.

Recent national elections have produced voter turnouts of 90 percent in Italy, 85 percent in West Germany, and about 80 percent in Great Britain, France, Israel, and the Scandinavian countries. The U.S. score in 1960 was 64 percent, the highest in our history.

A comparable showing in 1964 won't be nearly good enough. To insure a sound base for responsible government at home and strong leadership abroad, we need an overwhelming turnout at the polls on November 3. I urge every American Legionnaire to join now in a sustained drive, through education and persuasion and personal example, to impress upon all our citizens the responsibility to vote.

As a first step, each of us should make certain that our own path to the polls is clear. Responsible exercise of the right to vote requires that we (1) qualify as voters by registering under the laws of our State, (2) size up the issues and candidates in the light of the best information we can get, and (3) vote on election day.

The right to vote, like our other fundamental rights, is not self-perpetuating. To keep it, we must use it—intelligently and faithfully. Either we vote and thereby support our free, representative system; or we fail to vote and thereby weaken the system.

Any American Legionnaire who might be inclined to forgo voting on November 3 ought to consider these facts:

Three-fourths of the world's adults today are denied the privilege of expressing their preference at the polls. They live under systems where freedom of choice is outlawed or where educational and economic levels are too low to sustain popular government.

Thousands of young Americans who fought at our sides to preserve the right of suffrage never got a chance to exercise it. They gave their lives before reaching voting age.

Does one vote count? Every vote counts, yours just as much as any other. To believe otehrwise is to disbelieve the doctrines which undergird our free society. Your vote counts whether you cast it or not; for when you don't vote, you double the influence of a voter who disagrees with your view of what is good and necessary for the country.

In the 1960 presidential election, a switch of less than 1 percent of the ballots in eight States would have changed the election's result. The 1962 gubernatorial election in Minnesota was decided by a margin of 91 votes out of a million and a quarter cast.

But it isn't just a question of voting your choice. Public indifference at the polls breeds Government indifference. He who shirks his vote is poorly equipped to protest if those elected shirk theirs thereafter.

A 64-percent sampling of American voters in 1964 doesn't meet America's needs in the sixties. Nations around the globe, many of them new and groping for a political philosophy, look to the United States for lessons in the functioning of a free society. Rightly or wrongly, they will question an elective process in which 4 people out of 10 do not vote, and only 1 in 10 involve themselves in political combat.

Simply increasing the number of voters will not necessarily improve the quality of our voting. We also need more voters who are informed, alert, and perceptive. We need more men and women who make it their business to discriminate between candidates and issues at the local and State levels as well as the national. For instance, nominees for the board of education rarely pack the promotional or emotional appeal of presidential candidates. But how and whom we choose to serve on that board may do more to determine future progress in a community than our choice of President.

According to students of American voting habits, people stay away from the polls chiefly for three reasons: they aren't interested, they can't make up their minds, or they don't want to get mixed up with politics. For the dedicated American Legionnaire, the first two are unacceptable and the third just doesn't make sense.

Politics and good government are not only compatible—they are inseparable. Political organizations and loyalties furnish the fuel that makes the Government go. If you want a better grade of political performance than you're getting, there's only one effective way to go at it—from the inside, as a working, contributing member of your party.

Plato stated the alternative a good many centuries ago: "The punishment of wise men who refuse to take part in the affairs of government is to live under the government of unwise men."

A major American Legion "get-out-the-vote" drive already has been mounted by our national organization and many departments and posts. Every working Legionaire has a stake and place in it. If your post hasn't taken action, stir up some. Stress the obligation of every citizen to "get involved" in Government. Add your name and prestige to community "get-out-the-vote" movements. Remind your neighbors and friends that voting is one concrete answer to the question, "What can I do for my country?" Look for new ways, beyond baby-sitting and transportation services, to make it easy for people to stop at the polling place.

In free America, that's where effective citizenship and good government start.

Why Does U.S. Embassy Make Americans Look Bad?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

WHY DOES U.S. EMBASSY MAKE AMERICANS LOOK BAD?

An incredible attack on U.S. business in a document distributed recently by the American Embassy in London demands prompt explanation and disciplining of those responsible by the State Department.

Whoever made this blunder has no place in our Government.

Victor Riesel, whose column, Inside Labor, appears in the Evening Tribune, brought this incident to light.

Riesel reported that the document, bearing the official eagle insignia of the Embassy, goes beyond taking the side of Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers in the current prestrike talks between the union and the Big Three car manufacturers, and becomes an attack on American business generally.

Here are some excerpts from the Embassy document by an anonymous writer, as reported by Riesel:

"The increase in profits and depreciation allowances has meant a steady climb in the cashflow to corporations. During the past 3 years (this refers to the life of the auto industry's current labor contract) the retained corporate cashflow—after payment of taxes and dividends—has been greater than corporate investment in new plant and equipment. As a result, corporations are loaded with cash."

Who says so and on what basis?

This is a wholly unwarranted judgment in an area in which the American Embassy has no business.

Here is another example:

"Substantial wage increases also are possible because of the continuing high rate of productivity advance."

That's another gratuitous and unsupported opinion put out by an official agency which has no business making such judgments.

The Embassy document goes on to report that the rate of productivity advance in some industries has far outstripped the 3.2 percent a year increase which was set as the

wage guideline for the past few years. And then comes another snide aside:

"In most cases," the report says, "the fruits of these large increases in productivity have not been shared adequately with either workers or consumers."

This is the typical antibusiness line of every enemy of the American economic system.

Wittingly or not, the American Embassy in London has painted a false picture of U.S. business as gorging itself on swollen profit, denying workers their just wages, and paying out huge dividends to its shareholders and unwarranted bonuses to its officers.

The Embassy has prejudiced every businessman, every American, in the eyes of our friends.

Our Ambassador in London, David K. E. Bruce, owes the American business community an explanation and an apology.

Whoever is responsible for this slur ought to be fired immediately.

United States Should Couple Any Concessions to Soviets With Soviet Concessions on Captive Nations Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have long contended that any U.S. assistance or concessions to the Soviet Union should be coupled with Soviet concessions, particularly in behalf of the captive and subjugated people of Eastern Europe.

Mr. Charles Rozmarek, the distinguished president of the Polish-American Congress, and of the Polish National Alliance, recently delivered an excellent address on this most important subject at the golden jubilee of Group 1747 of the Polish Alliance, at Nazareth, Pa.

Mr. Rozmarek, a native of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., is highly knowledgeable on the problems of Eastern Europe; and I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt from his speech, as published in the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader and News, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

MOMENT OF TRUTH AND DECISION
(By Charles Rozmarek)

The moment of truth is fast approaching on the international scene.

It will also be a moment of historic decision for the American people. For it will exert powerful influence on the course of world events, and will shape our future.

The problem is simply this: The Soviet part of the Communist world is experiencing deep agricultural and industrial crises. They have nothing to do with the so-called Sino-Soviet ideological split which, for the time being at least, is of no special significance. It looks to me like a personal feud between Premier Nikita Khrushchev and Chairman Mao Tse-tung.

The economic structure of the Soviet bloc, however, presents an entirely different picture. It is a picture of chaos resulting from faulty planning, of broken down machinery with no spare parts, of unproductive agriculture saddled with forced collectivization.

These statements which I have gathered from writings and opinions of many American and European experts on Soviet bloc affairs were surprisingly substantiated by an unprecedented press conference of the Central Intelligence Agency.

It is not my intention to go into the details of the breakup of Communist economy in east-central Europe and in Russia.

I am pointing out these affairs of the Communist bloc, as the part of the moment of truth is approaching.

And the truth is simply this: Russia needs our economic and technical assistance. So do the European satellites. In addition, Russia needs long-term credits and will be asking for them in not too distant future. As a matter of fact, Moscow is already getting 12-year credits from England and 15-year credits from France which is contrary to the set policy of the West.

Perhaps, the pragmatic necessities of our allies will lead to more or less formal accommodation between Russia and the West.

And in this fact lies our greatest opportunity and greatest danger.

With determination and firmness, we may win considerable concession from Russia, for the benefit of enslaved nations. We may force Moscow to grant subjugated nations more freedom; we are in a position to force Russia to lossen her stranglehold on east-central Europe, thus allowing 100 million people to return to their rightful heritage within the western family of nations.

I do not think that such demand in return for our technical assistance and credits would be construed as a provocation of Russia. The world opinion would agree with us that we would be asking Russia to restore the historic balance in Europe.

If, on the other hand, we let this opportunity slip through our fingers, if we extend aid to Russia without extracting any concession from her in the behalf of subjugated nations, then we shall have forsaken millions of people who look toward us for deliverance.

(The foregoing is an excerpt from an address of Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish American Congress and of the Polish National Alliance, delivered at the golden jubilee of Group 1747 of the Polish Alliance at Nazareth, Pa. Mr. Rozmarek, a native of Wilkes-Barre and a former practicing attorney here, has been a resident of Chicago for a quarter century. He was a visitor in Wilkes-Barre this week.)

General Services Administration Boosts Purchases From Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, upon numerous occasions this year President Johnson has urged the various Government agencies to purchase a greater portion of their goods and services from small business concerns. Similarly, the Congress, in passing the Small Business Act of 1958, declared that a fair proportion of the Government's total purchases should be placed with small business enterprises.

In this connection, it is especially heartening and gratifying to learn that the General Services Administration, under the direction of the Honorable Bernard L. Boutin, during fiscal year 1964, increased by $120 million the amount of goods purchased from small business concerns.

Each year the purchases of goods and services by the Federal Government from privately owned business establishments total about $35 billion. The General Services Administration expends an important portion of this total sum, and it is noteworthy, as well as satisfying, to learn that this agency placed 53 percent of the dollar value of its purchases with small business firms.

Mr. Boutin, Administrator, General Services Administration, recently wrote me about this matter, and under unanimous consent I ask that this communication be reprinted at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., August 19, 1964.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Mindful of your keen interest in the degree of participation by small business firms in Government procurement, I am extremely pleased to report that in fiscal year 1964, GSA placed 53.2 percent of the dollar volume of its total prime contracts, or $451.4 million, with small business firms.

This was an increase of 12.7 percent, above the fiscal year 1963 figure of 40.5 percent, or $328.9 million, and is indicative of the intensified efforts made by GSA during the past year to implement more effectively the Administration's policy that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for property and services for the Government shall be placed with small business concerns.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator.

Technical Assistance for Less-Developed Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, an article published recently in Science magazine describes a constructive and imaginative new program of technical assistance to less-developed countries provided by private American citizens. Through an organization called Volunteers for International Technical Assistance (VITA), public spirited scientists and engineers in several American communities are providing, on request, valuable technical information in fields ranging from agriculture to water purification, sanitation, and construction.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article on VITA, written by Mr. D. S.

Greeberg. It was published in Science magazine on June 12, 1964.

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

TECHNICAL AID: VOLUNTEER GROUP ENABLES SCIENTISTS, ENGINEERS TO HELP UNDERDEVELOPED NATIONS

One of the differences between the rich and the poor nations is that the poor are often stymied by minor technical problems that were long ago solved by the rich. Several years ago it occurred to a group of scientists and engineers in the Schenectady, N.Y., area, that they might be able to do something about this, and out of their decision has grown a remarkable organization, Volunteers for International Technical Assistance. Stated briefly, VITA is a sort of stay-at-home technical peace corps, composed of about 1,000 scientists, engineers, and technical specialists who, without charge, serve as consultants on technical problems that have arisen in the underdeveloped countries.

For example, the Peace Corps, which has come to make good use of VITA, recently sent an inquiry from a volunteer in the Far East who was working on the early stages of a poultry project. What, he asked, would be the best feed mixture from available grain sources? The inquiry was forwarded to a department head at a major school of agriculture, who dispatched a sheet of simple instructions. In another case, an inquiry from a Caribbean island, asking about means of utilizing a good tomato crop, was forwarded to an executive of a food processing firm, who sent seven pages of handwritten step-by-step instruction on the preparation and bottling of tomato juice. Other inquiries have asked for advice on well-digging, construction of simple slide projectors, woodworking, pottery glazing, sewage disposal, water purification, and paper making.

One of the most refreshing things about VITA is its administrative simplicity. To become a member, an applicant simply fills out a form from VITA (1206 State Street, Schenectady, N.Y.), specifying the subject areas in which he feels qualified to serve as a consultant. When inquiries come in—they come from missionaries, government agencies, and a variety of other sources in addition to the Peace Corps—VITA headquarters forwards them to whomever seems to be the most suitable consultant. The consultant replies directly to the inquirer and sends a copy to the Schenectady office. And that's all.

In addition to counseling on specific problems, VITA, under a contract with the Agency for International Development, has prepared a Village Technology Handbook, a 169-page volume that contains a wealth of simple, how-to-do-it directions on turning odds and ends of pipes, steel drums, lumber, and, other cheap materials into useful devices for rural communities. One section, for example, provides plans for building a 30-gallon-per-minute hand-operated irrigation pump with simple tools, from galvanized iron, barrel metal, wire, and wood. Another tells how to convert a steel drum into a boiler for purifying water. There are plans for constructing latrines, seed and grain cleaners, bamboo poultry houses, and simple concrete structures.

VITA, which is now headed by Benjamin Coe, a chemical engineer at General Electric's Waterford, N.Y., plant, has chapters in Morgantown, W. Va.; Rochester, N.Y.; Santa Barbara, Calif.; and New Holland, Pa. It also has an extremely active affiliation with the Institute of Food Technologists, which handles virtually all inquiries involving agriculture and food processing, and with the Engineers Joint Council.—D.S.G.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not to launch a quixotic flailing at a dead horse, for the civil rights bill is in truth an accomplished fact. Rather I seek the ears of my fellow citizens of the South.

Ours is a beloved and blessed land, one which evokes a greater sense of pride, a truer sense of self-respect. One hundred years ago when that land was ravaged almost beyond repair, its industry a smoking relic and its government a picture of chaos, the people of the South turned inward for their strength. This was her sole refuge, the true greatness of the people themselves, a people with pride, self-discipline, self-respect, a people with an innate love for their fellow man.

We began to grow anew. Virginia gave us stability and statesmanship, Georgia the vision of progress with her most dynamic city, South Carolina the mellowness and warmth of wisdom, Tennessee the pride of volunteers serving a reunited nation; and all the rest.

Yet in growth we maintained a loyalty for the system which nurtured us. Our leaders, liberal and conservative, Republican and Democrat, sought to preserve the system of checks and balances so dependent upon the preservation of States' responsibilities. They did so because they recognized the basic foundation of our society rests in each individual as a creature of his Maker. They realized our future lay in giving each individual the greatest possible personal freedom through self-government and the greatest possible economic opportunity through free enterprise so that he might earn his most priceless asset, self-respect.

Now it becomes incumbent upon us to practice what we have preached. Let us use this occasion as one in which to dignify and validate our principles and beliefs. Let us use the crucible of adversity to strengthen our sense of responsibility.

If we fear the intolerable burden of Federal domination and control, then let us join hands in reason and restraint to prove that ours is and shall remain a government of laws rather than of men.

If we fear the effect of adding uneducated or illiterate citizens to the voting roles then we must attack no longer the symptom of the disease, but the disease itself. We must lend every bone and sinew to the task of expanding ten and a hundredfold our educational opportunities.

If we fear the effect of adding low-income wage earners in industry then let us muster every resource, both human and material, to the task of expanding new industries and creating greater job opportunities.

In sum, if we fear for the future of States and individual rights, then let us in the South rise as one man to prove the value of these principles by exercising our responsibilities.

This is our task here and now. We as advocates of the new South must earn our rights and our self-respect through reason, responsibility, and understanding, the basic principles of our philosophy. If we succeed we shall continue to point the way to a meaningful freedom for all men. If we fail, all men are the poorer for it.

I say to those of you from the rest of this Nation, we need your help—not in the pretty baubles of an overindulgent uncle bent on buying love, but in the friendly hand of respect and understanding—offered by one who knows himself well enough to sincerely share in the problems of others.

Business Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Niagara frontier area in New York State beats the Nation on business corps. The Buffalo, N.Y., area chamber of commerce performs many important functions and is doing an outstanding job in inviting business to come to the Niagara frontier.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article, expressing this view, which appeared in the August 16, 1964, edition of the Courier Express, one of our leading newspapers in Buffalo, N.Y.:

AREA BEATS NATION ON BUSINESS CORPS

(By Coe Crawford)

PIONEER

The Federal Government in the last few months has been getting a lot of publicity about its efforts to develop a volunteer corps of retired business executives who will advise operators of small businesses on their management problems.

The idea of setting up a counseling service for businessmen who can't afford the stiff cost of professional consultants is a good one. But in Buffalo it's old hat.

The Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce has been providing that service to its members for some time, and with considerable success. The Buffalo office of the Small Business Administration has cooperated closely with the chamber in connection with the service.

EXPERT POOL

Through its business advisory council, the chamber has on tap the talents of top men in almost every conceivable field of corporate endeavor.

The council is headed by Dexter P. Rumsey, former president of the Erie County Savings Bank, and the vice chairman is Philip S. Savage, former vice president of the Donner Hanna Coke Co. The secretary is Albert W. Dold, the chamber's manager of business and industrial services.

REASSURING

"One of the chief values of this council," Dold said, "is just the fact that it is there. There is a wealth of talent available and our members have a feeling of security in knowing that, if they do get into difficulty, they can call on men who have been in the very top echelons of business here to help them out.

"This council acts in the business community in the same way a fire department does in a city. People who never have to call upon it are still glad to know it is there."

NO COMPLAINTS

Dold added: "We have put out some fires, too. There have been a good many who turned to the council for advice. We've never turned anyone down and we've never had a complaint."

The council is composed of 27 retired executives who are members or former members of the chamber. They represent transportation, public relations, production, management, advertising, finance, personnel relations, accounting, marketing, and engineering services.

These men not only have freely provided assistance in their specialty but their local contacts have proved helpful in resolving more complicated small business problems involving more than a single phase of the business operation.

BACKUP FORCE

"Our resources aren't confined to the membership of the council," Dold said. "If some member calls me and tells me about a problem—and all contacts are made with me rather than with individual members of the council—I'll look over the list.

"Usually, there is someone on the council who can help. But if the problem or the business is so specialized that none of the council members seems just right, I will call on one of the active members in the same field and ask him to help."

NO MEDDLING

Dold said he has no way of knowing how many businesses actually have been rescued through the activities of the council because the chamber makes no effort to follow up on the work.

"After all," he said, "they came to us for advice. We gave it to them. There is no compulsion for them to accept it or act upon it. It's entirely up to them. We certainly aren't going to hound them for months afterward to see if they acted and pry into their affairs to find out what was done.

"The idea behind this is to help our members, not to compile a statistical record to show how much we've accomplished."

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include a resolution on expansion of Soviet-United States trade which was previously adopted and reaffirmed on August 17, 1964, by the board of directors, Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce:

BUFFALO AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE STATEMENT ON EXPANSION OF SOVIET-UNITED STATES TRADE

Two-way trade between nations in principle is to the economic advantage of both. Expanded trade between the U.S.S.R. and the United States based soundly on comparative costs of production and taking advantage of geographical differences in resources on a reciprocal basis would be in accord with that principle and be mutually beneficial to the general welfare of the people of both nations.

Excluding strategic materials, armaments, or equipment for military production, an expanded program between these two countries best could consist of properly safeguarded trade in consumer goods and raw materials.

L.B.J. and the Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I take leave to include an editorial from the Denison, Iowa, Bulletin, of August 27, which I am sure expresses the feeling of a great majority of farmers in the breadbasket of the United States.

Far too few Americans are aware of the fact that our American farmers feed the American people for 19 percent of their income while the average in all other nations is over 60 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the irony of that fact is that, at the same time our farmers' dollar is only worth 75 cents in purchasing power, the lowest since 1939, Congress was pounded into swallowing a watered-down bill which permits the importation of 725 million pounds of beef and mutton which gives rise to straight-from-the-shoulder editorials, such as follows:

L.B.J. AND THE FARMER

We wonder again how any farmer can vote for the present Democratic administration in the light of recent activity by both the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture with regard to meat imports. We can understand why State Department officials would oppose meat import restrictions. Our diplomats have been sacrificing U.S. agriculture for several years now in an effort to bolster economies of foreign nations. It is not a surprise to read that the State Department actually wrote the watered-down version of the import bill that finally passed Congress and was signed into law last week by L.B.J.

But should we expect the Department of Agriculture to sell feeders and ranchers down the river? This is exactly what happened. Agriculture officials fought hammer and tong against any kind of import restrictions, using the excuse that American farm exports would be hurt if we cut imports of Australian beef.

The Tariff Commission had power before the meat import bill became law to restrict imports if it could be shown that domestic industry was being damaged by the foreign meat. Department of Agriculture officials responded to demands that the Tariff Commission be asked to impose limitations on meat imports by asking the petitioners to show that imports were hurting U.S. ranchers and feeders. The Department's attitude proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that these bureaucrats are not working to better the lot of U.S. farmers.

It was USDA's job to make a study and prove that imports were hurting the meat industry, not the feeder's job. With all the evidence of the effect of increased imports on cattle and hog prices, USDA still refused to take the farmer's case to the Tariff Commission. This is the kind of farm administration we can expect from L.B.J.'s do-gooders.

But we never expected the bold, outright action that came during the last 2 weeks. USDA worked like demons to scuttle a reasonable imports bill. Several Senators chastised USDA for what they called "undue interference" in the legislative process, in other words the lawmakers charge that USDA completely overstepped their bounds by attempting to influence legislation.

Contrast this, if you will, with BARRY GOLDWATER'S statement of last week on agricultural program. GOLDWATER promises to continue price supports and reduce Federal interference with farming. We like good doers, not the do-gooders who tell us they are for farmers and then chop off our necks like L.B.J.'s Department of Agriculture did last week.

Scientists and the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a thoughtful editorial was carried in the August 17 edition of the Davenport (Iowa) Times-Democrat on what scientists themselves think about our race for the moon.

The results of the poll which prompted this editorial give Congress some facts upon which to ponder as we appraise these programs and appropriate money to advance them.

The editorial carries an admonition about more reasonable priorities and more realizable goals. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

SCIENTISTS AND THE MOON

In increasing numbers, scientists are speaking out against the pace and aims of the space program, especially the rush to meet the goal of putting a man on the moon by 1970.

The extent of such criticism reflecting the opinion of the scientific community generally is borne out by a poll conducted by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. This organization submitted questionnaires to 2,000 members selected at random.

Within 3 weeks, returns were received from 1,134—a high response to such a poll. Results are tabulated in Science, the association's weekly magazine.

Some 62 percent of the respondents said that the national interests of the United States did not require giving high priority to the moon landing by 1970; only 31 percent said they did. When asked a "reasonable" date to aim for a landing, 20 percent said by 1970; 23 percent by 1975; 19 percent by 1980; 9 percent by 1990, and 7 percent, never. Another 17 percent had no opinion.

Some 58 percent listed scientific achievement as the most important justification for manned exploration of the moon. But national prestige drew 13 percent and military objectives and the "spirit of adventure" drew 7 percent each.

Asked to rank scientific fields in order of their "potentiality for producing new knowledge," the scientists gave only 10 percent of their first place votes to manned lunar research. Biomedical research led with 51 percent, followed by physics research with 15 percent. Chemical research and oceanography also both rated ahead of lunar research.

These returns probably will be studied in Congress, where a more searching appraisal of space spending is being called for. It is not suggested by the scientists or others that exploration beyond this planet be halted.

It is strongly urged, however, that more reasonable priorities and more realizable goals be established so that both scientists and scientific dollars will be more effectively used.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Hon. James A. Farley, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, following the Goldwater gathering at Hershey, Pa.:

STATEMENT OF JAMES A. FARLEY

The Goldwater gathering at Hershey, Pa., is by way of being a farce. The objective is obvious. It is an attempt to give an honest and palatable Republican milk chocolate covering to the extremists deep inside the Goldwater movement. It is an effort to camouflage the gold shirts by hiding them behind the honorable Republican golden eagle.

The American people will not be fooled by any false labels, because they saw the dangerous ingredients of Birchism and intolerance mixed before their own eyes at San Francisco. In case they had any doubts about the mixtures, Republican Governor, Nelson Rockefeller, publicly identified them for his fellow Americans. While Governor Scranton disavows the scathing letter which emanated from his headquarters, it is safe to say it was not written by a Democrat. It was written, unquestionably, by an outraged Republican American. In any event, for the good of the country I hope that the responsible Republican leaders will continue to stand by the true Republicans who are standing by their consciences and the American way.

I repeat, this is no ordinary election. There is only one issue and that is Americanism versus extremism. It is my conviction that any gathering at any time which proclaims extremism as a virtue is not an American political conference, and in fact comes close to being an intellectual vacuum. It is for this reason that I caution my many Republican friends that they must not permit the Hershey gathering to be turned into the moral surrender of the Grand Old Party. A heavy burden rests upon them. History will judge whether they exemplified—or stultified—the ideals of the Republican Party.

America needs the Republican Party and for over a hundred years the Republican Party has spurned extremism. I am disgusted with the contemptible efforts to befog the meaning of extremism. Let no one fool himself that the American people do not know what an extremist is in its ordinary sense. It is an insult to their intelligence to say that General George Washington and the Founding Fathers were extremists. They were not. Neither was Abraham Lincoln.

I appeal to all of my fellow Americans—Republicans, Democrats and independents alike—to stand by Americanism against extremism. The Republican elephant and the Democratic donkey have honorably tugged it out for decades over the right to carry the American flag. But neither would tear it—nor the country to pieces. Neither the elephant nor the donkey need any gold shirted ringmasters who, once in power, would crack the whip over both of them.

The Christian College and a Free Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, Carroll College in Waukesha, Wis., was signally honored this year by having as its commencement speaker one of the truly great Americans of our time, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota who in a superior manner served the people of the Fifth District of that State and all Americans as a Member of this body for 20 years, the Honorable Walter H. Judd, M.D.

I am especially gratified that so outstanding a citizen as Dr. Judd brought so timely and inspiring a message to the Carroll College graduates and others who were present to hear his address. Carroll College, one of our fine Midwest institutions of higher learning, is especially near and dear to Mrs. Schadeberg and me. It is our alma mater, and, I am happy to add, our daughter, Nancy, is now in her junior year at Carroll.

The address was entitled "The Christian College and a Free Society," and I consider it a privilege to share it here with Dr. Judd's former colleagues.

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE AND A FREE SOCIETY

(By Walter H. Judd)

President Steele, members of the graduating class, members of the faculty, alumni, students, distinguished guests, and friends of Carroll College, permit me to express my great personal pleasure at being privileged to speak at the commencement exercises of this college, which for so many years has been serving with great distinction the youth of this State and Nation.

You who are being graduated today will find, I am sure, that your alma mater has equipped you well with all that any college can give its students of general knowledge and intellectual disciplines. If there should be any reason for concern, it cannot be regarding the excellence of your training in the liberal arts, the sciences, or whatever has been your particular field of study; it is more likely to be with respect to the intelligence of your citizenship, and the depth and strength of your faith. For these must be of a higher order than my generation has demonstrated, or there may not long be a free society in which you will have the chance to use with success and satisfaction the knowledge and skills you have worked so long and hard to acquire here.

In a few moments, you will become bachelors of arts, or of science. Some of you will go on to become masters or doctors. But before any of these, you are citizens. You are, or will be, parents and taxpayers. You are trustees of a great and noble heritage of freedom—trustees of a political and economic order which permitted even those of you who came from humblest circumstances, as did I, to get the expensive education which we could scarcely have dreamed of obtaining in most countries of the world. That heritage of freedom is gravely threatened today—by a cold, determined assault from without, and by ignorance and apathy within.

Let us look first at the most immediate and obvious threat—that from the outside. The whole world at the middle of the 20th century is characterized by as great conflict and confusion as at any period in human history. I think it is accurate to say that this is the first time in man's existence on this planet when all continents and cultures, all countries and peoples have been in turmoil at the same time. The conflict and confusion are unceasingly inflamed everywhere by an organized worldwide conspiracy directed from the Kremlin, with a rival center in Peking, which by its own pronouncements is resolutely determined to divide, soften up, and then subjugate all peoples still free.

While we need to recognize more sharply than we have the existence and the magnitude of the Communist conspiracy, we must not let fear of it lead us to our destruction. Our first task is to understand it, and that requires giving it more emphasis in our education.

For the biggest reason for our being in mortal peril only 19 years after winning a war with total surrender of all our enemies, as most people identified them at that time, is just plain ignorance on our part—ignorance of other peoples and their histories and cultures; ignorance and wishful thinking regarding the strong forces relentlessly working to undermine our type of society; and ignorance of the true nature of our own heritage of freedom and the sources of strength within it.

In most of our past, our main effort in training our youth has been, first, to equip them to make a living—and that is good; no one is worth much to himself or to society who cannot make a good living at honest, useful work. Secondly, to help them become normal, healthy, well-rounded, and socially well-adjusted human beings in a society which most Americans have confidently assumed would always be, for us, relatively stable and constantly improving. But it must be plain now to all that the kind of secure, orderly world for which that sort of education was designed is ceasing to exist and another quite different world is already here. Most of us are intellectually and emotionally unprepared for this new world.

Because of our physical isolation until recent years, we could and understandably did devote most of our attention to domestic problems.

We studied the history of Southern and Western Europe to learn something about their past, seldom in terms of trying to understand those people and cultures so as to be able to deal with them more successfully in the present and in the future.

If we studied Western Europe only a little, we studied Eastern Europe still less. Asia and Africa and their peoples, we studied not at all. Because of our failure to understand Asia, 108,000 young Americans had to give their lives in World War II in conflict with a militaristic Japan which we ourselves in ignorance had armed. Thirty-three thousand more died in a war in Korea that we in ignorance had divided with the Communists. More are dying today in a southeast Asia which our ignorance allowed us for so long to regard as far away and unimportant to us. And now the Soviet Union, while talking about "peaceful coexistence" and relaxation of tensions, has leapfrogged the Atlantic Ocean and, as recently documented by the Organization of American States, carries on subversion in the Western Hemisphere from its base in Cuba which the U.S. Government said it would never tolerate—and is now protecting.

Our most urgent defense need in America is not for more missiles and money. Our

most serious deficiency has been and is (1) trained specialists in the strategies, tactics, and techniques of political and ideological struggle with the forces of Communist imperialism; and (2) a body of citizens as well educated to understand and intelligently support sound political, educational, and cultural measures as our people by and large do understand and will support economic and military measures.

This grievous deficiency in our resources is not the result of anybody's design; it is the result of everybody's neglect.

The deficiency cannot be corrected just by establishing a West Point for diplomats. We must begin down in the elementary schools and in the high schools, and especially in the colleges and universities, to give our youth a better understanding of this new world which, literally, surrounds us; a better understanding of the forces against us; and a better understanding of the conditions we must fulfill if we are to preserve and strengthen our free society.

Why have we been so slow as a people in making the readjustments in our thinking necessary for survival in this new world? The main reason, I think, is that we have not fully recognized the nature of this new type of conflict.

We have seen that it is a conflict of arms; who will win the weapons race? Whichever side wins could compel the other to surrender or perish. Because of our Christian heritage and its moral restraints, we would not use superior power for that purpose. We proved that at the end of World War II when we had overwhelming superiority in every field—including the atomic bomb. Because of their Communist heritage, the other side would impose its will if it could. Mr. Khrushchev tried to slip enough nuclear weapons into Cuba to accomplish precisely that less than 2 years ago. The Chinese Communists freely announce that military conquest is their fixed objective.

We have seen that it is a conflict of economic systems. Which will crack up first under the strain?

We have seen that it is a conflict of educational systems. Which will produce not only the smartest, but the toughest minds?

We are beginning belatedly to see that it is a conflict, not so much of wealth and weapons as of wills. Which side will work the harder? Which has the steadier nerves?

But many have not seen that the basic conflict is still deeper. It is a conflict between two totally different philosophies of life, and, therefore, of government.

It is a conflict between two totally different sets of values, two different concepts as to the nature of man; which means two different concepts as to the nature of the universe; which means two different concepts as to the nature of God—or whether God is. That is, most fundamentally of all, it is a conflict of faiths.

On the one hand, the Communists openly proclaim their belief that there is no God; that there is no moral order in the universe; that man is the smartest of the animals, but nothing more. Their conduct, which we denounce, flows logically and inevitably from their militant atheism. If there is no God, there is no ultimate accountability. Why should persons who believe man is just an animal be expected to have scruples about his life or his liberty—or about truth in any area of life?

In contrast, our country and our free society were founded on the belief that there is a God; that there is a moral order in the universe; that there are such things as right and wrong, good and evil, truth and falsehood; that there are moral laws which neither man nor nations can violate with impunity any more than they can the laws of gravity or electricity; and that while man is indeed the smartest of the animals, he is something more—he is a child of God, and, therefore, a part of God. He has something of God's nature in him—including the capacity to make moral judgments, and free will decisions based on those judgments.

It is this, the divine in man, which we believe to be the unique and precious thing about him. It is this which we at our best have always believed it is the first business of a good government and a good society to protect and nurture. In short, it is our Christian faith and Judeo-Christian standards that are responsible for the unique values of our civilization.

For the first time in centuries, that civilization is challenged by a passionately missionary competitor.

Many in our country still imagine that the conflict between the Communists and free peoples is like that between the two major political parties in the United States. Both want the same good ends. Their differences, while important and deep, are over means. Which are the best ways to gain the ends everybody approves—and keep them?

But this world conflict is not over means, it is over ends. It is not over different ways to achieve the same good objectives; it is a conflict over objectives. Our objective is peace by civilized settlement; theirs is peace by domination. We go to conferences to try to end the struggle; they go to try to win it.

This does not mean we should not negotiate; it means we should accept as bona fide negotiation what so often has been merely prolonged talk, designated to produce relaxation on our part and gain time—and victory—for themselves.

The reason it has not proved possible to get any real agreement with Communists all these years, whether at Yalta or the United Nations, at Panmunjon or Geneva, is because they are not pursuing the same objectives as we at our best are pursuing. And why are they not pursuing the same objectives as we? Because they do not believe the same things we believe—about man and about the universe—that is, about God.

It is absurd to expect them to recognize and respect the unalienable rights with which we believe man is endowed by his Creator, when they insist there is no Creator.

So, while the free world must learn to use diplomatic, political, economic, and, when necessary, military measures, more skillfully in its efforts to get as much agreement with the Communist world as is presently possible, the more fundamental task is to enlarge the area of the possible. To enlarge the area in which wider agreement can become possible requires changes in men's objectives; that requires changes in men's attitudes and prejudices; that requires changes in men's minds and hearts; that requires changes in men. To change men is the business of the Christian religion.

Let us have no further illusions. We will not get Christian values or Christian behavior, by men or by nations, without Christian education and training.

That in a unique sense is the responsibility of the Christian College. If it does not perform that function effectively, who will?

If our failure to understand the world conflict is so largely due to failure to understand the adversary, our failure to understand the adversary is to a considerable degree, I suspect, because we have grown fuzzy about our own American heritage. That has led to the threat to our free society from within.

There is incredible apathy and ignorance in America regarding the nature of government itself and the nature of the struggle being waged here in our own land as well as throughout the world between the only two main forms or philosophies of government there have ever been. One form is government-from-the-top-down, with final decision in the hands of the few; the other is government-from-the-bottom-up, with final decision in the hands of the many.

For seven centuries beginning with Magna Carta, our ancestors fought successfully to restrict the powers of government as the way to gain maximum freedom and dignity for every human being, and thus to achieve a better life and society for all. "Liberalism" in those centuries meant winning for man the right to try to solve his problems on his own.

Our forefathers came to this country not to get government to do things for them, but to get a chance to do things for themselves. Yet many today, in ignorance of history or the naive notion that history does not apply to us, believe that the way to expand liberty and improve man's life is, in dealing with almost any difficult problem, to increase the power of government over him.

The system of government from the top-down always looks so good at first—witness Hitler's Germany and Castro's Cuba. Such a government hands out so much in apparent benefits—until it has used up the reserves. The people are "better off"—until they have lost their freedom and then the benefits are soon gone too.

Some years ago when I was serving as one of our delegates to the General Assembly of the United Nations, most of the countries wanted to set up a multi-billion-dollar program of economic development around the world. They wanted the United States to provide 50 percent of the capital, because, as they said, "You have 50 percent of the wealth."

I would ask, "Why do we have half of the wealth? There must be some reason for that. Don't you sometimes wonder why 6 percent of the people of the world with 7 percent of its territory and less than 10 percent of its resources have produced as much wealth and distributed it more widely than all the other 94 percent put together? Do you need just wealth, the commodities, the tools, the skills—all of which are results? Don't you want still more the reason for those results—the secret of our production—so that you too can produce the results you desire?"

What is the secret of our production? It is an economic system which provides opportunity and incentive for people to improve their lives in accordance with their own merit—their initiative and their effort.

From what did that economic system come? It came from a political philosophy—the right of the individual.

And from what did that political philosophy come? It came from a religious faith—the conviction that every human being is important because he is created by a Creator. He is a child of God.

That is the faith which we need to rediscover and strengthen here at home, and share with the world—not by coercion, but by contagion.

Thus we come again to the Christian religion as the foundation and the hope of a free society. If the Christian college does not lead in communicating that faith and building on it a free society, who will?

But how is religion to become once more the determining force in our society that it originally was? One requirement is that we have not only better training of men's minds, but also better training of their hearts.

The fact is that most people live by what they desire rather than by what they know. We need proper cultivation of the emotions, not just disciplining of them.

For power comes not from an idea, but from the generating of emotional dedication to an idea, to a cause. How completely do men believe it? How hard are they willing to work for it? That is the test of power.

As a preacher friend of mine puts it: liberty and loyalty were born twins. The democracies stress liberty—and loyalty tends to fade. The dictatorships stress loyalty—

and liberty dies. If our free society is to live, we must get the two together again.

In our proper reaction against the excesses of emotionalism systematically cultivated by the Nazis, the Communists, and by some religious sects, we have tended to go to the other extreme of seeking almost to suppress the emotions. To some in our colleges, the scholar most to be admired and emulated is the one who is always objective, who maintains a sort of sustained tentativeness. It is regarded as sophomoric, or at least unsophisticated, to believe in a cause—almost any cause—with all one's heart. Yet it is the one who believes with all his heart that moves the world. Gordon Cooper's space capsule was rightly named *Faith*.

Objectivity in examination is essential as a method of arriving at sound conclusions. But objectivity is not a virtue, it is a vice, if it becomes a substitute for decision and dedication, rather than a means to them.

In short, it is not enough to know the truth, or even to declare it in a Ph. D. thesis; we must commit ourselves to it. Until we come to care as well as to know, not much will happen. We will be like a wonderfully engineered and constructed automobile—without gas. It won't go.

What we need most is to recapture a faith in our faith comparable to the faith the Communists have in their faith. We can hold the line, for a time, with arms; but only with superior ideas, superior deeds, and superior dedication can we win in the end.

This world conflict is not an old-fashioned struggle for control of land; it is for control of man—the mind of man, the soul of man, the whole of man.

Never did we in America face such a fundamental challenge to the ultimate assumptions and values of life. Never did we have to think so deeply and work so hard as we shall have to in the years just ahead if we are to live in dignity and usefulness—or even to live at all.

Commencement is a day of judgment on yesterday—and the judgment is good, else you would not be here.

But commencement is also a day of decision for tomorrow. No generation can live by defending the past; it must win the future.

Nothing short of dedicated Christian leadership can be adequate for the tasks we face. It is the business of the Christian college to recruit, challenge, train, and inspire that leadership.

Never did the Christian college have greater responsibility and greater opportunity.

Never were you, its graduates, it faculty, and its friends called to higher duty, nobler living, harder work, greater usefulness, and more satisfying rewards.

Colorado Jaycees Are Active

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Colorado Junior Chamber of Commerce at the summer conference held in Durango, Colo., August 15, 1964. The resolution signifies the support of the statewide Jaycees organization for the Colorado Partners of the Alliance program.

I am pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that a distinguished Colorado team will be leaving at the end of this month for an intensive 2-week trip to Brazil to explore the means by which the Colorado Partners can cooperate with private groups and organizations in the State of Minas Gerais in helping to complete self-help projects throughout the rural areas. I am sure that the Colorado Partners will constitute a worthy addition to this new program, which is a private citizens' effort in the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place the resolution as passed by the Colorado Junior Chamber of Commerce in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A RESOLUTION

The Colorado Junior Chamber of Commerce, recognizing:

That the contemporary world demands international cooperation and understanding in constantly increasing degrees,

That the brotherhood of man can no longer be held abstract, but must be translated into action,

That this hemisphere, comprised of North, Central, and South America, as the geographical area that most impinges on our lives, needs greater social, economic, and political solidarity,

That no mechanism can replace human activity and therefore the people themselves are the best instruments to advance the lot of society: Therefore, it is hereby

Resolved, That the Colorado Junior Chamber of Commerce declares its support of the Colorado Partners of the Alliance which, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of State and the Alliance for Progress, is a program that incorporates these principles by its alliance of service organizations, civic clubs, and societies with similar groups in the State of Minas Gerais, Brazil, and to help the people of that State, similar in geography, climate, and industry to Colorado, in their attempt to raise themselves from poverty and despair and to admit themselves to a fuller participation in the amenities and responsibilities of the present world.

Mississippi Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, a young man, a resident of my congressional district, is spending his summer working in Mississippi as a voluteer in the Mississippi project. In a letter to his father, the young man described the nature of his work and expressed his sentiments and his firsthand experiences while working among Mississippi's Negroes.

Because of its timeliness and its message, I should like to insert the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to afford it the wider audience which it rightly deserves:

DEAR DAD: Please excuse the carbon; I have not much time. I want to tell you about Mississippi and about the freedom movement here. It is not easy. My impressions are many and very strong. I have met the best and the worst people here; the greatest courage and the greatest terror—sometimes in the same person.

Mississippi is a beautiful land of red earth and a thousand greens, made ugly by the squalor and hate which dominate the races that live here. I work in voter registration. Three of us work together; one is a Negro. In as many cases as possible, the Negro is made the project director. Such is the case here, and the policy is a wise and effective one.

On a normal day we roll out of bed early in the morning. We may have slept in the Freedom House or in the home of some generous and brave farmer—two essential requirements for anyone to offer us hospitality. We study the map of the county, decide where we will work for the day, we scramble for breakfast and hit the road. The day is long and hot. We drive from farmhouse to farmhouse. I have averaged almost 200 miles a day in the car. And find the roads in a despicable condition. We know where the colored people are by those roads. Where the pavement stops, the Negro sections are likely to begin, and if there is not even gravel on the road, we can be reasonably sure that we are in a safe neighborhood. Such is not always the case, though, and more than once, we have been cursed and threatened by someone for knocking on a white man's door.

We walk up to a house. There are always children out front. They look up and see white men in the car, and fear and caution covers their expression. Those terrified eyes are never quite out of my mind. They drive me as little else could. Children, who have hardly learned to talk, are well taught in the art of avoiding whites. They learn "yassah" as almost their first words. If they did not, they could not survive. The children run to their parents, hide behind them. We walk up, smile, say howdy and hold out our hands. As we shake hands, we tell our names, and they tell their names, and I say, "Mr. so and so, how do you do?" It is likely the first time in the lives of this farmer or housewife that a white man has ever shaken hands with them or even called them with a handle to their names ("Mr."). This doesn't necessarily bode well for them. They are suspicious. Chances are they have heard about the freedom riders passing through. The news is usually greeted with mingled fear, excitement, enthusiasm, and gratitude. But, the confrontation is more serious, more threatening. They think if "Mr. Charley" knew and they are afraid. And they have good reason to be.

Much as teenagers in our northern cities cruise the streets and whistle at girls, white teenagers abuse Negros. They go night driving, five in a car, and woe to him caught alone on the road. They throw bottles at homes and people, they even shoot at the cars. There is not a law man in the State who would arrest them for such an activity. Young girls never go out alone at night. All this appears before them as we speak, and it is this they fear. Many, too, are sharecroppers who must turn over a third or even a half of the year's harvest. These may be evicted and have often been, for far less serious offenses. Nearly everyone black in Mississippi is at least a year in debt. The threat of suspended credit and foreclosure is a tremendous burden.

Our presence adds much to the load. The rate for a laborer is usually $2 to $3 a day for work from 6 to 6. There is no job security, no sick benefit (often if you get sick, you get fired), no old-age pension; very often Negroes know nothing about welfare or social security. They have no insurance against misfortune.

Yes, they listen when we speak. We tell them we are from the North. We tell them that the Nation has finally become interested in them and concerned over their plight. We talk about taxes and patent allotments, and

usury and schools, and hospitals and Federal agencies. We talk about dignity. People listen and they wonder, they're not sure, what does it mean when a white man tells them the truth when he asks them to help him to help themselves. Why is he here? What does he really want? What will come of it? We tell them about the Freedom Democratic Party, about the convention challenge in Atlantic City. We talk about a Negro sheriff and blacktop roads; and respect. They listen and they wonder, they think of their children, of the danger of the odds and more often than not they sign up for the Freedom Democratic Party. This new party in this State is going to be the salvation of the black man and of the white.

Twice, in the last 5 days, we have held precinct and county meetings in DeSoto and Tippah Counties. DeSoto is very poor and 62 percent Negro; Tippah is surprisingly wealthy and about 20 percent Negro. The meetings attracted about 110 people in DeSoto and about 40 in Tippah after only 3 days' work.

Our job is a 7-day, 15-hour job, except when there are mass meetings—at least twice a week—when it is longer. We have extensive reports to write up in quadruplicate. We need a reproducing machine badly. Staff meetings, strategy planning, it is the most stimulating, satisfying work I have ever done. Nothing is ever enough. There is no such thing as a job finished. There is only progress.

We are involved here in a process of uniting, joining, becoming a mutually interested community. The song says it well: "We shall overcome."

YOUR SON.

Prevent Injury to Fish From Use of Pesticides

SPEECH
OF
HON. DON FUQUA
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] for yielding this time to me and also to say I do not think anyone who opposes this bill in its present form is necessarily supporting the efforts to further poison fish or wildlife. We all hope that something can be done to accomplish some good in this field. I think it is being accomplished administratively. I hate to see this Congress today confuse this issue more by passing this statute when we are already doing this administratively.

On page 1 of the bill—and it is rather confusing to me—it says:

The Secretary of the Interior shall transmit information to the Secretary of Agriculture as to how, in the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, or other pesticides, injury to fish and wildlife can be prevented or minimized and the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall require that such information or warning pertinent to any insecticide, herbicide, fungicide, or other pesticide shall appear on the label, etc.

It seems to me that is very confusing as to which one has the final authority in this. We have two Cabinet officials, both highly respected individuals, with large departments. One of these departments has been doing extensive research in this field, I am speaking of the Department of Agriculture. We are really confusing the issue, I think, by passing a statute making law something which is already being done and with more flexibility through administrative regulations.

I had a telegram this morning from the commissioner of agriculture of the State of Florida who felt that he has done tremendous work in the field of trying to make insecticides safe and to prevent the scare that we have had and the killing of fish and wildlife. He says that we should proceed with caution and not tie our hands by the fact that we will be doing something that we will regret later on.

More Fiscal Shenanigans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

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

MORE FISCAL SHENANIGANS?

Governmental ideas which sound entirely ridiculous when they are first tossed up as trial balloons, and which are quickly pigeonholed in the public mind because they seem of such a crackpot nature, have a disturbing habit of reappearing in serious form.

Such a proposal which first came up many months ago and apparenty died a quick death, is now back in the news from Washington and from Atlantic City where Democrat platform committee hearings have been in progress in connection with the party convention.

While one side of the official Government mouth keeps talking about a balanced budget and tax cuts, there are those in positions of high responsibility in the Government who are convinced that a balanced budget would create a "fiscal drag" on economic growth and who insist that the taxpayers' money must keep pouring into Washington—even if they have to work out new schemes to give it away.

This newest scheme calls for an automatic distribution to the States of a fixed portion of the annual growth in Federal revenue, in addition to the funds already being given for specific programs.

The President's Council of Economic Advisors is seriously exploring methods of working out such a program and it's being pushed by Walter Heller, President Johnson's chief economic adviser.

Many States have archaic and inefficient methods of collecting taxes. This sometimes makes it difficult for them to obtain funds to meet the legitimate needs of their citizens, according to the arguments of these economic experts.

They argue too that if it were easier for the States to finance their legitimate needs, there might be less of a tendency to seek solutions through the Federal Government. Thus they are offering to provide a solution through the Federal Government even before the problem presents itself. But it is their contention that more problems might be solved on the State level, and the power of State government could increase in relation to the power of the Federal Government.

On the other hand, if the Federal Government controlled the use of the funds given to the States—which it certainly would—or controlled the allocation between the States, exactly the opposite results would be obtained. State governments would lose even more power to the Federal Government.

Opponents of this new spending plan have some good answers.

They point out there would be no clear way to apportion funds fairly among the States and that more pork barrel thinking would result.

They argue that if a surplus is available, it should be used to reduce the Federal debt which is of such astronomical proportions as to be completely beyond the comprehension of even the best fiscal minds and which continues to rise every year.

And they argue that if the Federal Government doesn't need the money, taxes should be cut rather than going on collecting from the overburdened taxpayer at the present near confiscatory rates.

The whole idea is bound to bring cries of anguish from Members of Congress who have a sense of fiscal responsibility—and who must answer directly to the voters back home. They probably will even throw the plan out the first time it comes before them.

But it would be wise to keep in mind that such ideas do seem to reappear with amazing regularity, and that they will continue to do so as long as there are those who subscribe to the Government philosophy of "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect."

Many Voters Need a Chance To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa City (Iowa) Press-Citizen recently carried an excellent editorial on the need for changes in our residency requirements in order that people who move from one place to another prior to an election can be permitted to vote.

The facts pointed out in the Press-Citizen's editorial are the same ones which prompted me to introduce legislation this session calling for a constitutional amendment to permit voters to vote for the office of President, Vice President, U.S. Senator, and U.S. Representative in their last place of residence until they qualify in the place to which they have recently moved.

Because we are late in the session, there may not be time to act on this legislation before we adjourn, but the groundwork is being laid, and with the support of such papers as the Press-Citizen, we can build a groundswell for the disenfranchised so that the necessary changes will be made in the near future.

The editorial, "Many Voters Need a Chance to Vote," follows:

MANY VOTERS NEED A CHANCE TO VOTE

In 1960, in one of the closest presidential elections in U.S. history, only 63.9 percent of all Americans of voting age went to the polls. No less than 40 million potential voters stayed away.

This poor record is not likely to be significantly bettered in November. Undoubtedly, much of it can be blamed on an amazing apathy and lack of interest in policies exhibited by many people. This is the first, natural reaction to such statistics.

The startling fact, however, is that half of these nonvoters—an estimated 20 million people—were disfranchised by outmoded registration and election laws.

Included in this number were those who were traveling or on vacation or who wore the wrong color of skin. Five million persons were denied the right to vote because they were ill or hospitalized. Another 8 million were barred from the polls simply because they had moved some weeks or months prior to election day. They were in effect aliens, both in their old and new residences.

State and local election regulations are a hodgepodge of inconsistency. Of the 50 States, 37 require 1-year residence to qualify for voting; 12 require 6 months; 1 requires 2 years.

Also contributing to voters delinquency is the fact that most States restrict registration to one location in each county and to daytime hours. Some close registration as much as 9 months before an election.

Significantly, in those few States with progressive election laws, voter turnout is far above the national average. In Idaho, for example, rather than requiring voters to report to a central office to sign up registrars seek them out. Registration continues right up to 9 p.m. on the Saturday before a Tuesday election.

In 1960, Idaho registered 97.4 percent of its electorate and 80.7 percent of them actually voted.

One hundred years ago the Nation fought a bloody war to decide whether it was "the United States is" or "the United States are." In the matter of voting laws, the country is little changed from the days when separate colonies erected citizenship and tariff barriers against each other.

Certainly in the matter of the one single national office that transcends all State lines, that of President, any otherwise qualified American should be entitled to have his choice counted, no matter where he may be on election day.

Drum and Bugle Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the week of August 23 when Congress was in recess, Drum and Bugle Corps Week was observed nationally.

The very progressive community of Warren, in my congressional district, takes rightful pride in two wonderful organizations—the Sundowner Junior Drum and Bugle Corps and the Cornplanter Senior Drum and Bugle Corps.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the resolution of the mayor of the Borough of Warren, the Honorable Arthur L. Langdon, in which he pays tribute to these two fine groups:

A RESOLUTION

Whereas the week of August 23 through August 29 is observed nationally as Drum and Bugle Corps Week, and as Warren is exceptionally fortunate in having the Sundowner Junior Drum and Bugle Corps and the Cornplanter Senior Drum and Bugle Corps, and

Whereas both these drum and bugle corps offer the youth of the Warren area an opportunity for precision drill and musical training and through their travels carry the name of Warren, Pa. to many places, Therefore I, Arthur L. Langdon, mayor of the Borough of Warren, Pa., do hereby salute Warren's Drum and Bugle Corps and by the authority vested in me as mayor of the Borough of Warren, Pa., do hereby proclaim the week of August 23 through August 29 as Drum and Bugle Corps Week.

ARTHUR L. LANGDON,
Mayor, Borough of Warren, Pa.

Johnson Playing Kingly Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union, August 29, 1964:

"REX" COMPLEX CAN WRECK—JOHNSON PLAYING KINGLY ROLE

We can't recall a President more taken with his office than Lyndon B. Johnson. He is all things to all men and the White House the fountain from which all blessings flow.

Not all the people see the Presidency in the same light and not all men who have entered the White House have evolved as the natural inheritors of the wisdom of mankind.

Mr. Johnson is inclined to lose his temper when he reads or hears criticisms. Such things are the lot of lesser men and Mr. Johnson seems to believe that he has transcended ordinary experiences.

His fervor was reflected in a recent speech when he said that the country, under its Commander in Chief, was marching "toward vistas beyond the farthest visions of those who built your Union * * *. We will dream on together, you and I, and those dreams will point the way toward the destiny of our Nation."

That's pretty heady stuff.

The White House is not necessarily the repository of all the hopes of the people nor is the President necessarily the instrument of salvation.

These things must lie within a people. Freedom and security are not things given to them by a benevolent President. The personal concept of the Presidency and of a "creative federalism" to plan and guide people's lives are alien to the American experience.

Ever since the time of Franklin D. Roosevelt there has been an effort to elevate the Presidency beyond its constitutional definition, and radical-liberals have chafed under the restraints imposed by the Congress and by the States.

The Supreme Court is taking care of some of those problems for the radical-liberals, and apparently Mr. Johnson seems confident of handling the rest of them.

In recent speeches in one breath Mr. Johnson said "we are the citizens of the richest and most fortunate nation in the history of the world," and in another breath, he said that "the march of progress in America has left 30 million hungry, aimless, forgotten refugees in its wake * * *."

He spoke of "preserving the fading beauty of our countryside and making our cities decent places in which to live, and while yesterday we fought to create growth, tomorrow we will also have to control growth."

He came to the Democratic Convention and formally initiated his great society. Compared with this, the New Frontier was "small potatoes." While Attorney General Robert Kennedy watched with obvious emotion, Mr. Johnson abruptly brought the Kennedy dynasty to an end. It was no longer "let us continue" but "let us begin."

In his years in the Senate, Mr. Johnson was an earnest and capable cloakroom politician, and that is not written in disrespect. He was credited with getting things done. But no one in the world could have anticipated his "blastoff" into the higher realms.

It has puzzled many persons as much as it has delighted the radical liberals who were so unhappy at his own selection as Vice President in 1960. Maybe it's the "REX" complex. Things happen to people, once elevated on high. Kings can do no wrong.

The word "REX" has become more associated with carnivals, such as the Mardi Gras of New Orleans, where, in the tradition of the Old World of courts and royalty, masquers present allegorical dramatic performances.

We don't say Mr. Johnson is wearing a mask in his present role, but no one can deny that his dramatic performance has not been a good one.

But we say let's get the show off the road. The convention is over. Let's sit down and talk business.

The United States is sliding haphazardly toward vital decisions on the nature of our Republic and in the life and death struggle with atheistic communism, while we are being entertained with the dazzle of Mr. Johnson's vision of the great society. Kings can do no wrong.

An Old Tool of Tyrants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEIL STAEBLER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the following article which recently appeared in the Washington Post, dealing with the subject of reapportionment. Its authors, Dean Eugene Y. Rostow and Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, of the Yale Law School, should command our highest respect. They rightly see the proposed methods of Congress in attacking reapportionment as a blow at the Constitution itself and as imperiling the institution of judicial review.

AN OLD TOOL OF TYRANTS—METHOD OF CONGRESS IN ATTACKING REAPPORTIONMENT SEEN AS BLOW AT THE CONSTITUTION ITSELF

(By Eugene Y. Rostow and Thomas I. Emerson)

The attempt in Congress to turn back the tide of reapportionment is too serious to be enjoyed, and shrugged off, as a virtuoso performance in the great game of politics. It would be a catastrophe if Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN's bold tactic were allowed to succeed. In his last-ditch effort to save Old Sarum, he has mounted a fundamental attack on the independence of the courts.

If DIRKSEN's plan is accepted, it will imperil the institution of judicial review, the lynchpin of the Constitution. And it will

destroy the most basic of all the "privileges and immunities" of national citizenship, the assurance of equal suffrage. For the Homeric paradox of Senator DIRKSEN'S plan is that it would allow the courts to continue to protect some voting rights of Negroes but would forbid them to act in almost the only situation in which they are now asked to protect the voting rights of white citizens.

THE UNDERPRIVILEGED CITY

In reviewing the controversy over reapportionment now before Congress, it is desirable to recall briefly the problem as it was presented to the Supreme Court.

Our traditional voting structure, reasonable enough when 75 percent of our people lived in towns and villages, had become intolerable when 75 percent lived in metropolitan areas. In Connecticut, for example, 11.9 percent of the population can elect a majority in the lower house of the State legislature and 33.9 percent a majority in the senate.

The situation was comparable in most States and was rapidly getting worse as urbanization proceeded faster than reapportionment. No one attempted to justify the system on grounds of equity and principle.

The key fact was that political processes could not remedy the situation for the simplest and most human of reasons. A legislator asked to vote the probable end of his own political career is in a difficult position no matter how deeply he believes in equality.

Here, as in other realms, the Constitution depends upon the Supreme Court, as the umpire of the Federal system, to declare and enforce fair rules. The declaration it made in the reapportionment cases was quite simple: it ruled that both houses of State legislatures must be based solely on population.

It is true that voting rights had rarely been litigated until recent years and that there was some feeling that such matters were too "political" a problem for the courts. But the rapid development of our constitutional law of personal liberty made the protection of voting rights inevitable, sooner or later.

If the courts protect freedom of speech, of religion, of the press, and of assembly; if they go to great lengths to assure that the individual not be deprived of his life, liberty, or property without due process of law, how could the right to vote rationally be considered an exception?

CIVIL RIGHTS A FACTOR

Two changes in the factual situation ripened the issue of voting rights for decision. The rapid urbanization of society put increasing strain on the political structure. And the vindication of the voting rights of the Negro as a matter of law provided an unanswerable precedent: it is, after all, just as much a denial of equality before the law to give a citizen of New York one-tenth of a vote, as compared with an upstate or a downstate farmer, as to give him no vote at all.

The Supreme Court's recent decisions are fully justified as stages in the growth of constitutional law.

Decisions of the Supreme Court should, of course, be subjected to public scrutiny. They are never the last word in constitutional law; the people have that last word through their slow and deliberately complex power to amend the Constitution.

It is vital, however, that the criticism of the Court's work be indeed a "sober second look," as fully considered in the light of constitutional tradition as the opinions of the Supreme Court themselves. The Dirksen plan in the Senate does not meet such a test. There have been no committee hearings on it or on the bill proposed by Representative WILLIAM M. TUCK, Democrat, of Virginia, and passed by the House.

The House bill, and the Dirksen amendment to the foreign aid bill, raise grave constitutional doubts. As a matter of constitutional right, enforcible in the courts, all citizens are now entitled to have their votes counted on a basis of equality with those of other voters. That constitutional right, as declared by the Court, can be taken away or abridged only by the process of constitutional amendment.

But the Dirksen-Tuck proposals undertake to abrogate it altogether, or substantially to delay its realization, by simple legislative enactment. Beyond the legal subtleties, this is the heart of the matter.

TOO EASY NULLIFICATION

Both proposals attempt to accomplish this end by withdrawing jurisdiction from the courts. This device is one of the oldest tools of tyrants. If successful here, it would mean the end of the American constitutional system of judicial review and therefore of the American Constitution.

It would make it irresistibly easy for a transitory and inflamed majority of Congress to remove one category of cases after another from the reach of the courts. The history of the Constitution makes it only too obvious how often public opinion becomes aroused against the Supreme Court for a short time and how dangerous such an easy procedure of nullification would be.

The House bill provides that the Supreme Court "shall not have the right to review the action of a Federal court or a State court" in any matter relating to the apportionment of a State legislature and that the Federal district courts shall not have jurisdiction "to entertain" a complaint on apportionment. It thereby would make impossible, at any time, the enforcement in the Federal courts of the constitutional right to equal voting power.

If Congress has the authority to do this, it has the power to prevent the Federal courts from entertaining suits to enforce other constitutional rights, including the rights to freedom of religion, to equal protection of the law and to trial by jury. It would, in short, have the power for all practical purposes to wipe out the Bill of Rights and all other constitutional guarantees by simple statute.

The Dirksen proposal does not, on its face, go so far. It would require the Federal courts, except in "highly unusual circumstances," to stay all reapportionment proceedings until January 1, 1966. But the implications are the same.

The National Legislature has no more constitutional power to suspend the enforcement of constitutional rights than it does to prescribe legislative punishment. Clearly, it could not withdraw the constitutional right to counsel until after conviction, or suspend the right to freedom of speech and assembly until after a particularly close election.

Nor is there any analogy between the Dirksen proposal and the court decrees in school desegregation cases allowing school boards time to make adjustments. In such cases, the postponement of the constitutional right is to accommodate administrative necessity and is geared to the specific needs of each case.

The Dirksen proposal is a blanket suspension, not related to the needs of a particular case. Its objective is to gain time for the passage of a constitutional amendment. Its analogue would be a moratorium on all court proceedings to enforce the 14th amendment until an effort could be made to repeal it.

A PARAMOUNT POWER

The asserted justification for the Dirksen-Tuck proposals rests on article III of the Constitution. That article provides that the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction "with such exceptions, and under such regulations, as the Congress shall make"; and it authorizes Congress to "establish" inferior courts.

These provisions raise a familiar problem in construction. Like other documents, the Constitution must be read in context, and as a whole, not abstractly or in fragments. It must be read, too, as a constitution, in the light of its abiding purposes and the changing circumstances of a nation's history.

The sentences on which both plans rely are subordinate to the basic affirmative grant of power in the first sentences of both sections I and II of the third article: that "the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts" as Congress may establish; and that this judicial power "shall extend to all cases, in law or equity, arising under this Constitution," under the laws and treaties of the United States and in certain other categories of cases of national interest.

It is hard to see why the provision about the powers of Congress to regulate the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court should be interpreted to swallow up the whole of the judicial power declared with such sweep in the third article read as an entirety. The apparent generality of the proviso about appellate jurisdiction is hardly absolute. The proviso must be carefully weighed in relation to other grants of power and to the purposes and provisions of the Constitution as a whole.

In that perspective, what emerges as central for present purposes is the provision that the judicial power extends to all cases arising under the Constitution. This sentence, and the whole thrust of our constitutional history, indicate that Congress cannot remove one disfavored category of constitutional claim from the reach of the courts; that one of the main reasons for having an independent Federal judiciary was to uphold the Constitution in all cases where its construction is necessary to the decision of a case. Without that rule, Congress would soon conquer the Supreme Court.

SOME POWERS CONCEDED

The extent to which the Federal judicial power can be limited through the exercise of Congress' authority to make exceptions to the Supreme Court appellate jurisdiction, or its power to establish lower Federal courts, has never been clearly mapped.

Undoubtedly, such authority permits Congress, for example, to restrict jurisdiction over certain types of cases to particular courts. Or Congress could withdraw jurisdiction to enter orders on matters not involving constitutional rights. Or it could preclude the Federal courts from granting one remedy if another form of relief were available.

But the exception clause, and the power to establish lower Federal courts, cannot be used to abrogate all judicial power to protect any one basic constitutional right.

The case of Ex Parte McCardle, upon which great emphasis has been placed by proponents of the Dirksen proposal, does not support this radical departure from constitutional tradition. In that case, which arose during Reconstruction, McCardle was held for military trial by the Union general at Vicksburg, who objected to the critical views expressed by McCardle in his newspaper.

McCardle's application for habeas corpus in the circuit court was denied. He then appealed to the Supreme Court, but in 1863, while his appeal was pending, Congress passed an act withdrawing jurisdiction from the Supreme Court to hear appeals from circuit courts in habeas corpus cases. The Supreme Court upheld the law and dismissed McCardle's appeal.

The McCardle case has been widely misinterpreted as standing for the proposition that Congress has unlimited power to withdraw jurisdiction from the Federal courts in all cases involving constitutional rights. It does no such thing. Actually, McCardle's original right to appeal to the Supreme Court from the circuit court ruling was

based on a statute passed by Congress in the year before he filed his appeal; before that, no such right of appeal existed.

More significant, the 1868 law withdrawing appellate jurisdiction did not prohibit all habeas corpus proceedings; such suits could still be brought in the circuit courts. And, most important of all, the 1868 law did not prevent another method of reviewing decisions of the circuit courts in habeas corpus cases: such review could be obtained by filing a habeas corpus proceeding directly in the Supreme Court itself.

Thus the McCardle law withdrew jurisdiction only as to one particular mode of relief, leaving another effective method still available.

The language of the Court's opinion in the McCardle case is indeed broad, but the question decided was much narrower. The dictum of the Court is of little authority today. Rendered in the period of turmoil following the Civil War, the opinion hardly conforms to the main lines of constitutional development over the last century. It is significant that no similar effort to curb the Supreme Court's jurisdiction over constitutional issues has been made between that time and the present day.

We thus conclude that the Dirksen-Tuck proposals are wrong in principle, wrong as constitutional law and wrong as a procedure for considering changes in constitutional law. So grave a matter should not be pressed so hastily.

The House bill was unceremoniously wrenched from the Judiciary Committee. No opportunity for open discussion, or for proper expression of public opinion, has been afforded.

It is said that the Dirksen-Tuck measures are necessary in order to maintain the status quo until a constitutional amendment can be adopted. But this is scarcely a reason for abandoning constitutional principles or acting in panic. The issue will be much more fairly tested if normal procedures are allowed to develop public opinion on the basis of full debate. Nothing will be done by the courts now that cannot be undone later by constitutional amendment.

On the other hand, as Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat of Connecticut, has observed, it is hardly just "to have the rotten boroughs decide whether they should continue to be rotten." And Old Sarum was the rottenest borough of them all.

Ultimately, then, the issue raised by the congressional fight over reapportionment is whether the institution of judicial review is to be cast aside. There may be some who would welcome that eventuality, but we are confident that that view is shared by only a small sect.

Public opinion has resisted, and overcome, many modern attacks on the authority of the courts, from President Roosevelt's court-packing plan to the Jenner proposals of a few years ago. Every segment of the Nation gets angry at the Supreme Court occasionally. But our people know that the Court has served them well and that without it the Constitution would vanish, leaving "not a rack behind."

Appalachian Aid Bill Is Soundly Conceived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY A. TAYLOR
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Asheville Citizen of August 13, 1964, contained an editorial entitled "Appalachian Aid Bill Is Soundly Conceived." This editorial makes a forceful presentation of the reasons why Congress should approve the Appalachian development program. I think that the editorial deserves wide attention; and I am, therefore, placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hope that my colleagues in Congress will take note of it. The editorial follows:

APPALACHIAN AID BILL IS SOUNDLY CONCEIVED

There are people who say that you can't fight poverty with public funds, and these are respected people.

They are also, mostly, rich.

We concede that a dole is no answer. Public welfare, though it has served a useful purpose in many cases, has also been a mattress for indolents. Welfare people realize this; they defend their role—and properly so—in the knowledge they've helped a lot of deserving people return to the human, productive society.

Properly administered (and here lies the key to the whole program) the administration's antipoverty bill can touch off an economic revolution.

It isn't, in itself, that good. It is indeed, as the critics charge, a "drop in the bucket" and politically motivated. But the bucket has been long dry and the vote-potential is likely more negative than positive. People who can't read rarely vote.

The same is true of another bill, still pending congressional approval—aid to the Appalachian area.

It's a good bill. It ought to be passed.

Much of the legislation designed to relieve poverty in this session of Congress has been aimed largely at Negro poverty. But the Appalachian area is a region where white poverty is a tragic reality.

The picture, of course, varies from State to State but the general description is the same: natural resources like timber and coal, which once provided many jobs, have been used up. Small farms have become uneconomic in an age of mechanized farming. The young and progressive families have often had to leave in order to make a decent living. Many of those who remain are unemployed or "underemployed," with all the discouragement and demoralization that this situation brings.

As passed by the House Public Works Committee, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964 authorizes a little more than $1 billion for the economic development of 355 Appalachian counties in 11 States.

The bulk of the money—$840 million—is for highway construction. These highways in general will embody a new principle. Rather than being based on existing traffic counts, they will be "development highways," designed to bring new tourists and industrial users into the Appalachian area. Western North Carolina will be entitled to some 142 miles of such development highways if this legislation is passed.

Various other programs for the Appalachian region will be included in the act:

The Federal share of school construction funds authorized in the Vocational Education Act will be increased by $16 million.

Increased Federal funds will be provided for the development of sewage treatment facilities.

Nearly $80 million will be authorized for the construction and operation of multi-county demonstration health facilities, that is, for hospitals and diagnostic and treatment centers. These are most needed in rural sections not financially able to build health facilities of their own.

Funds are also authorized for grants to landowners to improve pastureland; assistance to "timber development organizations" to improve woodland productivity; restoration of areas that have been rendered unusable by mining operations; and for preparation of a program for development of the water resources of the area, including lakes, recreation facilities, etc.

There may be justification criticism of some of the lesser provisions of the act, such as the timber development and pasture improvement programs, for which other Federal agencies are already providing assistance.

But in a region that has long lacked highways the possibility of a major new highway program looks good. Vocational training for a people who need skills for today's labor market, hospitals and health centers for areas that lack them, and increased Federal funds for other public projects will give a real and perhaps a permanent shot in the arm to a part of the Nation that has been too long overlooked.

Basically, the bill is sound. It ought to be adopted.

Statement by Walter Harnischfeger of Milwaukee on the Occasion of the 90th Birthday of Former President Hoover at West Branch, Iowa, August 10, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when the 90th birthday of former President Hoover was observed at his birthplace in West Branch, Iowa, on August 10 this year, a high tribute was paid to this great humanitarian by Mr. Walter Harnischfeger, of Milwaukee, a vice president of the Herbert Hoover Birthplace Foundation. Included in Mr. Harnischfeger's remarks was the reading of a message from Mr. Hoover to his friends assembled at West Branch.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Mr. Harnischfeger's statement and the text of the warm letter which Mr. Hoover wrote:

STATEMENT BY WALTER HARNISCHFEGER

It is a signal honor to be chosen to stand on this rostrum, frequently occupied by our beloved chief, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, to celebrate his 90th birthday. These birthday celebrations are always a source of great inspiration. It was here among humble surroundings that the chief spent his early boyhood. Here he received his basic education; here he worked and played. The faith of his parents, the simplicity of his early life, the necessity to work, and his worship of God shaped his sterling character. Life here gave him energy and ambition, and above all, vision.

It was the strength drawn from this simple background which enabled him to become one of the world's outstanding engineers, and later President of the United States and one of the greatest statesmen and humanitarians the world has ever produced.

In 1896, the chief was graduated from Stanford University with an A.B. degree in engineering. For 18 years his engineering endeavor encompassed the world. He became one of the early empire builders of underdeveloped nations. And, I hasten to add, without taxpayer handouts. World War I interrupted his engineering career and channeled him into public service.

The secret of the chief's statesmanship is revealed in a quotation from his "Memoirs," volume 4, relating his return from Europe

following World War I: "Among our problems was the beginning of infections from European ideologies. They appeared not only as the long-agitated socialism, but as Communist fifth columns and a new mixture later known under the name of fascism.

"We had a large sprinkling of intellectuals who, stimulated by the fumes from the caldrons of Europe, were promulgating the idea that there was merit in a mixture of these new systems.

"I had come out of the European laboratory more convinced than ever that in the centuries of our separation from the Old World we had developed something which, for lack of a better term, I called the American system, which was alone the promise of human progress and the force which had led our Nation to greatness."

Thus, in 1919, Mr. Hoover outlined the precise problems of today. Possibly in the humanitarian field, the chief rose to his greatest stature. In his "An American Epic," volume 4, he writes:

"During these famines of both world wars, the American people furnished the margins of food and medicine which saved the lives of more than 1,800 million human beings, largely women and children."

This humanitarian effort is without parallel in history.

Time precludes even listing all of Mr. Hoover's contribution to society. The library before you containing records and documents of great historic value to which this community has made a great contribution in making this a reality; his "Library of War, Revolution, and Peace"; two Hoover Commissions; his 88th birthday suggestion on reorganization of the U.N.; his boys' clubs; his prolific and meaningful writings—all of these and more prodigious efforts constitute a contribution of incalculable value to human progress.

In this election year of crisis, let us dedicate ourselves to the resumption of the chief's "American system, which (is) alone the promise of human progress and the force which (has) led our Nation to greatness." And as time passes, this shrine will be a source of inspiration to future generations as they come here to honor President Hoover and all he represented.

May we stand for a moment in silent reverence to the chief—wish him a most happy birthday and much health and happiness to him and his family.

It now gives me great pleasure to read the message that the chief has asked me to convey to his friends gathered here.

AUGUST 10, 1964.

MY DEAR FRIENDS: I do deeply appreciate this tribute of your friendship on my 90th birthday.

Iowa was my childhood home, and my first memories are of the warm friendliness and great kindness of its people. At 90, I am still the recipient of that friendliness and kindness.

I am very grateful for all you have done toward beautifying and improving the area surrounding the Presidential Library. I want particularly to express my gratitude to the Birthplace Foundation and to the West Branch Heritage Foundation for their efforts in restoring and preserving buildings of historical interest while retaining the flavor of West Branch of pioneer days.

I am content that the close association of the Birthplace Foundation, the Heritage Foundation, and the Library will prove a valuable contribution to the community and to our country.

I wish it were possible to be in West Branch today in person to greet you and tell you of my affection for you, but I am with you in spirit. May God continue to bless you.

HERBERT HOOVER.

The Menace of One-Party Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, August 26, 1964:

THE MENACE OF ONE-PARTY GOVERNMENT

(By Henry Taylor)

ATLANTIC CITY.—The President of the United States is in charge here. He and his party rule our national roost. But when is enough enough?

"Cry in your swimming pool," movie mogul L. B. Mayer once told star Jean Harlow. "That'll improve your perspective." The Democratic Party wants more and more authority. But one party already has too much, a danger from either party—always.

Mr. Johnson is not only his group's undisputed leader. His party holds the chairmanship of every committee in the Senate and House. And it controls Congress itself by a topheavy majority seldom equalled in American history.

Party balances in both Houses were fairly even throughout World War II and in the first postwar decade. General Eisenhower won in 1952 and 1956 by large popular majorities, but this did not alter the congressional balance very much. Then in the 1958 off-year election the Democratic landslide hit. This changed the ratio drastically. In the two subsequent elections the Republicans recovered only slightly in the House and nothing in the Senate.

Meanwhile, Presidential authority over us has mounted steadily. Our challenge today is to the structure of our Government, its entire system of checks and balances, not just to one party or the other. The Presidency is becoming a party of itself, autonomous and often even anonymous in its self-sufficiency.

Any group in power anywhere seldom needs compliments. It supplies these for itself—dramatically, persuasively, endlessly. Instead, it needs competition. For nothing needs competition so much as political bodies and men in power. But politicians discourage competition and go to great pains and expense (taxpayers' money) to stifle it.

A President can command the headlines and TV attention at will, or use his appointees, with their imposing titles—Secretary of State, Treasury, Defense—to put the best possible face on everything. Government handouts can become party handouts. The present administration, for example, employs (taxpayers' money) about 3,000 press officers, which is roughly twice the number of journalists in the Washington working press.

As one result, the administration's managed news is a fan dance: A calculated progression of disclosures, each revealing different parts of a mysterious whole but not everything. We were not told the truth about Cuba, or Laos or Panama, either. We are not being told the whole truth about South Vietnam or our latest involvement in the Congo. The list is long and grows longer.

In principle, the student of good government must now be on the side of the opposition party. Our Government is very badly out of balance. In terms of good government, and no matter what happens to Senator BARRY GOLDWATER in his presidential run, it is vital for the Republicans to conduct an enormously vigorous and competitive campaign. The nonpartisan American should be deeply concerned, and very hopeful, that this opposition party can achieve important advances in the House and Senate. In our checks and balances—admittedly required—at least this check needs betterment in November.

The party meeting here would howl at that contention, yet its desirableness for better government of the Nation as a whole is undeniable. Apathy, in turn, helps defeat this objective. The more the Democrats pound away at their theme of "peace and prosperity" and the more solidly this impresses the country, the more apathetic will be the public toward voting at all.

The tragedy will come if the opposition fails to get out the vote, a fact true in any free country. About 113 million will be eligible to vote in November. History indicates about 43 million will stay away from the polls. In most democratic countries abroad, the average voting turnout exceeds 80 percent. In the 1960 presidential election, ours was 63 percent. In the 1962 congressional elections, it dropped to about 44 percent. The percentage of nonvoters stays stubbornly close across the years.

The cheers here by Democrats for further Democratic gains are understandable. But if opposition gains can be made, the Democrats must then turn in a better performance for the good of all. We cannot indefinitely be threatened by one-party government—by either party—and the sooner the country sees that clearly, the safer the Nation will be.

"Recent Supreme Court Antitrust Decisions"—An Address by Attorney Rufus E. Wilson of the FTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, at the annual convention of the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, on August 18, 1964, Rufus E. Wilson, Chief, Division of General Trade Restraints of the Federal Trade Commission, delivered an illuminating and very informative address entitled "Another Year of Decision."

Mr. Wilson, an outstanding attorney with the Federal Trade Commission, in his address reviewed recent court and Commission decisions pertaining to the small business segment of the petroleum industry. He is to be commended for making such an excellent presentation and clarifying some of the intricacies of the antitrust laws and trade regulation statutes of special interest to small business generally and to gasoline service station operators particularly.

Because of the importance of this subject, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wilson's address be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of National Association of Petroleum Retailers, ladies and gentlemen, it is with a deep feeling of appreciation that I thank you for again inviting

me to attend your convention. It is also a privilege of which I am mindful to be again honored by being asked to be one of your speakers.

At the outset, I must remind you that my remarks here today are my own and are not to be construed in any manner as expressions of policy or views of the Commission.

Last year at your convention in Los Angeles, you will recall that I referred to 1963 as the "year of decision."

Your leaders at that time, Mr. Fountain, John Nerlinger, Cash Hawley, and others, had previously made this statement. Mine was but an echo. How right they were, we all know.

For at that time we had heard the Supreme Court speak out in Sun Oil. No right thinking person can deny the impact of that decision, a decision that freed small independent businessmen from the shackles of price discriminations with which they were bound. A decision which, in its rejection of the conduit theory, established the freedom and independence of the lessee-dealer as an independent businessman.

In my address to you last year, I gave full discussion to the Sun Oil decision and what it meant or would mean to you, as service station dealers and small independent businessmen. However, I find from various letters that have been written to us by service station dealers over the past year that a misunderstanding exists as to the extent of this decision and the law upon which it was based.

In view of this, I believe it important to again say to you that neither this decision nor the law as expressed in the Robinson-Patman Act requires that a supplier must charge the same price to all of its customers wherever it may be doing business.

The section of the Robinson-Patman Act with which we are here concerned reads as follows:

"SEC. 2(a) That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality, where either or any of the purchases involved in such discrimination are in commerce, where such commodities are sold for use, consumption, or resale within the United States or any territory thereof or the District of Columbia or any insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States, and where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them; * * *"

Every price difference is not an unlawful price discrimination.

The Court gave its sanction to what, on occasions, have been referred to as "feathering." Thus a supplier in the event of a price war situation, is not required to give all of its dealers in the area affected the same amount of allowance, penny for penny. It may "realistically" determine "gradations" in its allowances extending from a higher to a lower allowance. The "realistic" gradation between the higher and lower allowances must be such as to make the lesser amount of allowance de minimis. In so doing it is not discriminatory within the meaning of the act as construed by the Supreme Court. For example, a dealer in the center of a price war may receive an allowance which may be some cents higher than that which a dealer receives who is some distance removed from the center of the price war. But in such instances the difference in the amount of the allowance must be "realistic" and not based on the whim or caprice of the supplier, or on the establishment of artificial boundaries surrounding so-called competitive but actually unrealistic pricing zones.

I stated last year and will repeat today that no supplier, earnestly desiring to help its dealers, should have any difficulty in establishing nondiscriminatory allowances within the meaning of the Supreme Court's decision. Application of the know-how set forth in this decision, if conscientiously followed should help to eliminate all price wars which are caused or allowed to spread by unrealistic allowances or allowances based on artificially drawn zones of so-called competitive behavior.

All of you here, I am sure, have heard in some way of the Commission's two cases in your industry involving consignment operations.

Complaint was issued by the Commission against Sun Oil Co. on November 8, 1957. Subsequently, on April 7, 1959, this complaint was amended. This case involved the use of consignment agreements as a device to fix and maintain the retail price of gasoline in the Norfolk and Portsmouth, Va., area.

Under date of April 23, 1959, the Commission served its complaint against Atlantic Refining Co. wherein, among other things, the use by Atlantic of consignment contracts was challenged as a device to fix, maintain, and control prices at its dealers' gasoline stations.

The Commission in both of these cases found that the use of the consignment agreements were merely devices to fix, maintain, and control the resale prices of their lessee-dealers. These cases are now on appeal in the courts.

But these cases were just forerunners to another case that was initiated as a private suit by a service station dealer in California named Richard S. Simpson against Union Oil Co.

Richard Simpson operated a gasoline station in California under a lease from the Union Oil Co. I am quite sure that he considered himself to be an independent businessman because the record reflects that he acted like a man who considered himself to be independent. Although he was under a 1-year lease and a 1-year consignment contract which provided that "title" to the consigned gas "shall remain in consignor until sold by consignee," Mr. Simpson sold his gasoline for 27.9 cents in the face of demands by the company that he adhere to a price of 29.9 cents. As a result, Union Oil refused to renew his lease.

Simpson brought suit for damages under the antitrust laws. After pretrial hearings, Union moved for summary judgment and Simpson for partial summary judgment on the basis that the consignment lease program of Union, violated the Sherman Act. The district court held for Union and the court of appeals affirmed. Simpson petitioned the Supreme Court, which agreed to hear the case. On April 20, 1964, the Supreme Court held that the consignment agreement was used by Union as a device for resale price maintenance. Mr. Justice Douglas, writing for the majority, stated:

"Dealers, like Simpson, are independent businessmen: and they have all or most of the indicia of entrepreneurs, except for price fixing. The risk of loss of gasoline is on them, apart from acts of God. Their return is affected by the rise and fall in the market price, their commissions declining as retail prices drop. Practically the only power they have to be wholly independent businessmen, whose service depends on their own initiative and enterprise, is taken from them by the proviso that they must sell their gasoline at prices fixed by Union Oil."

The Supreme Court, while recognizing that consignment has historically served legitimate business purposes, struck down the consignment arrangement in this case because it was used to control the dealer's resale prices. The Supreme Court looked at the arrangement realistically—pierced the consignment arrangement—and in looking through the opening, saw the true character of the arrangement, a device by which the "independent" was to be kept subservient, a device by which his independence was to be destroyed, a device to fix and maintain the retail prices of an independent businessman.

The chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee, in an article appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 24, 1964, in referring to the importance of this case said:

"Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision in an antitrust case which is recognized as being of greater importance and significance than any other antitrust case decided in this decade."

Mr. EVINS' appraisal of this case must be accorded significance. He is, as you know, one of the great champions of small business in this country and prior to his becoming a Member of Congress, was an outstanding attorney with the Federal Trade Commission.

Just 4 days after the Supreme Court's decision in Simpson, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, on April 24, 1964, handed down its decision in *Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* and *Atlantic Refining Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* affirming the Commission's previous decision in Federal Trade Commission Docket 6486.

In its decision the court had this to say about the independence of the dealer operating under a lease arrangement with a major oil company:

"Ostensibly, they are independent businessmen but behind the legalistic facade of independence, there exists a servitude caused by the coercive pressures which Atlantic exerts upon its dealers. The keystone of the actual relationship between Atlantic and its dealers is the lease and the equipment loan contract with their short term and cancellation provisions. Without repeating all the components of the relationship, it is evident that the service station dealer is more of an economic serf than a businessman free to purchase the TBA of his choice."

The Federal Trade Commission issued its complaint against the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. and the Atlantic Refining Co. charging a violation of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act which declares unlawful unfair methods of competition in commerce and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce. The Commission's complaint challenged the legality of the distribution of tires, batteries, and automobile accessories, commonly called TBA, to service stations under a sales commission agreement between Goodyear and Atlantic. The Commission held against Goodyear and Atlantic and issued orders to cease and desist from this, Goodyear and Atlantic appealed.

In the challenged sales commission contract between Goodyear and Atlantic, Atlantic agreed to promote the sale of Goodyear TBA products to Atlantic's distributors and service station dealers located in New England, New York, and the Philadelphia-New Jersey area. A sales commission was paid to Atlantic by Goodyear on the products which were sold by Atlantic's distributors and service station dealers.

Atlantic, prior to 1951 bought Lee tires and Exide batteries and various accessories from other sources and sold them to its wholesale distributors and retail dealers in the area which was the subject of the commission's complaint. Having become dissatisfied with this method of operation, Atlantic surveyed its dealers to determine such things as preference of brands and sources of supply. The survey showed that only

11 percent of the dealers preferred Goodyear tires and in addition, a majority of the dealers preferred to purchase their tires, batteries and accessories from more than one source. In spite of the survey results, Atlantic entered into a sales commission contract covering TBA effective March 1, 1951, with Goodyear and a similar contract with Firestone, the two contracts covering its entire marketing area. Atlantic assigned a portion of its sales territory to Goodyear and another portion to Firestone. Firestone got the eastern Pennsylvania, western Pennsylvania and southern regions.

Each Atlantic dealer was assigned to a specific supply point designated by Goodyear. These supply points were either Goodyear stores, Goodyear franchise dealers, or Atlantic service station dealers who were also Goodyear franchisees. Atlantic received a 10-percent override on all purchases of Goodyear TBA made by Atlantic dealers from the tire companies' supply points, and a 7½-percent override on purchases by dealers from Atlantic's wholesale distributors.

The service station dealers were told that the new plan was a change in company policy; that Atlantic wanted them to carry Goodyear or Firestone tires, batteries and accessories; and that the switch would be to the dealer's benefit.

Letters were sent to the dealers informing them of the availability of the plan and advised them to take advantage of it. Numerous meetings were held by Atlantic with its dealers to explain the new programs. Atlantic gave Goodyear and Firestone the names of the dealers in their respective territories so that their advertising could be installed in the service stations. Under Atlantic policy this meant that only Goodyear or Firestone identifications were to be displayed at Atlantic stations. Atlantic salesmen accompanied by either Goodyear or Firestone salesmen contacted the dealers concerning the new sponsored TBA. Reports were made to Atlantic by Goodyear and Firestone including the names of dealers who refused to permit the installation of Goodyear and Firestone signs.

Atlantic established TBA quotas; Atlantic policed the dealers; they promoted Goodyear TBA and wrote up TBA orders. Atlantic salesmen checked the books of dealers to see whether they were buying from other sources. Atlantic salesmen made trips with Goodyear salesmen to police the operation. This is called double teaming. Atlantic credit cards included the Goodyear TBA.

When Atlantic selected a new retail dealer, at least three seperate interviews were held with the applicant at which the sales commission program was explained. After selection but before receiving a lease, the applicant attended an Atlantic training school where extensive discussions and demonstrations of Goodyear TBA were conducted. He was told at the school that it was to his advantage to carry Goodyear or Firestone products. He was told what Goodyear inventory he should carry and that he should use approved Goodyear signs, decals and advertising boards.

The seventh circuit upheld the Commission stating that the sales commission system was, in effect, an illegal tying arrangement. The court stated:

"In its narrower aspects the system is a tying arrangement because it requires the buyer of one product, the service station dealer who purchases Atlantic gasoline, to buy another line of merchandise, Goodyear TBA. Surrender by the dealer of his freedom to choose between brands of TBA is per se illegal if a 'not insubstantial' amount of interstate commerce is affected."

Goodyear, by 1955, had signed TBA contracts with 2,183 of the 2,248 Atlantic service stations in the 8-State territory assigned; Firestone, by 1955, had signed virtually all the 4,698 Atlantic stations in its 10-State area; and total Goodyear and Firestone sales under the Atlantic contracts from June 1950 to June 1956 was more than $52 million; therefore the court had no difficulty in finding that the sales commission system was within the "substantiality of economic effect on commerce" test established in previous tying cases.

Before leaving this important case, I would like to read one more quote from the court's decision. This is in the area of coercion and illustrates vividly the court's determination to penetrate beyond the facade of the Atlantic-Goodyear arrangement and to recognize it for what it was, a coercive and oppressive method of taking away the dealers' independent judgment and substituting therefor the profit motivated judgment of Atlantic and Goodyear. The court stated:

"Atlantic says that its influence over its dealers to purchase sponsored TBA short of force, threat, or intimidation is lawful; that it may recommend high quality TBA to its dealers; and that such action serves a legitimate business purpose in the promotion of the sale of gasoline. This would be a persuasive argument except for the dealers' economic dependency upon the oil company. In that setting, recommendation is tantamount to command. Covert practices are as efficient as overt action. Sophisticated methods of pressuring the dealers into carrying sponsored TBA are as effectual as express covenants and open threats."

However, all is not well. We received a serious setback in our enforcement activities when we lost the American Oil Company case in the seventh circuit and the Supreme Court denied our petition for review, as well as our recent loss in the court of appeals, District of Columbia Circuit in *B. F. Goodrich Co., et al.*, FTC docket 6485. The remaining TBA case, *The Firestone Tire and Rubber Co., et al.*, FTC docket 6487, is still on appeal in the fifth circuit.

Although it must be expected that we will encounter reverses in our enforcement activities it cannot be said that the agency is not trying to enforce the laws it administers. And from these reversals will come knowledge to be applied in these and other areas.

The Federal Trade Commission, as of this year, reaches its 50th birthday. There will be no ringing of bells, no unfurling of flags nor the draping of bunting on the light posts to mark such an event. Likewise, there will be no parades nor blaring of bands in its honor. With the exception of perhaps a few speeches or references to it on occasions such as this, the birth date of this agency may go unnoticed.

The birthday—yes, it may possibly go unnoticed. But the honesty of endeavor has its own reward. Its 50 years of service stand as a monument to the wisdom of a Congress that listened to the words of President Woodrow Wilson echoing the voice of the small businessmen of this country to supplement the Sherman Act by legislation that would close up the loopholes in the law which permitted monopoly, as well as other unfair methods of competition to grow unchecked and unhindered.

In its 50 years of existence it has, like Horatio of ancient years, stood squarely in the path of those who would destroy the system of free and open competition under which this country, like no other, has grown and prospered.

Today, in this year, the Federal Trade Commission more nearly approaches the aims and goals that President Wilson had expressed in recommending its creation, than at any time in its past. On that occasion, January 20, 1914, President Wilson sent a message to Congress recommending the establishment of an Interstate Trade Commission.

President Wilson envisioned the Commission in a guidance role and staffed with a body of experts who would interpret and apply the broad meaning and purpose of the trade laws to the businessman's particular problem. The basic idea was to halt unfair or discriminatory practices when first they arose. That businessmen needed a clearer idea as to the law, and that such clarification would prevent entanglement in the law and resultant prosecution because of the inherent honesty of the great majority of businessmen and their desire to obey the law once they understood what was expected.

It was thus only a small step from this to the institution of the Commission's trade practice conference procedure in 1919. However, it was a greater step to our advisory opinions and trade regulation rules procedures adopted in the last few years under Chairman Dixon.

It is under this procedure that the Commission is today giving consideration to the petitions filed by your association and others to the establishment of a trade regulation rule in the gasoline marketing industry. Five years ago this type of procedure was impossible—today it is a reality.

The purpose of these rules is, among other things, to advise the business community that engaging in the proscribed conduct is a violation of law and an invitation to litigation. For those who wish to comply with the law this procedure will supply them with a clear and simple answer. For those who remain uninterested in complying with the law the mandate is clear. They are no longer acting in ignorance of the law but in defiance.

It must be said though that not all industries are adaptable to the trade regulation rules procedure. This may be true for a variety of reasons. Every industry, and the practices sought to be corrected, must be given thorough study in the light of our experienced in that industry.

However, you may be assured that full and complete study and consideration will be given to every petition for promulgation of trade regulation rules.

Again, I thank you for asking me to participate in your convention.

B. H. Shearer, Editor of the Columbus Gazette, of Columbus Junction, Iowa, "Though 82, Still Records History at the Grassroots"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have often spoken of the important role performed by the editors of our weekly newspapers in this country. One of those of whom special notice should be taken is Mr. B. H. Shearer, who recently observed his 82d birthday, but who continues to edit the Columbus Gazette in the community of Columbus Junction, Iowa, as he has done over the past 56 years.

It pleased me to note that the Des Moines, Iowa, Sunday Register recently carried a story on Mr. Shearer's journalistic achievements, and in further recognition of his years of service to his community, I wish to have this article

appear in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The story on Mr. Shearer follows:

COLUMBUS JUNCTION, IOWA.—From his familiar Main Street observation post here, B. H. Shearer, 82, will continue this week to record the passing scene of his town.

A country editor now in his 56th year in this town, Shearer sums up the editorial philosophy which has guided the Columbus Gazette since May 1, 1909:

"We're a hometown newspaper. We print the local news, and that's about all."

Circulation is a big 2,925 in a town of "slightly over 1,000" population.

If one stays put anyplace 56 years he'll see and hear a lot, and it was Shearer's duty to record this history.

WHAT HE RECORDED

He saw the beginnings of two World Wars, and their endings. A League of Nations was proposed and the United States shunned it. A United Nations was proposed and the United States offered it a home.

A man named William Howard Taft, President of the United States, came through Columbus Junction on a train 1 day and he made a speech.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt died 10 minutes after the Gazette press started, and Shearer said "stop the press," or words to that effect, and the Gazette made a page 1 bulletin insert, a coup in the life of any weekly newspaper.

"I was for the League of Nations, and I supported Woodrow Wilson," recalled Shearer. "No, I didn't get much criticism here. This community is not very radical on anything.

"We didn't say much about President Harding's troubles. We concentrated on local news.

"BACKED PROHIBITION

"I supported prohibition. I thought it was all right for the State to legalize liquor by the drink last year. People are going to drink, and they were doing it anyway illegally.

"Besides, prohibition wasn't very successful. I recall that they sold liquor around here in those days.

"I don't write many editorials anymore. Once in a while I write one on taxes. I'm against high taxes. I'm against the $310 billion national debt, too.

"Yes, I went through one depression, and I thought we might be due for another one. It doesn't look like it now. People are buying more cars than ever before.

"The small towns are losing out now, there's no doubt about that. But I think we'll do all right because the Rath Packing Co. has put a plant here."

Shearer was honored as an Iowa master editor-publisher in 1952.

U.S. "Dumping" of Beef Hit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the inept handling of our beef import problem and the generally confusing and conflicting policies which surround the present administration's foreign trade relations have seriously damaged our alliance with the South American countries.

Increased shipments of U.S. beef to Western European countries are ruining the South American markets in Europe and already Argentina and Uruguay are determining ways to "defend their common interests" by economic retaliation.

The Christian Science Monitor of August 27, 1964, contains a very interesting and enlightening article on this subject and demonstrates quite clearly how this latest State Department scheme has boomeranged.

The article follows:

U.S. "DUMPING" OF BEEF HIT

(By Norman A. Ingrey)

BUENOS AIRES.—Beef has again been thrown into the stew of River Plate relations with the United States, and the international flavor of the dish is momentarily somewhat off.

The Argentine and Uruguayan Foreign Ministers, meeting in Montevideo, Uruguay, have agreed on a joint defense policy against current U.S. efforts to "dump" its beef surpluses in South America's "traditional" markets in Europe.

Prior to this meeting the Argentine Senate put the stew on the fire by a formal resolution protesting the invocation of "law 480" to facilitate American oversea beef sales. It called for the "rectification" of this Washington policy and warned that, were this maintained, defense measure would be required which might weaken continental unity.

BIGGEST EXPORT

Beef is the biggest export-earner of the River Plate—or Rio de la Plata—Argentine-Uruguayan action surged from a background an annual cattle shows both sides of the river where ranchers have been communicating their concern to the two governments. But officials needed no goadings from the farmers—the state of their own exchange coffers forces action.

The Uruguayans, who normally deal more in sheep and wool than in steers and hides, are just as concerned—and indignant—as the Argentines. They have been spurring their neighbors into action. Nearly a month ago Foreign Minister Alejandro Zorrilla de San Martin announced his government would invite Australia and New Zealand as well as Argentina to a conference on "defense of their common interests."

In the wake of the Argentine legislative protest the U.S. Government announced it was sending a top-ranking trade expert this way to emphasize once again its interest in giving regional problems special consideration. This is Ambassador W. Michael Blumenthal, attached to the American trade office in Geneva. But other officials have recently been calling here from Washington and neither they nor resident ambassadors have convinced the Argentines or Uruguayans that their special interests will invariably be in foreign sales of this nature.

"BIG INTERESTS" HIT

Acting Chairman Eduardo J. Gamond, recently returned from the United States where he was a State Department guest, went so far as to allege that the "big interests" were again obtaining control in Washington and would "ruin American international prestige." Another allegation was that the "United States favors totalitarian governments in these countries."

Agricultural Minister Wilson Ferreyra in Uruguay told a large inaugural attendance at the annual cattle show in Monevideo that the United States had now "placed itself on the list of those competitors who do not follow the rules of the international trade game."

But the most disquieting development in this surge of River Plate suspicion of and opposition to American oversea sales of beef in "our traditional markets"—Britain and Europe especially—is the increasing executive and parliamentary trend to compare one United States regime with another.

ABSURDITY CHARGED

More than one public speaker has obliquely but unmistakably indicated that since the passing of former President Kennedy the "big interests" have been gaining control. A more subdued but common argument cites the absurdity of imposing sacrifices on the American taxpayer to support the Alliance for Progress and canceling the good effects of this through an erroneous trade policy.

Neither Buenos Aires nor Montevideo is disposed to accept repeated assurances of prior consultations before any beef sales are made in their "traditional markets" under the shelter of law 480.

The Argentines are sensitive and fearful because last year's drought and maybe some local export mistakes have caused shortages and high prices in Europe, with an inability on their part adequately to supply old clients. The Uruguayans are anxious for diametrically opposite reasons—they expect to set a new national export record in beef this year, 110,000 tons, with corresponding gains in volume and price.

Argentines, of course, have bigger foreign market interests at stake—well over half a million tons of fresh, frozen, and canned beef yearly—and half of this in the first-mentioned category where Americans, under law 480, are now considered to be developing as competitors.

DEBATE SURPRISING

The critical Senate debate and resolution, however, came as something of a surprise, as Foreign Minister Miguel A. Zavala Ortiz only a few days previously had announced receipt of Washington assurances that it would not subsidize beef exports and would consult with Argentina on sales in its markets.

The strong terms of the Senate resolution also reverberated here, and the unanimity of feelings expressed and votes registered. The president of the republic was directed to formulate the "most energetic protest" against law 480's dumping on and distortion of the international beef market.

Attention was also called to the "contradictions between the generous Kennedy postulation through the Alliance for Progress and procedural conduct that could destroy the bases of economic emancipation."

War Against Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Fernando (Calif.) Valley Times, Aug. 31, 1964]

(By Ed Delaney)

In order not to be regarded as a draft dodger, my application for enlistment in the war against poverty has been sent to R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., Antipoverty Corps, Washington, D.C. It reads:

Dear "General": When your Commander in Chief, Elbee-Jay, signed the bill for the $558 million Federal pay hike, he said it was "to attract and keep top-caliber talent." It has. This is my acceptance of his invitation. Knowing that you will need top-caliber talent in the higher pay echelons of your army in the war on poverty, please list me somewhere in the $20 thousand a year grade now, so I will be eligible for the increase of from $4,000 to $7,000, when the pay hikes

come, January 1, 1965. Nothing helps in the process of depauperization like a modest, assured income.

Another factor which impelled me to make the great personal sacrifice is that the Nation's tailors have named you as one of the 10 best-dressed men in America—ranking first among those in public service. That did it. It is doubtful if anything can inspire elan and esprit de corps among the thousands who will be recruited for the antipoverty war, as the knowledge that their commander is the very acme of sartorial splendor.

Moreover, those who have filled out the dozens of forms, and are eligible to be depauperized, will look upon the impeccably arrayed general as symbolizing the haut monde, the noblesse, the grandee of our rapidly developing oligarchy. Those people will be cooperative, secure in the knowledge that they, too, in time, will be so attired when we have conquered the cause of poverty.

This will be a long war, Sarg, I mean, General, perhaps equaling the Thirty Years' War which European history records. Because those among the "haves"—from whom we will take now, will be the "have-nots" in another decade. They will then be eligible for depauperization. The campaign can go on and on—ad infinitum. We must be very adroit, Sarg.

Since we are an educational arm of the administration, special attention should be given the schools. One suggestion would be to have a large framed picture of Elbee-Jay displayed in every classroom. There should be a semblance of a halo in the background, but not too obtrusive—in the first few million pictures. Some unprogressives in places like Arizona, might take exception. The children might be taught to recite a couplet, such as: "Every child should give thanks each day, for all that we receive from Elbee-Jay."

In a subtle manner, if you will pardon the use of that word, we build up a new American idol. A great leader who has the commendable conviction that poverty, like political opposition, can be overcome quickly if dollars are scattered judiciously. His personal history proves something. Starting as a country school teacher and even without the aid of a Bobby Baker, he and his family are now classed as millionaires several times over.

There are many antipoverty suggestions in my idea kit, General, which will be available for you. So please send at once not less than $1,000 to banish poverty at the local level and for travel expenses to Washington. That will include, of course, the cost of a new custom tailored (civilian) uniform in keeping with the example set by yourself. It would not be maintaining the apparel standards, for one of your top-caliber talents to arrive in a two-pants suit. Yours for the duration.—E.D.

Times Certainly Have Changed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the August 24 issue of the Neosho Daily News was printed before the most recent revelation of scandal in Washington involving a $25,000 "kickback" from the District of Columbia Stadium contract.

The editorial directly portrays the decline in morals and morality under the present administration. How can we encourage honesty and integrity in the young people of our Nation when such poor standards are being set by the very men who hold the reins of leadership.

The editorial follows:

TIMES CERTAINLY HAVE CHANGED

Time was that, if a man from the East had filed for the U.S. Senate in California, the people of the State and the Government of the United States would have roused up and told him in no uncertain terms that this was not legal and he would have to file for office in the State of his legal residence, or get out of the race.

Time was that, if a resident of Massachusetts and Virginia were to file as a candidate for the U.S. Senate from New York, he would have been listed as a cheat and a fraud.

Today, a major political party of those States, and the Federal Government, have given such men their blessings.

Time was that, if a man of Bobby Baker's caliber, who parlayed a $19,600-a-year job into a more than $2 million fortune because of his high position in the Government, he would be slapped into the Federal penitentiary where he belongs.

Today, he is given a slap on the wrist and the entire Senate investigation of the matter is hushed over because people in high places, including the President of the United States, were his friends and someone might be embarrassed if the truth were to be told.

Time was that, if a man from Texas parlayed an average $20,000-a-year job into a fortune in excess of $4 million, at the most conservative estimates and $14 million as a more realistic figure, the Congress of the United States would impeach him.

We do not mean to say that it is illegal to become rich. We do mean to say that, whether you are President of the United States, or a retail merchant on the main street of Neosho, Mo., it is legally and morally wrong to use your high office and connections for personal gain.

We don't believe everything we read, but we have checked with responsible people in Texas and are told that the stories related in the book "A Texan Looks at Lyndon" are true.

We'd be interested in knowing all the facts of how the President bought a TV station in Texas for less than $20,000 when its known value to others was in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. Or how he has kept that station in a city of 200,000 people as the only station there, while throughout the rest of the country, the FCC has granted multiple TV licenses to many, many cities of substantially less population. Or how he has forced other stations out because the FCC refused to listen to the complaints of their owners about unfair practices on the part of the Austin competition.

It is reported that all of this fortune was made on money inherited by his wife. But the records of the probate court of Harrison County, Tex., reveal that this inheritance was $21,000 (credit, not cash) and out of this, according to biographers, the President borrowed $10,000 to finance his first successful run for the U.S. Senate, a job which paid about $15,000 at that time.

Today, this same man, who was a personal friend of Bobby Baker, who has used the influence of his political offices for personal aggrandizement, will be selected by unanimous acclamation as President of a major political party.

Time was that the people of the entire Nation would look with askance at such goings-on of people in high office.

Today we take it as a matter of course.

Time was that the workingmen of the country would have roused up in protest if one of their leaders had used vast sums of their private pension moneys for his personal use and then dipped into the coffers again to get money to defend himself in court against Federal charges growing out of his questioned manipulations of money and people.

Today, even the courts of the United States seem unable to place such a man in jail. It is a safe prediction that the best chance of getting such a man out of office, and circulation, is to charge him on an income tax evasion count, where high office doesn't seem to mean so much to the prosecution, the defense, and the courts.

It is a sad commentary of our times that we, the people of the United States, accept such goings-on as a matter of routine and refuse to become disturbed by them.

Costs Savings Enable Textile Wage Hikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Government's new cotton price policy, which was prescribed in the Agricultural Act of 1964, is producing the results sought by those of us who worked for its enactment last April.

An accounting of the benefits of the new policy is contained in today's issue of the Journal of Commerce, a newspaper dedicated to objective reporting of business news.

We who supported this legislation to provide fair treatment to the textile industry can take pride in what is happening.

Textile manufacturers now are permitted to buy cotton at the same price it is sold on the world market. And the reduction in cotton costs has opened the way for increased wages for textile employees, increased investments in new plants and equipment, and increased cotton consumption.

Although this new policy has been in effect only a few months, and a longer period is necessary for maximum realization of benefits, we can cite it as a significant contribution to the national economy.

I commend to my colleagues the reading of the following article:

COTTON LAW CITED: COSTS SAVINGS ENABLE TEXTILE WAGE HIKES

(By Al Wyss)

Cost savings resulting from enactment of one-price cotton legislation and improving textile sales have touched off the second hourly wage boost in the southern textile industry in 10 months. A host of textile mills throughout the South already have announced pay hikes and practically all cotton, as well as synthetic fiber, textile mills are expected to follow suit. The hourly wage rates generally are going up an average of about 5 percent and will go into effect as of mid-September.

FIRMS NAMED

Among the textile mills which already have announced advances in hourly wages for their employees are Cannon Mills Co., Alice Manufacturing Co., Dan River Mills, Inc., including its Woodside Mills subsidiary; Inman Mills, Pacolet Industries of Spartanburg, S.C., Riegel Textile Corp., Greenwood Mills, Abney Mills, plants of Pepperell Manufacturing Co., Dundee Mills, West Point Manufacturing Co., Springs Cotton Mills, Judson Mills and Gayley Mills which are a division of Deering Milliken, Inc., and Harriet and Henderson Mills, leading yarn producers.

The last hourly wage increase, which went into effect last November, also averaged about 5 percent and since 1959 a total of five wage advances have taken place in the textile industry.

Enactment of one-price cotton legislation last April is one of the key factors which touched off the latest round of wage hikes, in that it afforded mills substantial cost savings in raw cotton. Mills, however, also reduced prices of cotton fabrics and yarns by about 3 to 4 cents a pound in May and June, passing along some of the low cotton costs to customers.

Textile company executives, in fact, emphasize that they have passed along a very substantial part of the cotton cost savings, and in some cases even more, despite recent strengthening of cotton fabric prices.

James A. Chapman, Jr., president and treasurer, Inman Mills, Inc., has released a letter to the company's employees in connection with the wage advance effective in mid-September, the company's second in 10 months, which cited detailed statistics on costs and prices.

In February of this year, "we shipped 2,633,726 pounds of cloth for which we received $1,824,402.12 which is an average of 69.27 cents per pound," Mr. Chapman said. "During the first 3 weeks of August, we had shipped 2,040,098 pounds of cloth for which we received $17,270,662.11, or an average of 62.28 cents per pound. The difference between 69.27 and 62.28 cents per pound is 6.99 cents per pound. You can see that we have passed on to our customers more than the cotton price has been reduced," Mr. Chapman added.

COSTS REDUCTIONS

"The new one-price cotton legislation provides for reduction in our cotton costs of 6.5 cents per pound. You can readily see that we have reduced our price by more than the offset fee that we might receive from the Government in order that our cotton costs will be the same as our foreign competitors. Some might ask you: What happened to your share of the one-price cotton benefit? We hope this gives you the answer."

Other factors, however, were involved in the current round of pay boosts besides the reduction in cotton costs, including a big upsurge in sales, anticipated pressure from textile unions and costs savings resulting from stepped-up mill modernization.

The big upsurge in cotton textile business results, it is believed, in large part from the revival of confidence following enactment of one-price cotton legislation. For a year or more, pending enactment of the legislation, buyers held back because they anticipated price reductions and feared inventory losses as a result of such reductions when the legislation was passed.

ANTICIPATE UNION'S MOVE

In announcing wage advances at this time, mills actually have jumped the gun since many in the industry did not expect wage increases to be put into effect until next November. Behind this quick move to boost hourly wage rates, may have been an effort on the part of mills to steal the thunder from anticipated union statements urging mills to pass along cost savings.

Most mills in the South are not unionized but a small number do have contracts with unions which are subject to reopening for negotiations on short notice. In addition, the Textile Workers Union of America (AFL–CIO) has contracts with northern textile mills which are subject to renegotiation on April 15, 1965.

Current hourly pay boosts were, in fact, announced by southern textile mills almost simultaneously with strongly worded statements by the Textile Workers Union which in effect demanded that all textile mills take prompt action to pass along cotton cost savings afforded by the new legislation.

A statement to this effect, for example, was issued by the executive council of the union at just about the same time that Harriet and Henderson Mills announced a wage boost of about 5 percent.

AIDED BY NEW EQUIPMENT

It was well known in the industry, however, that textile mills were planning for some time to advance wages late this year. In addition to the cotton savings, mills have achieved considerable cost savings from modernization. Big injections of new equipment in the industry are resulting in faster, lower cost production of yarns and fabrics. Based upon third quarter new plant and equipment expenditures, the seasonally adjusted rate of such expenditures for 1964 has reached $900 million compared to $640 million for all of 1963.

All these factors are moving the textile industry into a stronger position, as pointed out by H. W. Close, president, Springs Cotton Mills, who said that this has enabled the company to add more than $2.25 million to the paychecks of its employees.

Congressman Zablocki's Moving Address to Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on August 30, 1964, the 25th anniversary of the Nazi attack on Poland, my able colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] made a memorable address to a meeting in Kosziusko Park in Milwaukee, sponsored by the Polish-American Congress and 25 cooperating veterans groups. Because of its arresting delineation of the fight of the people of Polish ancestry for human rights both at home and in this country, I commend Representative ZABLOCKI's remarks:

"THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NAZI ATTACK ON POLAND"—REMARKS OF HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, OF WISCONSIN, TO THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, MILWAUKEE, WIS., AUGUST 30, 1964

Toastmaster Thomas Rozga, Very Rev. Father Wiktor Krzywonos, Mr. Edmund Banasikowski Judge Robert W. Hansen, Senator Richard Zaborski, Col. J. A. Dries, distinguished guests, veterans organizations, veterans auxiliaries, Gold Star Mothers, fellow Americans, at the very outset, I want to express my own deep appreciation for your kind invitation to join you in this evening's commemoration. Secondly, to convey to you President Johnson's warmest greetings and best wishes.

Then, too, just the other day, Postmaster General John Gronouski asked me to extend his deep regrets that he was unable to be with us tonight. The Postmaster General asked that I tell you he sincerely appreciates your invitation and extends his kindest regards.

It is a sad occasion which brings us together today. We have assembled here to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the attack on Poland by the Nazi war machine—and the beginning of a conflict which brought devastation to three continents, caused the death of millions of men, women, and children, and visited untold suffering upon millions of others.

Twenty-five years ago—September 1, 1939—do you recollect how the shocking news was received? How you and others reacted? If you will permit me a personal note, I wish to state that I shall never forget that date—certainly not the spontaneous, sincere, prayerful supplication of the people gathered in the churches, responding to the intonation of the majestic hymn "Boze Cos Polskie":

"Oh God who has throughout the ages bestowed upon Poland power and glory—we implore Thy help and protection."

That day I could only join with you in the fervent prayers of hope. Today—thanks to your confidence in me I have been privileged to be in a position to be of some assistance to the beleaguered people of Poland, of other Communist-dominated nations, and to many of you directly.

I know that you too have vivid recollections of September 1, 1939. Many of you had friends or relatives who were victims of the attack. Some of you had been in the very midst, on the very scene of the rape of Poland.

All of us, therefore, are motivated today to rededicate ourselves to the effort to bring freedom and human dignity to all mankind—as we commemorate the 25th anniversary of the attack on Poland.

That date—September 1, 1939—marked the beginning of an especially tragic chapter in the history of the courageous Polish nation—a chapter, I may add, which continues to this very day.

Attacked by the Nazis from the west, and by the Soviet Union from the east, Poland succumbed to the overwhelming power of the aggressors' armies. But her people never stopped fighting. For almost 6 years, her home army, and the units which managed to escape to the north, to the west, and to the south, resisted the invaders and fought valiantly on the side of the Allies.

Narvik, Tobruk, the Battle of Britain, Monte Cassino, the Warsaw uprising—these are but a few names, few places, in which the Poles fought and died for the cause of freedom during the Second World War.

The tragedy of Poland was compounded when the war finally came to an end.

Her population decimated by the horrors of the occupation and the war—her cities and farms in ruin—Poland, almost alone in this condition, was not permitted to share in the fruits of the Allied victory.

Her lands were divided—an alien regime was imposed upon her people—an Iron Curtain dropped to separate her from the West—and her hopes for freedom and justice were dashed to the ground.

That tragic chapter in Poland's history continues today.

The Communist regime, and the system of oppression which it introduced in Poland, are still in existence. The ways of the regime may have changed somewhat during the last few years, but the effects of its rule remain the same: the people of Poland continue to be deprived of their right to self-determination and of other human rights.

It is fitting, therefore, that we commemorate this anniversary and reflect upon the plight of the Polish people, here, at the foot of the statue of Thaddeus Kosciusko. For he, more than anyone else I can think of, per-

sonifies the highest ideals of Poland's national tradition of respect for the rights of men—all men.

Kosciusko devoted his entire life to this cause.

He fought for the rights of the peasants in Poland.

He fought for the rights of the colonists in America.

He suffered wounds, discomfort, privation, and long imprisonment while waging a lifelong battle for the rights of other men. Nothing could diminish his devotion to this cause. And in the final act of a generous and humanitarian heart, he gave everything that he owned in the United States—all that this grateful Nation bestowed upon him—to be used for purchasing and freeing of American slaves and helping them become useful and respected members of our society.

What a noble example we find in the life of this man, what great inspiration for the job that still remains to be done. For in our age, as in Kosciusko's time, the struggle for the rights of man goes on.

It continues in Poland, where the suffering people of that tragic land daily fight the encroachments of totalitarian communism.

It continues in many other countries, where would-be dictators, or the privileged few, strive to move ahead by trampling upon the rights of the people.

It continues even in our own homeland. And the need for men and women who will stand up for the rights of others—who will not turn away when their neighbor is being killed, or oppressed, or abused—men and women who, by defending the rights of others, will ultimately secure their own right to live in freedom and democracy—the need for such men and women is as great today as it was 200 years ago.

Who, I ask you, is better equipped to meet this need, fight this battle, than the heirs of Kosciusko?

We share in the heritage which produced him.

We have the example of his life.

And over and above, we have one very special asset: the experience and the stamina gained by living as members of a minority group in the United States.

All of us—immigrants, children and grandchildren of immigrants—have been tested in the battle which every minority group has had to wage to secure social acceptance, economic advancement, and equal rights.

As members of a group with a distinct cultural background—and, at the start, with perhaps limited or too little education, too little skill, too little ability to use the English language—we had been exposed to humiliation, at times we were called greenhorns.

We have felt the sting of being rejected by those who considered themselves culturally and socially superior.

We have experienced discrimination in employment and political exploitation.

We have felt the burning shame of being denied the opportunity to be equal in the home of democracy, the land of the free.

It was a hard school—but the lesson it taught us is at times all too quickly forgotten.

Today, Americans of Polish ancestry need not take a back seat to any citizen of our Nation. Men with names like Gronouski, Cieplinski, Muskie, Kowalski, Gorski, Kluczynski, Grabowski, Brzezinski, and others, have won national recognition and national prominence. A legion of others, men and women of Polish ancestry and bearing Polish names, occupy positions of prestige and responsibility in industry, in labor, in the professional field as doctors, dentists, lawyers, in the academic, civic, and political life of our Nation—in almost every field of human endeavor. They are accepted, and respected, even though their names may be difficult to pronounce.

Yet the battle is not over—for us, or for anyone else. And we who have gone through the hard school of social, economic and political discrimination, should be the first to recognize this fact and to do something about it.

I say, then, let those among us who have not forgotten the bitter taste of second-class rights accorded to third-class citizens, look around and take note of the job that remains to be done.

Let us remember that so long as discrimination, oppression and third-class citizenship are allowed to exist, the cause for which Kosciuszko fought and died, the cause which the Polish nation championed during the thousand years of its existence, the cause which was the very reason and the inspiration for the founding of our own great nation—that cause will not be victorious.

Therefore, let us resolve to join in the battle for the rights of men, to the end that all men and women of good will, who assume and meet their responsibilities to one society, may be secure in the enjoyment and the protection of their rights.

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude my remarks by paying tribute to an organization unique in the history of our Polonia, one that came into existence as a consequence of the events which we are commemorating today.

I refer, of course, to the Polish American Congress.

This organization was born out of the profound sympathy of Polonia for the tragic plight of Poland. It was designed to champion the rights of the Polish nation. In the past two and a half decades, the voice of the Polish American Congress has been the voice of mankind's conscience, calling for justice and freedom for Poland.

That voice must continue to be heard. And so, while paying tribute to the men and women who have founded this organization—those who have worked for it and through it for some 20 years—I want to urge: Do not let the Polish American Congress wither and die. For if it dies, a part of us, a part of our conscience, will die with it. It must survive. The Polish American Congress must live. To assist in the struggle that Poland shall not die—and Poland will not die—as long as there is life in us. Under the protection of and with the intercession of Our Lady, Queen of Poland—there is no doubt that divine providence will help our cause.

Thank you.

Buck Jenkins New VFW Commander in Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, Alabama is indeed proud that one of our fellow citizens was selected by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States as national commander in chief, during its convention in Cleveland, Ohio, on August 28, 1964. Mr. John A. "Buck" Jenkins, of Birmingham, was elevated to this high and coveted position, and I am delighted to have the privilege of inserting into the RECORD the remarks he made in acceptance of this post.

His remarks follow:

REMARKS OF JOHN A. "BUCK" JENKINS

Today you have accorded me a great honor by electing me commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. With deep humility and appreciation for the faith and confidence you have shown in me, I accept this high office.

Any words of thanks would be totally inadequate, but I pledge to you that I will express my appreciation through my actions as commander in chief. I shall give my every ounce of strength and ability to the great cause which we serve.

However, it is together we will get the job done. Our past record is proud testimony to the significant role that you, the leaders of our great organization, play. Our success or failure during the next 12 months will depend on how we as a team do our jobs. Together I am confident we will get the job done, not for individual glory, but for the cause we serve, for the United States of America and for those departed comrades whose blood and sacrifices mortar the stones of freedom.

Let us review some of the problems we face.

There are continuing attempts to dismember the Veterans' Administration; to transfer its programs to other agencies. We shall combat such destructive efforts and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs stands at our side in this struggle.

We shall continue to pursue the elusive goal of a standing committee of Veterans' Affairs in the U.S. Senate. Under the leadership of Joe Lombardo, 46 Senators signed their names to Senate proposals, calling for such a committee. This effort must not wither on the vine.

The lagging compensation rates for our disabled veterans are distressing. For several years these deserving comrades have not received an increase while Congress has granted increases to military personnel, civil service employees, social security retirees and others. We shall fight with all our vigor for an equitable increase in compensation rates.

Pensions are in much the same condition. The so-called old or part III pension program has not been increased since 1954. There has been no increase in any pension rate since 1960. There are about 2 million veterans, widows, and children, of these 1½ million World War I veterans and their widows, receiving pensions for disabilities or death not connected with military service. Many of these are existing on less than $1,200 a year, so there is an urgent and immediate need for a substantial increase in pension payments and income limitations.

Increased pension payments and limitations are only a part of the need. The law regulating entitlement to a pension for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, needs improvement.

The requirement that earned income of a working wife be counted as a part of the veteran's income should be eliminated. The expense of a burial in the immediate family should be credited in determining net income. Medical expenses should be deducted from the annual income limitation thereby increasing the pension payment. We shall urge Congress to make these corrections.

We continue to be perturbed over the failure of Congress to grant recognition of the type and length of service as a factor in fixing veteran benefits. Our bills would provide for an additional 10 percent in the pension payments for any veteran who served overseas or in combat. These are improvements we will earnestly seek this year.

We have not and will not abandon our goal of a separate pension program for our World War I comrades. But, in the meantime, and in their present need, we are seeking the improvements already mentioned which will help so many of them.

Service to veterans and their dependents is our basic objective—it is an obligation inherent in our organization and stated in our congressional charter—an obligation which we shall never neglect.

Our rehabilitation program is unequaled by any other organization. Thousands of qualified and dedicated post service officers locally assist veterans and their dependents. Expert department service officers provide skilled representation at Veterans' Administration facilities in every State. Our national rehabilitation service staff of outstanding experts provide professional representation for all veterans and dependents whose problems require consideration in the Nation's Capital. During the year ending May 31, 1964, the Veterans of Foreign Wars successfully represented 150,000 claimants in securing annual benefits of $168 million. This is a splendid record. I commend all concerned for this achievement unequaled in the annals of fraternal or veterans organizations.

Several other trends demand continued close observation and action. Nearly all of the 10,000 separate VA contact offices have been abolished. This is shortsighted economy at the cost of necessary service.

The reduction in the size of the burial flag is irritating.

The slow activation of the 2,000 nursing care beds already authorized is keenly disappointing. The inclusion of these 2,000 nursing care beds in the total 125,000-bed limitation contrary to the original directive is indeed a disappointing development. The reduction of 2,000 domiciliary beds during recent years is alarming. More disturbing is the unofficial report that the number of domiciliary beds will be further reduced by the gradual elimination of approximately 50 percent of the remaining 16,000 beds. I promise you that as commander in chief, we shall fight such cutbacks.

We are also concerned that the U.S. Civil Service Commission has sanctioned or closed its eyes to many Federal agency policies and individual actions adversely affecting veterans and dependents.

These illustrate our opposition. As the memory of war fades, the attacks on veterans benefits increase in number and intensity. These attacks are usually pointed at condemnation of benefits, particularly pensions and hospitalization for non-service-connected veterans. They always repeat the foul canard that veterans do not deserve special consideration. This Nation received the special consideration of loyalty and sacrifice from its oversea veterans in its hour of national peril; and this great Nation has historically recognized this debt. The American people demand this recognition of patriotic service.

And now a few words about another basic interest—national security.

This is of vital concern to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Our Nation must remain strong, if we falter, everything America stands for goes down the drain. All of the blood and sacrifices have been in vain.

We of the Veterans of Foreign Wars have a very experienced understanding of what must be done to insure our national survival.

First and foremost, we recognize that communism is a worldwide conspiracy with the objective of worldwide domination. We know that to accomplish this, they must destroy the United States. They have so stated. Our logic convinces us this is their objective. This atheistic and cruel conspiracy must be defeated.

To accomplish this, our Nation must be strong. Communists understand only the language of power. Our military power must be second to none. We need a truly modernized and highly mobile army; an Air Force of long-range missiles, manned bombers and high performance interceptors; a naval building program including nuclear power that will provide us the seapower to beat back the four ocean challenge of Russia's tremendous and still growing naval strength; a Marine Corps of at least 200,000 with the latest amphibious equipment.

All of this costs money. We recognize the value of economy, but we oppose false economy that would put second-rate weapons in the hands of our first-rate fighting men.

If the history of warfare teaches anything, it is that cheap weapons are the most costly—most costly in human lives and most costly in terms of national survival.

Now, let's turn to Cuba. The Kremlin's success in Cuba is the high water mark of communism. A Communist Cuba poses a continuing threat to the United States. It is a base for the exportation of Castro-type revolutions into all of Latin America. It straddles the sea lanes between North and South America. It controls the entrance to the Gulf of Mexico and the approaches to the Panama Canal.

There can be no relaxation while Cuba is communistic. The return of this former ally to the honor roll of free nations requires a resolute enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine.

While we are considering the Caribbean, let's look on our position in regard to the Panama Canal. We are in the Canal Zone under treaty as honorably arrived at as any in the history of international negotiation. If we are ever to have world peace—the rule of law—the efficacy of treaties must be rigidly observed. Aside from our self-interest, to renegotiate our treaty with Panama would seriously undermine the permanency of that as well as all other international treaties. The acceptance of the principle of renegotiation by unilateral demand destroys the sanctity of treaty and of international law.

Then, South Vietnam. If that faraway land falls under the Red yoke, all of southeast Asia will be open to Communist aggression. The great base of Singapore will be exposed; Malaysia will be outflanked; Thailand, Burma, and even the eastern flank of India will be the next Red targets. In Asia, the loss of South Vietnam would destroy our prestige. If South Vietnam falls, we lose the bottom anchor of our outer defense line in the Western Pacific; the Philippines, free China, and Okinawa would be endangered. So in the cause of freedom in Asia, and from the standpoint of self-interest, we support whatever action is necessary to win—I repeat and underscore the word win—to win in southeast Asia, freedom has no more room for retreat.

The true malevolence comes from Red China. We must anticipate the possibility of direct confrontation with this evil regime with its 600 million human slaves. If this confrontation should occur, and Heaven forbid, we must have the resolute courage to use every technological, scientific and mechanical superiority at our command. To successfully resolve such a conflict there must be no hesitation—no qualm—we must have a predetermined willingness to use our every superiority. There must be no repetition of the tragic frustration on the Yalu.

Then there is NATO. An alliance erected to resist Communist aggression against Western Europe. Here is comprehended the fairest part of the earth, the most civilized portion of mankind. Here freedom is guarded by ancient renown and disciplined valor. Here the nations which have subdued and civilized so considerable a part of mankind stand together in defense of their common freedom. If one doubts the value of NATO, let him listen to the angry roar of the bear who walks like a man. The destruction of NATO is the No. 1 objective of the Kremlin.

We know that Khrushchev's soft line, his phony handshake, and his false smile have a single objective, to lull us into a false security. It is with such hypocritical actions that the Kremlin tries to loosen the bonds that bind together NATO. They promise only to betray—they flatter only to ruin.

Some say trade with Communist countries is an extremely complex issue. We say that it is an extremely simple and wrong one. Can we trade with Russia and in good faith ask our allies not to trade with Cuba? We cannot. Can we prevent communism from destroying us by strengthening them? Of course not. Worse still is the nagging suspicion that we are in fact subsidizing the wheat sales to Russia and to that extent, giving rather than selling.

Let us not forget that Lenin prophesied that any shortcomings in transition to the Communist system could be remedied by purchases from the capitalist nations; that in our greed for profit, we would commit suicide.

With respect to trade with communism, we believe in principle over profit. Communism is out to destroy us—Khrushchev promised to bury us. Should we help him?

Our answer is "No."

And now we come to another matter of genuine seriousness concerning our national security. I refer to the plight of those who wear the uniform of our Armed Forces. While we must have the finest weapons, we know they are ineffective without thoroughly trained and experienced people to use them.

For too long, rewards for continued service—active, reserve—such as retirement benefits or benefits accruing to dependents—have not been attractive. Pay has not kept pace with industry or that of civilian Government employees. Hospitalization for dependents is under attack. Commissaries are in danger. Retirement benefits uncertain.

We of the VFW can take real satisfaction that we are fighting—and will continue to fight—for those things which the men in uniform so rightly deserve. We serve notice that we will vigorously oppose any efforts to pick the already lean pockets of our servicemen.

Up to this point I have dealt with those areas in which our national organization acts on behalf of the membership. This is one side of the coin. The other side reflects the things which you as individual members do for our organization and our Nation.

I speak of your wonderful accomplishments in the fields of community service, youth activities, Americanism, and Buddy Poppies.

These are the programs that are responsible for the continued growth and increased prestige of our organization. You have clearly established in the minds of your friends and neighbors the understanding that our interests go far beyond the narrow path of self interest. You have established through deeds, not words, your continuing interest in your community, your State, and your Nation.

It is my sincere hope that during the coming year you will increase your efforts in all of these endeavors. In so doing you will increase our prestige and hence the desirability of belonging to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

And now, let us talk about belonging to the VFW. Let us talk about membership.

Never can any of us ever forget that membership is the heart throb of our organization. It is our prestige, it is our strength, and it gets the job done. It is membership that limits the good we can accomplish.

As time passes, desire of recognition for having served our Nation overseas in time of conflict will increase. The prestige in having seen oversea service will grow. This has been true of all our past wars. The time will come when every eligible oversea veteran will want to be a member to wear his badge of honor—the Cross of Malta—emblem of oversea service in a theater of war in behalf of the United States of America.

Membership cannot be an overworked word. We must not take it lightly. All of us in the Veterans of Foreign Wars must feel an obligation to enlist every eligible veteran into our ranks, with the certain knowledge that by so doing, we will provide the Veterans of Foreign Wars with the numerical strength to accomplish its objectives.

When we adjourn here today, I hope that all of you will depart for your homes dedicated to the premise that we must continue our growth if we are to continue to serve. I know that you have the talent and ability, let us see that talent and ability reflected not only in September 1964 but also in the last 1965 membership report.

In closing, let me thank you again for giving me the privilege of serving you.

American-Hawaiian Steamship Co.

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the bill pending before the House extends for 1 other year the time within which certain construction reserve funds of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. may be committed to the construction of new vessels. We have extended this particular item I think two or three other times.

What is involved here is that the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., which lost its vessels during World War II, wanted to get back into the coastwise and intercoastal ship operations. During the time of their operations before they lost their vessels they placed into a construction reserve fund some $11 million for the construction of new vessels. The time within which the company must build or construct new ships is limited by law. Under the extensions we have heretofore provided, the present time limit is at the end of this year. The company has made application to the Maritime Administration for Government insured loans.

May I say at this point there is no subsidy involved here whatsoever, but it merely is a matter of receiving Government insured loans to be granted by private financial institutions. Applications made for loans have been timely, but the Maritime Administration asked the company to renew its application or to submit a revised application. The Department has not yet had sufficient time this year to act on it. They estimate they will act on the application sometime early next year, which will give the company time enough to ask for bids on its ships and have the money for the construction of them before the end of this following year. The Department favors the legislation and the Maritime Administration favors it. There is no opposition to this particular legislation and there never has been when we have had the bill before the House on previous occasions. This is a bill which we ought to pass to provide that the $11 million now on deposit may be committed to new ship construction.

The CIA at Bay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Bay of Pigs fiasco, the CIA has been subject to widespread criticism in the Congress. Much of that criticism has come as a result of Members of Congress not being fully apprised of the growing and farflung operations of this supersecret Agency.

A paradox has arisen around the Nation's role in the cold war. We all realize the urgency for maintaining secrecy in today's world conditions, but we are all similarly concerned with the unchecked expansion of this Agency and its apparently free privileges to spend tax dollars with little accounting to the constitutionally vested guardian of those funds, the Congress itself.

Several days ago an incident occurred which even further points up the need for solving the misunderstanding which exists between Congress and the CIA. That incident involved Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN and his investigation into the tax-exempt statuts of certain charitable foundations linked to the CIA.

In an excellent editorial, the Washington Daily News has handled the matter with perception. I urge that it be included in the RECORD at this point.

THE CIA AT BAY

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, in the course of his deep probe of tax-exempt foundations, is giving the Central Intelligence Agency some embarrassment.

The Congressman has turned up information, verified by the Internal Revenue Service, that the CIA was giving money to the J. M. Kaplan fund, a New York foundation. Or, as Mr. PATMAN put it, the Kaplan fund was used "as a conduit for channeling CIA funds."

We don't know the purpose of this indirect use of taxpayer money. And probably we don't want to know. We are not anxious to uncover the legitimately secret operations of the CIA which of necessity must be hush-hush.

But Mr. PATMAN asks why the CIA was spending tax money with a foundation which has been under intensive investigation by both his congressional subcommittee and by the IRS. When Mr. PATMAN went to CIA for an answer, he said he didn't get it.

"I feel like I've been trifled with," he said.

Two different directors of IRS have recommended that the Kaplan Foundation's tax-exempt status be revoked, and IRS is still probing.

It does not necessarily follow that whatever service the Kaplan fund provided the CIA was not worth whatever CIA paid it. But somebody (not us) ought to know.

Once again, we say Congress should set up a watchdog committee to keep tabs on CIA and all the other hush-hush agencies. The public doesn't ask what they are doing, and why. This type of system has worked very well with the Atomic Energy Commission, which is partly secret. It is even more important that there be a check on CIA and like agencies.

The more secret an agency, the more liberties it is likely to take—unless it is accountable to somebody who is accountable to the voters.

The 25th Anniversary of the Nazi Attack on Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, on September 1, 1939, the military force of the Third Reich brutally attacked Poland. On that day, there began a tragic chapter in the history of that brave, freedom-loving nation—a chapter which has seen the people of Poland subjected to more hardship, privation, and tragedy than the people of any other nation.

Attacked from both sides by the forces of Nazi Germany from the west and by those of Communist Russia from the east—Poland was overcome and subjected to an occupation whose horrors even today—some 25 years later—revolt the sensibilities of every civilized person.

Throughout World War II, the courageous people of Poland fought on the side of the Allies—both in their homeland and on other fronts. Yet when the war ended, Poland, having lost 6 million of her people—some 22 percent of her entire population—was not permitted to share in the fruits of the Allied victory.

Almost one-half of her prewar territory was, in effect, handed over to the Soviet Union; an alien system of government was gradually imposed on h er people; and an Iron Curtain rose to separate her from the free world.

In partial compensation for the loss of her eastern territories—and in recognition of the tremendous devastation visited upon her people—Poland was given administrative title to the territory located between her pre-World War II western boundary and the Oder-Neisse line. That area, together with some former German areas to the north which were also placed under Polish administration, includes some 40,000 square miles—or approximately one-third of what is known as today's Poland.

This happened almost 20 years ago.

Since that time, the character of those lands—known today as Poland's western territories—has changed completely.

The German nationals have long ago been resettled.

Polish citizens have moved in with their families and their possessions.

The destruction of the war period has been largely repaired.

Cities have been rebuilt—farms have been restored to operating condition—and Polish social, cultural, and ethnic institutions prevail.

By now, the second generation of Poles is living in those territories. They were born there. They know no other home. They belong there.

As of this day, however, their title to the lands they till, to the homes they live in, to the factories they have built and operate—in short, Poland's title to her western territories—has not been openly acknowledged by the United States.

Recalling the provisions of the Potsdam agreement—which, I may add, have been repeatedly and flagrantly violated by the Soviet Union—the Government of the United States adheres to the position that the final delimitation of the German-Polish border should await a peace settlement with Germany.

Our Government has maintained this position despite the fact that the agreement which emerged from the Crimea Conference of 1945 clearly and explicitly stated that because of the loss of her eastern lands to the Soviet Union, "Poland must receive substantial accessions of territory in the north and west."

This position of the executive branch, which probably is sound from a legalistic standpoint, has little to commend itself from the standpoints of justice, of present-day realities, or of commonsense.

It has generated apprehension of a still further partition of Poland in the hearts of her people, and it has given birth to, and sustained, a certain distrust of our intentions amnog some people in Poland.

To my mind, this official policy has not contributed materially to the attainment of the goals the United States seeks: The establishment of conditions conducive to peace, security, freedom, and justice in central Europe.

There is no doubt in my mind that the United States neither seeks, nor would condone, the taking away of Poland's territories. But we ought to make this even more clear than we have done in the past. I believe that our Government should take a forthright and realistic, rather than a legalistic, position on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the bonds of friendship which have long existed between the people of the United States and the people of Poland, dictate this course.

These same bonds of friendship, as well as our national commitment to the rights of man, also require that we pledge ourselves anew to the task of aiding the people of Poland to secure justice and freedom. To this end, we must continue our best efforts.

Letter to Representative Beckworth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received recently:

TEXAS AND SOUTHWESTERN
CATTLE RAISERS ASSOCIATION,
Brady, Tex., August 28, 1964.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LINDLEY: Thank you for your vote on H.R. 1839, the legislation placing reasonable quotas on beef, veal, and mutton imports, and for the wonderful support you have given us throughout our fight.

I trust we shall be bothering you no more this session of Congress, but look forward to seeing you again next year.

Incidentally, I was over in east Texas a few days ago and was with Bill Clements who said be sure and tell you hello.

With best regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

FRED WULFF.

The Reapportionment Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include a fine editorial from today's Washington Daily News entitled "The Reapportionment Issue." This is a clear and direct approach to the problems to which we must give our best attention. This Congress must not adjourn until this all important issue is settled.

The editorial follows:

THE REAPPORTIONMENT ISSUE

An argument that rings the bell with us in the heated debate over the Supreme Court's equal-population-basis decision for apportionment of State legislatures is:

Why should it be unconstitutional for a State legislature to be set up along lines regarded as strictly constitutional for the Federal Legislature? To wit, one house on a population basis and the other on a basis including geography.

The Supreme Court gave short shrift to this line of argument in its controversial 6-to-3 decision on June 15, holding that under the 14th amendment it is unconstitutional for either house of a State legislature to be apportioned on other than a population basis. The Court majority said the Federal-State situations were not analogous.

This decision now, of course, is the law of the land.

But there is great disagreement as shown by the strength of the Dirksen-Mansfield "breather" amendment in the Senate and by the 218-to-175 House vote last week for the Tuck bill to deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction over apportionment of State legislatures.

And just how important is the Court's decision was stated best by Justice Potter Stewart in his vigorous dissent:

"The Court's Draconian pronouncement, which makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States, finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of our Federal Union."

With the situation as chaotic as it is in many States and with the issue of such overriding importance, it seems mandatory for Congress upon its return after the Democratic Convention to pass something such as the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment. This would give Congress time at its next session to decide whether to submit to the States the proposed constitutional amendment to allow a State, if its voters approve, to set up a legislature along Federal lines—one house on a strict population basis and the other taking geography and other factors into account.

Such a constitutional amendment seems highly desirable. The States should be given some latitude on how they want to set up their legislatures.

Under the highly regarded Federal system, for example, New York with 16.5 million people has 2 U.S. Senators and Nevada with only 285,000 citizens also has 2 U.S. Senators. That's constitutional and—so far—hasn't ruined the country.

Why shouldn't it be made constitutional for the voters of California, for instance, if they so choose, to set up one house of its legislature on an other-than-population basis to keep Los Angeles County from dominating its legislature?

Congressman Abele Reports on the Poverty Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. ABELE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to place in the RECORD my latest report to the people of the 10th Congressional District of Ohio, which discusses the recent poverty bill that was before the House. I would hope that this will serve to present my thinking on this matter.

The report follows:

On August 8, 1964, the House of Representatives passed the administration's so-called war on poverty bill. This bill was officially known as the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Since that time, much has been written as to what the act is and what it will or will not do. I feel that many, perhaps unknowingly, have made an unfair appraisal of the poverty bill. This program is not to be confused with the Appalachian program.

On this legislation, as on all legislation, I gave it thorough and undivided attention. The main reason I did not commit myself to a "yes" or "no" vote in advance of the bill is because any bill can be changed on the floor of the House as part of the amending process. As a matter of fact, on this very bill the Senate version of the bill was substituted for the House version, and finally another complete version was again substituted on the floor of the House. In my legislative experience, both here and in the Ohio Legislature, I have found it wise not to commit myself to a name or a number.

Let's examine the history of this particular bill and the bill itself. The poverty bill has been labeled as Johnson's only major contribution during his administration. The original bill was H.R. 10440, introduced by Representative LANDRUM, of Georgia, on March 16, 1964. The bill was then referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor, whose chairman is the Reverend ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. The committee held a tight schedule of hearings on this bill, hearing only those witnesses that were favorable to the bill. Republican members of the committee, including BOB TAFT and BILL AYRES, of Ohio, were unable to amend the bill or even offer constructive criticism. All opportunity for debate was cutoff. After the public hearings were finished, the Democrat members met behind closed doors to change the bill. There were so many changes that the Democrats finally had to introduce an entirely new bill.

This was Johnson's bill, and he put it at the top of his "must legislation." This was also an election year bill, more concerned with buying votes than actually providing a

solution to the problem. The bill, as passed, calls for a total expenditure of $947 million in its first year of operation alone. Nobody has any real idea what it will cost in future years. However, plans are already underway to increase the size of the so-called Job Corps from 40,000 to 100,000 persons. One hundred and ninety million dollars have been earmarked for this program during the first year of operation. This figures out to about $4,700 per person. More than the cost of attending college in any of our first-rate colleges or universities in the United States.

If you would listen to the administration, you would think that the United States has never done anything to combat poverty, and that our whole country is poverty stricken. The truth is, there are 42 Federal programs which spent $31.8 billion fighting poverty in fiscal year 1964. This, of course, does not include the many millions of dollars being spent by State, local, and private organizations in the war against poverty.

There is no doubt in my mind that the primary reason for this legislation is to gain votes for Johnson and the Democratic ticket in the November election. Now let us examine some of the provisions of the bill itself.

Title I of the bill authorizes youth programs, which are known as the Job Corps, work training programs, and work study programs. As I have already pointed out, the Job Corps would cost approximately $4,700 per person. This Corps will consist of young people between the ages of 16 and 22, who are school dropouts and who are not employable. These youths will be trained in conservation and home employment, which will not permit them to obtain a usable skill once they reenter the labor market. In the meantime, the Federal Government will be paying them for attending these schools. This may encourage rather than discourage school dropouts.

Title II of the act provides for urban and rural community action programs. This part of the bill is a catchall that provides something for everyone. The provisions of the bill are not clearly spelled out and give wide discretionary powers to the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In addition, this program would overlap other Federal programs. This portion of the bill would authorize the use of Federal funds to finance any private nonprofit organization (religious or nonreligious) in activities of the community without the approval of any public agency.

Title III of the act authorizes special programs to combat poverty in rural areas. As originally written, this part of the bill would have allowed direct grants of up to $1,500 to rural families, to buy land, etc., at the discretion of the Director. It also provided for loans of $2,500 to the same family, for nonagriculture purposes. The major requirement for the programs would be that they couldn't get the money elsewhere. The final version of the bill was that only loans of $2,500 could be made to buy land, etc. However, the Director still retained the power to compromise any part or all of the loans should the person default. This amounts to a gigantic Government giveaway. Farm loan programs are already available under the Department of Agriculture, rural area development program, and various credit production associations. This amounts to a socialistic attempt to redistribute farm property by using your tax dollars. Of course, this title only authorized $50 million of your money to be given away.

Title IV of the act provides for employment and investment incentives. This program would duplicate efforts already being made to aid small business and create employment through the Small Business Administration. The chief criterion for these loans would be that the money is unavailable elsewhere. Yet the interest rates on these loans would be lower than existing interest rates. In other words, if you can't qualify for a commercial loan, the chances are the Government will take you on, even if you are a bad risk.

But the crowning achievement of the entire program is the creation of the Office of Director of Economic Opportunity. This job has been variously described as being that of a "Poverty Czar" or the "General of the Poor Corps." In this one man is lodged the responsibility of carrying on the many programs under this act. He would be a superbureaucrat who would have authority over many members of the Cabinet. Never, in peacetime, has any man, other than the President, been given so much authority and responsibility.

He will have wide discretionary powers that can only be checked by the Governor of each State before certain programs can be started in that State. The Governor may exercise this veto right without giving any reasons. Afterwards, the director remains virtually a law unto himself.

I want you, the people of the 10th Congressional District, to know that as long as I am your Congressman I will not be pressured into voting for or against any matter, which is against my principles and against the principles of good government.

Very sincerely yours,

HOMER E. ABELE.

Let Protest Be Heard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, interest increases and concern mounts concerning the series of Supreme Court decisions handed down on June 15, 1964, nullifying constitutional provisions on apportionment of several States of the Union, including Ohio.

It clearly appears that unless the Congress, or three-fourths of the legislatures of the 50 States, acts to stay or nullify such decisions of the Supreme Court, constitutional provisions of well over 40 of the States will be stricken down and completely nullified by such Supreme Court decisions.

I might add that the provisions of the Ohio constitution which were stricken down on that fateful day had been approved by popular vote of the people of Ohio by a vote of more than 29 to 1.

The Lorain, Ohio, Journal of June 27, 1964, in its lead editorial had much of interest to say about legislative apportionment. I commend it to people everywhere who are interested in the constitutional crisis which has resulted from such decisions.

The editorial follows:

LET PROTEST BE HEARD

"I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

The basic concept on which the Government of the United States was founded is being altered, and the American people, bogged down in a morass of complacency, are doing little more about it than to raise a murmur of protest.

Destruction of one of the main foundation stones supporting our governmental structure will be the eventual—and inevitable—result of the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court requiring that both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned only according to population. Only by the adoption of a constitutional amendment to nullify the decision can our system of representation based on population and geographical units be preserved.

If we seem to belabor the subject, it is because we hope by our editorial voice to help swell the protest against the decision from a murmur to a resounding shout reverberating in all parts of the Nation.

Much of the confusion over the merit of the apportionment decision springs from the seeming rightness and righteousness of a policy described by the catch phrase, "One man—one vote." The idea is that every citizen's vote should have equal value. Most Americans are quick to accept this as a logical argument against geographical apportionment, without stopping to think that this Nation and the States which comprise it have always had such apportionment.

The original purpose, which is as important today as at the beginning, was to preserve the value of each citizen's vote by a system of checks and balances.

After all, a vote is of scant actual value if the voter has no means of slowing down decisionmaking by the majority during a moment of crowd hysteria. In the long run, after the citizenry has heard sensible debates and has had time for sober second thoughts, the majority should rule—and it does.

Yet today many persons, enamored of the phrase "One man—one vote," are prepared to surrender the system under which this Nation has prospered and grown powerful.

We noted today the comment of a newspaper colleague in another community concerning the so-called minority control of the Ohio House of Representatives. He concluded his editorial by stating:

"Even so, it is a jolt to know that the controlling votes in the house could in theory represent only 28 percent of the State's population. A change is coming. It seems overdue."

This can be considered a shock only if one assumes that the people of the small counties of Ohio are the bitter foes of the people of the big counties. If such an assumption is valid—which it isn't—then it must also be accepted that the people of little States are the bitter foes of the big States.

This line of reasoning led us to this question: What percentage of the votes could in theory control that august and powerful body, the Senate of the United States? Getting the answer required delving into figures and mathematics, a miserable chore for most editorial writers, this one included. But the final result proved interesting.

Starting with the indisputable fact that the Senators of 26 States, if they all voted together, could control the Senate, we then began checking population figures. Using the 1960 census, we noted that 16 States are less than a million in population and that 6 are between 1 million and 2 million. To these we added 4 States topping 2 million.

These 26 States have a population of 29,624,902 out of a total population of 179,323,175. Since each State, regardless of size, has 2 Senators, the 26 States have a total of 52 and the other 24 States have only 48.

This means, as we compute it, that 16.52 percent of the Nation's population could in theory control the U.S. Senate.

Once the one-man, one-vote ideology is accepted at face value, no logical course remains open except to push for a change in apportionment of the U.S. Senate. Even the Supreme Court will feel the pressure to rid itself of its present fish-and-fowl decision.

The Court has its role as a final arbiter, and we are not advocating a change in that. But even when the final arbiter makes a mistake, there is a means of correction by the Court of Last Resort—the people of the United States.

By the will of the people exercised through our representative government, a constitutional amendment can be adopted to establish fair and acceptable apportionment guidelines which will preserve our traditional form of government.

Charlotte Sue Perry: My Solution to the School Dropout Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, recently during the World Teen Fair held at the Orange County, Calif., Fairgrounds as a feature of the Orange County Diamond Jubilee, a teenage essay contest was held on "How To Solve the Dropout Problem."

The contest was sponsored by station KRLA and World Teen Fair. The essays were judged by educators from the University of Southern California, the University of California at Los Angeles, and other top educational institutions.

I was very happy to learn that Charlotte Sue Perry, a student at John Marshall Junior High School, of Pomona, located in the 24th Congressional District which it is my privilege to represent, placed 4th in the contest.

Charlotte's essay is thoughtful and well written and is of especial interest because it presents the viewpoint of the age group most personally involved in this serious school problem. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit her essay for inclusion in the RECORD:

MY SOLUTION TO THE SCHOOL DROPOUT PROBLEM

School dropouts, in my opinion, are caused more by the problems and difficulties at home and lack of understanding at school than by any lack of intelligence. You almost have to go way back to preschool for the answers to the high school dropout problem. Psychologists pretty well agree that our first 5 years of life are very important in starting us on the right track.

Many kids are handicapped right from the start by the fact that their home life has been void of books, music, or any emphasis on exploring the five senses. There are other handicaps.

In my kindergarten class, there were some children who spoke no English—only Spanish. The teacher spoke only English, which, needless to say, created a problem for them. Naturally these children could not be expected to achieve at the same rate, yet often they were given no additional help. As we progressed through grade school, all different levels of learning ability became apparent. Some of these differences were due of course to natural ability, but many of the kids who seemingly couldn't learn the basic tools of reading, writing, and arithmetic were simply being shortchanged at home by parents who either didn't know how, didn't care enough, or were too emotionally disturbed to take the proper interest in their children's education. These kids needed extra help and encouragement at school to compensate for their environment.

When I was in the sixth grade, the teacher let me spend an hour a day giving help to a boy and girl who were poor readers. The girl is now doing very well in junior high, and the boy has shown improvement. If that sixth grade teacher hadn't realized that their problems at home entitled them to a little extra help, they very well may have been dropouts in a few years.

For there comes a point of no return where lack of reading skill has caused so much failure and frustration, that these kids give up even trying. They sit and mark time until their 16th birthday releases them.

What I have learned from all this is that students must learn to read well by the time they are through grade school or else they stand little chance of mastering more advanced work. You can't build without first laying a foundation. Reading is the key that opens the world of knowledge and achievement. Almost everyone possesses the intelligence to learn to read so the teachers must see to it that they do.

I'm certain that if the elementary schools made sure that every child capable of learning, did learn the basic tools despite the differences in abilities or home life—the high school dropouts would decrease drastically.

Statement in Support of H.R. 8290, To Authorize the Secretary of the Interior To Accept Certain Lands for Everglades National Park, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to state my support for H.R. 8290, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept certain lands as part of the Everglades National Park, Fla. This legislation, which has now passed the House, will not only enhance one of Florida's major assets, but will be of benefit to Floridians as well as the many Americans who visit Florida each year.

And it is a particular pleasure to me to be among the supporters of this bill because a companion bill to it, S. 2082, was introduced and passed in the Senate by our distinguished senior Senator from Florida, Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND.

Senator HOLLAND has long been concerned with the growth and development of the Everglades National Park, and it is among the many tangible attractions in Florida which bear his touch.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board of independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Los Angeles Bunker Hill Urban Renewal Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, an announcement has been made that the first building in the Bunker Hill urban renewal project in Los Angeles, located all within my district, will soon be started. This will be a 40-story, $30 million office building, to be built by the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.

I represented this area located in the heart of the city of Los Angeles, between the downtown district and the civic center for over 13 years. As a Los Angeles City councilman I played an important part in supporting the rights of property owners and residents in their negotiations, in favor of fair appraisals of their property and the orderly and proper relocation of the residents.

When the entire 136-acre parcel is redeveloped, it will represent over $500 million of new construction and will certainly be an example of the partnership between private industry and government from which a new complex of residential and business buildings, all of substantial economic and esthetic value to the city, will emerge.

On the occasion of the announcement of the Connecticut General firm's participation in the project, Mr. Frazar B. Wilde, chairman of the board of that company, made the following statement.

I would like to have the text of Mr. Wilde's statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because it sets out clearly how a part of the private sector of our economy views urban renewal, and it touches on some of the factors which lead to private enterprise participation in the federally aided urban renewel program.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON BUNKER HILL SQUARE BY FRAZAR B. WILDE, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, CONNECTICUT GENERAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.

It is natural that an investor looking for unusual opportunities should turn to California. The record of population and economic growth, alone, for the entire State and for Los Angeles, is in many ways unparalled. For example, within the past year your estimates indicate that California has now become the most populous State in the Union, with 60 percent of the population living below the Los Angeles mountain range. This underscores your growth in numbers and in diversity of activity.

This rapid growth in population is due in large part to the influx daily of hundreds of new residents, many of them attracted by job opportunities and the favorable climate. While these immigrants include many retirees whose capital benefits the economy of this State, the majority of new residents are young, energetic, and competent—the types of people who have endowed your State with a unique character throughout its history.

Those of us from the East are especially impressed with the way Californians continuously seek out and embrace new ideas and opportunities. Your creativity is translated in a wide range of activities, from the most commercial to the highly intellectual. Particularly praiseworthy are the scientific and intellectual achievements of your schools and universities and of the private organizations which foster important research and study into diverse fields. From the investor's viewpoint, this kind of stimulating atmosphere, stemming from the initiative and competency of your people, inspires confidence.

One of the most unusual aspects of Los Angeles is the pattern of your physical growth. Los Angeles has spread out more than most major cities. Tall buildings are the exception even in the downtown region. Centers of business activity have proliferated from the core of Los Angeles and now cover a wide area.

The freeways which web your city together are dramatic evidence that Los Angeles relies on the automobile perhaps more than any other metropolitan region in the Nation. With nearly 25 percent more automobiles in Greater Los Angeles than we have people in the State of Connecticut, there is no question that mobility is a crucial factor in the economic and social life of this area. An efficient and flexible system of highways is only part of the answer, however. A comprehensive mass transportation system is an equally pressing consideration for a metropolitan region such as this.

The new Los Angeles Civic Center, which will be the largest planned concentration of public buildings outside of Washington, is a testimony to the belief of an influential body of civic and business people that downtown Los Angeles will continue to be the hub of activity. And the plan for Bunker Hill, adjacent to the civic center, is a key development in the resurgence of this downtown area.

Because of the nature of the business, an insurance company must be especially careful that its investment programs protect the interests of its policyholders and at the same time provide an attractive return. While we obviously emphasize soundness in our investment planning, we try to be alert to new and unusual investment approaches which will be both successful and profitable. We feel this investment accomplishes both objectives.

Specifically, we are talking about a $30 million investment in a segment of the Bunker Hill urban redevelopment program. To be known as Bunker Hill Square, this project will include the tallest building in southern California, a 40-story tower, situated on a landscaped plaza with reflecting pools and plantings. We are excited about the plans which are being developed. We think you will be, too, when they are described in more detail shortly.

These three prime factors, then-continued growth in people, ideas, and activity; the need for mobility; and a definite indication that downtown Los Angeles was the specific area for concentrated urban development—influenced our decision to make this investment. We were particularly anxious that any major investment involving new construction should result in a building which will fill an important need. Here, we felt that a building of unusual beauty and quality—a prestige building in a convenient location—would be a fitting complement to the current plans for the redevelopment of Los Angeles. With effective use of space and ready access to and from the freeways, a new development such as this should fast become an important activity center.

Our interest in this project was sparked not only by the attractive investment potential of this particular area, but also by the opportunity to join forces with the winning team of Galbreath-Ruffin. They and their associates—architects and builders—have lent their talents and their abilities to similar urban development projects in other cities throughout the country. Their past successes bode well for the future of this project.

The prime responsibility for the success of a redevelopment program of this scope and quality lies with the people of Los Angeles. We can demonstrate our confidence in the potential of an investment such as this by our willingness to underwrite a key segment of the program and to see that standards of exceptional quality are maintained. But whether this project or related ones which follow it, shall accomplish their main objective of adding strength and vitality to this city will depend on the support of many people.

Increasingly, our major metropolitan regions have recognized the need for an effective downtown area as the heart and core of their cities. Perhaps a decade ago there was less care devoted to the development of a strong downtown center and more emphasis on widespread development. Today, the two are considered essential to the strength and growth of a metropolitan area and its economy.

If Los Angeles is to have a unified and effective downtown center, considerable dedication to the program and some reorientation of business planning will be necessary. Experience in other areas of the country indicates that with the necessary planning and support the rehabilitation of a downtown area can be an orderly process. You have already demonstrated your interest in this direction by your support of the civic center.

The redevelopment of Bunker Hill presents a major opportunity to realize the potentials of an effective downtown for which the civic center has already set the foundations. These are indications that Los Angeles is on the threshold of an important step in its historical development. We are pleased to be a part of it.

Public Service by Retired Peace Corps Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BIRCH E. BAYH
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, all of us have marveled at the fine work done

around the world by members of the Peace Corps. Hundreds of volunteers have now returned to the United States, to resume their careers. Many, however, are continuing to devote their lives to humanitarian public service. An outstanding example of this is work being done here in Washington by a retired volunteer who now is working as an Eleanor Roosevelt National Foundation Human Rights intern. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the August 14 Washington Post, describing the work of Mr. Ken Rashid as an Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation intern, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 14, 1964]

INTERN REPORTS: CONCERTS SOOTHE TENSION

(By Dorothy McCardle)

A young man with Arab ancestry and Roman Catholic faith is now battling for the rights of the Jews and Negroes.

Kenneth R. Rashid, who was formerly with the Peace Corps and is now here working with the Howard University Neighborhood Council, had a story to tell yesterday which is typical of the report of accomplishments made by his fellow Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation Human Rights Interns.

Rashid was one of seven such interns to report on their work in inter-group relationships to Orin Lehman, executive director of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, who had come from New York.

The interns have completed the first half of the year's work in bettering relations between racial groups. Five have been in Washington, two in Philadelphia, and all are enthusiastic.

Rashid has been especially successful in helping to promote a series of Sunday night open air concerts at Meridian Hill. Some 17 concerts have been given this summer, drawing crowds of 3,000 to 5,000 people a night, he said. They represented many races and the whole economic spectrum.

Rashid and other interns agreed that the work in behalf of better inter-racial human relations fulfills a dream of retiring Peace Corpsmen.

"Many returning members of the Peace Corps are searching for meaningful tasks in this country," said Rashid. "Their experience in inter-group relations abroad can be of great value in the United States."

Other interns who reported were Mark L. Alter, who is interning with the D.C. Commissioner's Council on Human Relations, Martin E. Henner, who is with the American Jewish Committee in Philadelphia, Doris Jordan, with Neighbors, Inc., Amy W. Paige, with the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Eugene Solon, with the Industrial Union Department of AFL–CIO, and Marv Zommick, of the Urban League of Philadelphia.

Book Entitled "2,121 Funny Stories and How To Tell Them," Written by Mr. Winston K. Pendleton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I know that many times we, as Members of Congress, are in need of wholesome anecdotes to use as we make our public appearances in our home districts and throughout the Nation. I have been intrigued with the shortage of books that are available to help us with this problem. Last year several of my constituents wrote me and asked if I could recommend to them certain books of anecdotes. The list was very inadequate and it was not until just this past week that I found a book that fits the bill. The title of the book is "2,121 Funny Stories and How To Tell Them." It was written and edited, I must say frankly, by a longtime friend of mine, a fellow Floridian and my favorite story teller, Mr. Winston K. Pendleton. Pendleton is one of this country's best known afterdinner humorists and he has been collecting and telling stories most of his life.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is proper and ethical for me to call attention to this book because it deals with an important aspect of our American heritage. It is a book of humor and, as such, commends itself as a most wholesome example of this facet of our national culture.

I appreciate a funny story, I believe, as much as any of my colleagues, whether I am telling it or listening to it, whenever the story fits the occasion. Win Pendleton's book is filled with good stories. They are listed by subject like a dictionary and are carefully cross-referenced. His section on "how to tell" a funny story gives some valuable pointers that will help anyone become a better storyteller. Anyone who is a public speaker, and I believe that each of my colleagues is a gifted one, can profit from the wealth of humor in this book.

The book "2,121 Funny Stories and How To Tell Them" is published by the Bethany Press, St. Louis, Mo., and I am sure copies are available in most bookstores.

Mrs. Katharine Graham, Distinguished Guest of the President, First Lady of the Press, on Trip From Atlantic City to Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mrs. Katharine Meyer Graham, described in a recent Associated Press article as America's first lady of the press, was a guest on Friday, August 28, of President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, on a trip to Texas.

It was my privilege also to accompany the President and the Vice Presidential nominee of the Democratic Party, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, on this flight of Air Force 1 from Atlantic City, N.J., to Austin, Tex.

Mrs. Graham was warmly received by the people of our State, and we in Texas were honored by her visit. An article published in the Dallas News of Thursday, August 13, 1964, illustrates the high regard in which she is held throughout the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the article, by Arthur Edson, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Dallas Morning News of Aug. 13, 1964]

KAY GRAHAM: HEADS PUBLISHING EMPIRE

(By Arthur Edson)

WASHINGTON.—In the office of almost any other metropolitan publisher it would be preposterous. But visitors waiting for the president of the Washington Post may employ their time by studying gay swatches of decorator fabrics placed there on a table.

With Katharine Meyer Graham, America's first lady of the press, this seems precisely right.

"I was never wild for a career," she says.

And along with comments on great men and great affairs, she sprinkles her conversation with such womanly concerns as explaining how she would like to be home each day to welcome the children from school.

Recently politicians appear to have rediscovered women, who now get Government jobs of increased responsibility. So it's fitting that Kay Graham should preside over a communications empire larger than any ever headed by a woman.

True, it's not in the same league with a Hearst or Beaverbrook group. But, in addition to the Post, the company owns Newsweek magazine, Art News magazine, one radio and two television stations, an interest in a Nova Scotia paper company and, with the Los Angeles Times, a news service to 62 clients here and abroad.

Highly diversified holdings, Mrs. Graham points out, present highly diversified problems. She commutes between the Nation's Capital and New York to wrest with them.

Mrs. Graham's responsibility came shockingly, sickeningly, with the death of her husband, Philip L. Graham, a year ago.

Housewife, mother of three sons and one daughter, volunteer worker for Washington's needy children, Mrs. Graham had to shore up her shattered personal world and take command of a complex business.

This would seem to call for courage, but Kay Graham says simply:

"I had no other choice."

Fortunately, she was not entirely unprepared.

Her father, Eugene Meyer, banker and Government executive, had bought the Post in 1933, her husband had been with the paper since 1946, and both discussed with her the joys and troubles of an expanding business.

Her mother, Agnes Ernst Meyer, has been a lecturer, writer, literary critic, authority on Chinese art and a vigilant defender and pepper-upper of a hundred causes.

Katherine Meyer was born June 16, 1917, in New York City, but her family moved here when she was 6 months old.

Kay went to Vassar, transferred to, and was graduated from, the University of Chicago, spent a short time as a $21-a-week reporter for the San Francisco News, and for 6 years worked in the Sunday circulation and editorials departments of the Post. She has known most of its key people for years.

Yet one gets the idea in talking with her that she still may be a bit awed by the editorial processes, although not so awed that she doesn't go about her job manfully while asking questions womanfully.

While she reads, she wonders.

"You may have a doubt about this," she says, "and you may ask: 'Haven't we gone overboard on something? And why?' "

Tall, vivacious and enthusiastic, Mrs. Graham has a manner and can be both refreshing and disconcerting. When asked a question, she ponders it, as if it really deserves an honest and fresh answer, most unusual in a city where answers tend to be stereotyped or evasive or both.

Mrs. Graham goes along gamely with an inside joke: When Managing Editor Alfred Friendly finds one of her suggestions particularly helpful, he gives her a "Brenda Starr Award," a reference to a whirlwind girl reporter in a comic strip appearing in the Post.

On Tuesdays and Wednesdays Mrs. Graham is in New York for Newsweek editorial conferences. On Mondays and Thursdays there are meetings here, including lunch with famous guests and the editorial staff.

"One week it may be all South American," she says. "Then we had Gen. Maxwell Taylor before he left. Vietnam week, obviously."

Friday, big bonus: No scheduled meetings.

All three Washington papers—the Evening Star, the Daily News, and the Post—face a unique situation. It's one thing to comment on national affairs from afar; it's something else to goad the animals while sitting inside the cage.

The Post is a morning newspaper, so a Congressman upset by an editorial or a cartoon or a column or a news story can be fighting mad by the time the House and Senate open.

Vituperation statistics aren't kept, but the guess is that no other newspaper is scolded so regularly and so heartily, even though it usually is high on any rating of the Nation's top newspapers.

She says she wants the news account to be fair.

"If we are not going to be fair," she asks, "what are we here for?"

Well, she's been on the new job for a year—how does she find it now?

Her answer was most ladylike:

"I'm amazed at how much I like it. I adore it. I love most of the things you spend your days doing."

A reporter said he had always supposed the management end of the news business would be dull.

"It isn't," Mrs. Graham said. "I promise you."

She confesses one disastrous failure.

"I'm not a great sports expert," she says, even though once when the local baseball franchise was endangered she owned one-tenth of the lowly Washington Senators.

"The children would come in with some comment like: 'Your team has really done it again. What a trade.' "

Publisher Graham laughed at the memory of Graham, baseball baroness.

"There are gaps in my learning," she said. "Here's a total gap."

St. Louis Radio Station KXLW and the School Dropout

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

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we often hear of the activities of the Federal agencies in attempting to cure some of the serious problems of our times. We only rarely hear of the efforts of private individuals and interests in combating some of these social ills. Recently, one such effort was brought to my attention, and I would like to call it to the consideration of my colleagues. Radio station KXLW in St. Louis, Mo., placed a brief announcement on the air stating that the president of the radio station, Mr. Richard J. Miller, would like to send a personal letter to each boy and girl who was contemplating dropping out of school. Since June 18, when the announcement was first made, Mr. Miller has received over 570 requests for the letter.

I think that this is an example of commendable public interest in trying to combat one of the most serious problems of our generation. Under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD at this point a copy of the letter sent by Mr. Miller to these potential school dropouts along with one radio announcement of solicitation:

RADIO STATION, KXLW,
St. Louis, Mo.

To: Everyone thinking of becoming a "dropout."

Do you know the reasons many "dropouts" give when asked why they quit school? They say "They are tired of being treated as a child and they want to be grown up."

I recognize that a fierce desire to play an adult role comes earlier to American youth today than in the past. I'm not sure I know all the reasons for the change, but I think that you would agree that many young people of high school age resent being kept in the status of pupilhood because they equate it with childhood, dependence, and inhibition of freedom. There is abundant evidence that there is restlessness on the part of our adults-to-be during their pupil stage. They want to be adults and they want to be treated as adults.

Now, I'll take a deep breath and plunge boldly into my theme: the phrase "He quit school and went to look for work," just isn't the adult thing to do, it is the childish thing to do. From the point of view of the labor market alone we just can't "afford" to have more people looking for jobs. There are now three-quarters of a million unemployed between the ages of 16 and 21. Moreover the decrease in the number of available unskilled jobs suggests that insufficient education will not enable one to get and hold the job he or she wants. Furthermore education provides more than just vocational preparation, it provides development for the cultural growth of the young person and aids in the search for his identity. So don't be a fool, education is a tool, don't drop out of school.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD J. MILLER,
President.

SCHOOL DROPOUTS

This is Oznathylee Walker, your KXLW News and special features director with a very important announcement for any boy or girl who is thinking about becoming a dropout.

Mr. Richard Miller, president of KXLW, wants to send you a personal and confidential letter on this subject, and I urge you to receive and read Mr. Miller's letter before you make your decision on dropping out of school.

Remember, this personal letter to you could change the course of your life, so you owe it to yourself and your community to read Mr. Miller's letter. Mothers and fathers can send for a copy for their son or daughter. Anyone who knows someone who is thinking of dropping out of school should send for a copy of Richard Miller's dropout letter. For a copy write Dropout Letter, KXLW the big K–13, St. Louis, Mo., 63144.

The Oklahoma State University Ethiopian Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be acquainted with Dr. Luther H. Brannon, who served for 7 years as extension director of the Oklahoma State University Ethiopian program. He now serves as the full director of this program undertaken by Oklahoma State University in conjunction with the Agency for International Development.

I recently received a letter from Dr. Brannon, who is now in Ethiopia, in which he expressed his gratitude to the Congress for its support of the program with which he is connected.

I am sure all Members will be interested in reading the following excerpt from his letter, as it records the impressions of an on-the-scene witness, over a period of years, of one of our AID programs:

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, July 16, 1964.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALBERT: The educational efforts of OSU in Ethiopia that began in 1952 as a result of Dr. Bennett's visits have produced results of inestimable value. It was my very great privilege to be a member of the original group that arrived here shortly after the signing of the agreement. Our first challenge was to select some 80 students for secondary school training from more than 500 nondescript applicants. Today, some 12 years later, I am seeing these timid, frightened youngsters as well-trained professional men—after secondary school training, 4 years at the Ethiopian College of Agriculture, and specialized training at the graduate level at U.S. universities. I visited an experiment station last week that is staffed by Ethiopians who received their basic training from OSU faculty members. The breadth and scope of work at this station will compare favorably with any I have seen.

It is really a great source of satisfaction to return and observe the changes that have been brought about through a planned program of agricultural education. There is no shortcut or crash program that can substitute for education in achieving economic development. The former students are now assuming positions of importance; they are friends of the United States in a very real sense and this will pay dividends in years to come. In my opinion, the infinitesimal percentage of foreign aid appropriations that has gone for technical assistance will bring returns far out of proportion to the money so spent. Oklahoma can truly be proud of the contribution it has made to the cause of world understanding and world peace.

It is certainly hoped that ere long your schedule will permit you to visit this operation to see, firsthand, the program that is underway. Since I have been away for so long and cannot claim personal credit for the accomplishments, I feel perfectly free to indulge in a little bragging. Meanwhile, may I extend best wishes and kindest personal regards to you, your family, and staff.

Sincerely,

LUTHER H. BRANNON,
Director, OSU Ethiopian Program.

General Motors Commended for Expansion of General Motors Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important and rewarding investments which individuals or corporations in the United States as well as our Government, States, and communities can make today is in education, for it is essential that America's youth be properly trained for the tasks ahead in a highly complex technological age. It is particularly encouraging to note that General Motors Corp., which has invested heavily to expand its manufacturing facilities, is also increasing its financial support of the General Motors Institute, a baccalaureate degree-granting college accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, which General Motors has sponsored since 1926. Today about 2,500 students are enrolled at GMI, working for bachelor's degrees in mechanical, industrial, and electrical engineering. The General Motors' press release which follows was issued August 18, 1964, and gives additional relevant information:

FLINT, MICH.—Two major construction projects, the first stage in a new long-range campus development program at General Motors Institute, were announced today by Dr. Harold P. Rodes, president.

Construction will begin next spring on a four-floor student activities and conference building, and also a men's residence hall that will house approximately 400 first-year students. Construction bids will be requested early in 1965 and both buildings are scheduled for completion in time for the 1966 fall semester, Dr. Rodes said.

The extensive GMI campus expansion will take place on a 34-acre tract which General Motors purchased from the Hasselbring estate last year—south of Third Avenue and west of Chevrolet Avenue (across the street and directly south of the present campus).

"The new student center and the men's residence hall will incorporate many of the latest architectural principles and design ideas," the GMI president explained. "However, certain features—such as exposed red brick in patios and in the structures themselves—will relate them to our existing buildings, so that the total impression will be one of unity."

The four floors in the student activities and conference building will cover approximately 175,000 square feet. It will serve as a focal point for student activities and include recreational facilities not available in existing GMI buildings. Food service will be provided in a modern cafeteria and dining rooms, including an area for GMI faculty.

The upper floors in this building will consist of classrooms and living quarters for personnel attending GMI management training programs. A large multipurpose room is also to be provided which can be used for banquets and social events.

"Transfer of student relations offices and food services to the new building," Dr. Rodes pointed out, "will make space available in our existing buildings for additional laboratories, classrooms, and faculty offices."

The men's residence hall, to be located just southwest of the student center, will be the first dormitory constructed on the GMI campus. Previously, all students have lived in rooming houses or in fraternities.

"We believe the new residence hall for freshmen will strengthen our academic program by providing more uniform housing for first-year men," Dr. Rodes said. "They will also have GMI upper class student advisers available to them for counseling and tutorial assistance with their courses.

"The student activities center and the men's residence hall were the two most needed buildings at this time," he continued. "Their construction represents the first stage in a master plan for development of the GMI campus. Completion of this program will enable us to meet the continually increasing demand for engineering education, as well as for management development and specialized technical training, geared to the needs of General Motors."

Since the institute is in operation the year around, both of the new buildings will be fully air conditioned. Attractive landscaping is included in the construction project.

Tarapata-MacMahon Associates, Inc., Bloomfield Hills, Mich., are architects for the GMI master development plan and the first two buildings. The architects have been working with the Argonaut Realty Division of General Motors as well as the GMI Board of Regents and appropriate staff members, Dr. Rodes said.

(GMI was established as an evening school by an association of Flint factory employees in 1919. Since General Motors assumed sponsorship of the school in 1926, its programs and facilities have been steadily expanded and its enrollment has increased to approximately 2,500 engineering students. In addition, GMI has approximately 10,000 General Motors employees enrolled each year in resident programs covering management and specialized technical training.

(Over the years there have been eight major additions to the original structure that was built in 1927. These have provided a total of 300,000 square feet devoted to outstanding classroom and laboratory facilities for undergraduate engineering education. The institute has, for some years, been accredited as a baccalaureate degree-granting college by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Those successfully completing the 5-year GMI cooperative course are awarded bachelor's degrees in mechanical, industrial, or electrical engineering.)

Old Places—New Faces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Mattye C. McCall of Fulton, Mo., has written a song dedicated to the election of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

Mrs. McCall is an outstanding Republican and I know the words she has written reflect the hopes of millions of Americans.

The song follows:

OLD PLACES—NEW FACES

(Played to tune: "I'll Be Seeing You," Liberace's theme song)

(Lyric by Mattye C. McCall)

We'll be seeing you
In all the old familiar places
After you have won tough races
And are through.
In the house off 16th Street
Lafayette Park across the way
On Capitol Hill new faces you'll meet
Or to Senate office you may stray.
We'll be seeing you
When fall covers lawns with heavy dew
In every function bright and gay
We'll always think of you that way.
We'll find you in the morning sun
And when the day is done
We'll be looking at you
But thanking God that you won.

Results of a Public Opinion Survey Taken in North Carolina's Eighth Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the results of a public opinion survey I have taken this year in North Carolina's Eighth Congressional District. I have been circulating questionnaires in my district for years but the returns this year far exceeded those of previous years, thus indicating an increasing interest among my constituents in taking advantage of the opportunity to inform their Congressman of their views on some of the issues of the day.

This year 14,938, or approximately 16 percent of the questionnaires mailed out, were returned. I am informed by colleagues who also circulate questionnaires that this percentage of return is quite high, and am highly gratified that so many of my constituents responded. I like to keep up with the thinking of the people down home and the use of a questionnaire is one of the best methods of doing so.

Tabulation of the answers was made by Data Management, Inc., of Washington, D.C., by use of data processing equipment. The results are quite interesting and I believe representative of the views of the voters of the district. The full tabulation will follow but I would like to call specific attention to some of the results.

For example, while 47 percent of those who answered the question indicated approval of the sale of wheat to Russia, only 4.4 percent said they would favor doing so on credit; 76.8 percent said they would approve a Federal income tax credit or deduction for all or part of college expenses; and 37.2 percent would extend the credit or deduction to any taxpayer who pays the expenses of a student—dependent or otherwise; 90.3 percent feel that the national debt is high enough already and oppose increased Government spending if it would require borrowing additional money—which is substantial opposition to further deficit financing, and was pleasing to me since I have long advocated curtailing the national debt during periods of prosperity. Incidentally, when the question-

naire was prepared earlier in the year the national debt was $310 billion, but by August 25 it had climbed to $314 billion.

To continue, 70.1 percent expressed opposition to increasing the pay of Members of Congress and other officials and employees of the Government. This vindicates my "no" vote on that bill. While some salary and pay adjustments are in order, I could not justify voting to increase the pay of Members of Congress by $7,500 at one time.

Only 13.9 percent expressed the feeling that our country's foreign policy is succeeding, while 77.3 percent answered in the negative and 8.8 percent did not respond to that question.

Following are the questions propounded and the answers by numbers and percentages:

1. (a) Do you approve this country selling wheat to Russia?

Yes (47.2 percent)	7,048
No (50.3 percent)	7,517
No answer (2.5 percent)	383

(b) If you have answered yes, would you favor extending credit to Russia to finance such purchases?

Yes (4.4 percent)	653
No (57 percent)	8,510
No answer (38.6 percent)	5,775

2. Would you approve a constitutional amendment making prayer and Bible reading permissible in the public schools when conducted on a voluntary basis?

Yes (91.2 percent)	13,627
No (7.2 percent)	1,079
No answer (1.6 percent)	232

3. Do you favor the Civil Rights Act under consideration by Congress?

Yes (16.1 percent)	2,400
No (76.7 percent)	11,450
No answer (7.2 percent)	1,088

4. Do you believe private and parochial schools should be included in any programs of Federal aid to education?

Yes (14.3 percent)	2,129
No (81 percent)	12,230
No answer (3.8 percent)	579

5. Would you approve a Federal income tax credit or deduction for all or part of college expenses?

Yes (76.8 percent)	11,472
No (20.1 percent)	2,996
No answer (3.1 percent)	470

6. (a) Would you favor a credit against the tax?

Yes (17.9 percent)	2,680
No (14.9 percent)	2,226
No answer (67 percent)	10,032

(b) Would you limit it to a deduction?

Yes (52.9 percent)	7,906
No (5.2 percent)	770
No answer (41.9 percent)	6,262

(c) Would you limit it (credit or deduction) to a taxpayer who pays college expenses of a dependent?

Yes (41.3 percent)	6,176
No (11.8 percent)	1,767
No answer (46.9 percent)	6,995

(d) Would you extend it (credit or deduction) to a taxpayer who pays college expenses of a student who is not a dependent?

Yes (37.2 percent)	5,561
No (18.1 percent)	2,698
No answer (44.7 percent)	6,679

7. The national debt of the United States is now approximately $310 billion. Under existing circumstances, do you favor increasing Federal spending above current levels even if it requires additional borrowing?

Yes (6.2 percent)	928
No (90.3 percent)	13,491
No answer (3.5 percent)	519

8. Do you favor a pay raise for Government employees—including Cabinet officers and executive officials, Federal judges, and Members of Congress?

Yes (21 percent)	3,130
No (70.1 percent)	10,466
No answer (8.9 percent)	1,342

9. Do you believe our Government should agree to renegotiate the Panama Canal treaty?

Yes (40.8 percent)	6,094
No (49.1 percent)	7,342
No answer (10.1 percent)	1,502

10. On the whole, do you think this country's foreign policy is succeeding?

Yes (13.9 percent)	2,072
No (77.3 percent)	11,553
No answer (8.8 percent)	1,313

CCC Keeping Lid on Wheat Prices—Kansas City Star, August 30, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, as predicted by those familiar with the policies of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, he is using every possible method of depressing the market price for wheat. It is difficult to understand Freeman's action, as it is harmful to the American wheat producer. An excellent article concerning the administration's effort to keep wheat prices down at the market, written by Roderick Turnbull, farm editor of the Kansas City Star, should be of interest to everyone:

Action by the Commodity Credit Corporation last week to make Government wheat available to mills against export flour and bulgar at prices the same as those offered grain exporters was taken at the Kansas City Board of Trade as another indication of the determination of the administration to keep wheat prices down at the market.

There would be at least two reasons for the administration to want to hold the line on market prices. First, when the wheat law was passed, a tacit promise was made that the price of bread would not be increased. The promise was made on the basis that the new market price on wheat plus the 70-cent mill certificate would be about the same as the market price previously. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, has contended that bread price increases of recent days have not been justified.

Second, a high market price benefits the farmer who did not join in this year's acreage cut program just as much as the cooperator. Virtually all Government actions tend to reward the farmer who cooperates with the programs.

As the Government price support functions, the price support loan tends to put a floor under the market, while the CCC selling price—when the Government is selling freely—becomes the ceiling.

M. D. Hartnett, president of the board of trade, interprets the new CCC policy on sales to mills as a mechanism to lower the ceiling or at least a method of making it more difficult for the market to penetrate the ceiling.

The CCC selling price, as it is normally explained, is "105 percent of the price support loan plus carrying charges." This means that under the law the CCC can sell its surplus wheat at 105 percent of the loan plus the monthly carrying (storage) charges. The trade usually speaks of this as the statutory price.

The loan level varies as to location of the wheat. On the average, the price support loan this year is $1.30 a bushel at the farm. In Kansas City, the loan value is $1.53. Five percent of this is 8 cents. The CCC carrying charge for 1 month is 1½ cents a bushel. It costs three-quarters of a cent to get wheat loaded out of an elevator. Put all these together and you have $1.63¼ as the cost of CCC wheat delivered into your hands in Kansas City.

Applying the same formula at the gulf, Hartnett explains, you start with a loan value of $1.77. The "105 percent of the loan plus carrying charges" would add 9 cents for the 5 percent. Then must be added the 1½ cent carrying charge and three-quarters of a cent loadout charge. The total becomes $1.88¼.

Under normal interpretation of the rules this would be the statutory price at the gulf. But the CCC has been offering wheat for export at $1.71¾ cents at the gulf. Now it makes the same offer for wheat to be used in flour for export.

It does this, Hartnett explains, by using the statutory price in Kansas City plus freight to the gulf. The Kansas City statutory price, as mentioned, is $1.63¼.

Freight to the gulf on wheat, under new and lower rates established July 4, is 8½ cents a bushel. Add this to the Kansas City statutory price and you get $1.71¾, considerably less than the price reached when the loan value at the gulf is used.

Now both exporters and mills can buy wheat at the $1.71¾ price. The tendency will be, Hartnett said, for mills to buy from the CCC rather than farmers—in other words the statutory price will function as a ceiling on the cash market.

All these quotations are on No. 1 Hard Winter wheat.

Don Smith, director of the commodity office in Kansas City of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, explains that what the CCC is doing on its sales is to give the miller exporting flour essentially an even break with the exporter of the grain.

When the freight rate was cut in July reducing the rate to 8½ cents a bushel on wheat to the gulf, a similar cut was not made on flour. That flour rate remains 14½ cents a bushel (flour equivalent). Therefore, the new pricing system gives the flour exporter the advantage of a price which is about the same as if the flour exporter also got the freight rate reduction. The CCC requires that the wheat bought under the new method actually be exported as flour.

The CCC had disposed of 34½ million bushels of wheat in the Kansas City area, which includes the gulf and the west coast, from July 1 to August 25.

Incidentally, the trade continues to comment about the situation in which the Government, by its every action, indicates it is going to keep a lid on wheat prices, yet at the same time farmers are holding tightly to grain harvested this summer. More has been put under loan than a year ago.

Some grain letters comment that farmers apparently believe that before the election the administration will relent some-

what and prices will be allowed to rise. Others mention the possibility of lower freight rates in October and still others suggest farmers may want to put their wheat income over into 1965. It must be recognized, too, that not all free wheat is in farmers' hands. Others also may be holding wheat.

The Success of Ranger 7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. WEAVER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, The remarkable success of Ranger 7 has placed our Nation in the forefront in lunar exploration. The scientists, technicians, and other personnel who worked on this project deserve the thanks of the Nation for their efforts that resulted in this magnificent achievement.

The press in western Pennsylvania has praised the performance of Ranger 7. Following are some editorial comments:

[From the Titusville (Pa.) Herald, Aug. 5, 1964]

THE MOON AT CLOSE RANGE

Men have now seen their first closeups of the moon's surface—100 to 1,000 times more detailed than any previously taken through telescopes—thanks to Ranger 7. The taste of success is particularly sweet, for six previous Rangers and as many other U.S. space vehicles intended to place a useful payload on the moon or in orbit around it had failed in their missions.

The practical result of the Ranger 7's success at dispatching thousands of lunar closeups is that spacemen are now much closer to knowledge about the exact nature of the surface on which they hope to place an astronaut by 1970. The area chosen for the landing is known to be relatively smooth. The unanswered question has been: How smooth? A far better answer than other means had provided is available now. Landing gear to deal with the anticipated surface can now be designed with much more confidence than before.

The Ranger 7 flight is a fine feather in America's space cap. Its pictures of the moon are not the first to be sent back by a space vehicle; a Russian capsule dispatched some fuzzy views of the moon's dark side from 40,000 miles out in 1959. But the Ranger pictures are far superior to those. Taken from a range of 1,000 miles down to almost the point of impact, they provide the first close view of the moon. Getting those photographs was a remarkable feat that augurs well for the success of the first manned lunar flight a few years hence.

[From the Meadville (Pa.) Tribune]

RANGER 7 ON TARGET

The success of Ranger 7 in taking a series of closeup pictures of the moon places another feather in the cap of the American space program. No other space project has yet probed the moon's secrets so minutely.

An early Russian rocket missed its target but sent back long-distance photos of the moon's dark side and six previous Ranger missions were unsuccessful, although No. 6 scored a bullseye but its cameras failed to operate. But Ranger 7 has sent back about 4,000 pictures which will give scientists a closer look at the moon than they have ever had and disclose information requred before an astronaut can be landed on the moon.

The emphasis assigned the lunar project by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been questioned by those who contend that priority should be given to military applications of space. But despite some well-founded doubts about the project, Ranger 7's success marks a magnificent step ahead in the Nation's space and missile technology.

Combating Poverty in the New Orleans Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and proud of my home city of New Orleans, La., for many, many reasons, but I am particularly proud of the constructive and responsible community-wide effort now being made to implement in the best possible manner the opportunities provided by the enactment by the Congress of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It is more popularly termed the antipoverty bill, designed to help local communities throughout our Nation to utilize to the fullest extent their own resources, both human and material, with the aid of Federal assistance, to combat poverty by striking at the root causes of this malady.

A group of the New Orleans area's finest citizens, including governmental, business, and civic leaders, organized some 2 months before the passage of this landmark legislation the New Orleans Committee for Economic Opportunity Program, as the the community-wide vehicle through which they could tackle the manifold problems presented by poverty. This outstanding committee, whose activities are being directed by a full-time coordinator, Mr. Winston Lill of New Orleans, will formulate long-range plans on a communitywide basis to fight poverty in the New Orleans area. Mr. Lill is a man of exceptional experience and ability for this task, having served for many many years as executive assistant to the late deLesseps S. Morrison, long-time mayor of New Orleans and then U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States.

I am confident that this committee will do a splendid job to alleviate poverty in my area of the Nation. The antipoverty bill—a most significant piece of legislation enacted by the 88th Congress—provides $947.5 million in Federal funds to begin a nationwide assault on the root causes of poverty, and the Congress is to be commended for passing this legislation.

A fine description of the New Orleans committee's efforts to date, and its plans for the future in combating poverty in the New Orleans area, was recently presented to readers of the New Orleans Times-Picayune by one of that newspaper's reporters, Mr. Lee Stinnett, in a three-part series of stories. I am happy to commend to my colleagues in the Congress this fine series of stories by Mr. Stinnet which appeared in the Times-Picayune on Tuesday, August 25; Wednesday, August 26, and Thursday, August 27, 1964. His stories were bylined on page 1 of the Picayune each day, and Mr. Stinnett deserves a hearty salute for his outstanding reporting on a timely, vital subject of interest to all citizens of the United States.

The newspaper articles follow:

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Aug. 25, 1964]

WAR ON POVERTY—UNIT FORMED TO CONSIDER SPECIFIC PROJECTS FOR NEW ORLEANS—LOCAL GROUP WILL SEEK FUNDS FROM UNITED STATES—I

(By Lee Stinnett)

While most of the United States was still wondering whether Lyndon Johnson would get his antipoverty bill through Congress, a New Orleans committee had begun laying the groundwork for possible application of funds here.

Now over 2 months old, the committee has organized itself into subcommittees to consider specific projects for New Orleans.

President Johnson signed the $947.5 million Economic Opportunity Act into law Thursday.

Though the committee has no official status, New Orleans Mayor Victor H. Schiro said Monday he will act on the recommendations of the committee and "get whatever we can for the city."

The mayor announced he has appointed a liaison man to the committee. He said he has taken no other action on the act.

The local group, which will be called the New Orleans Committee for Economic Opportunity Program, will provide the organization for title II of the new act, under which public or nonprofit private organizations can apply for funds to "mobilize community resources to combat poverty through community action programs."

COORDINATOR HIRED

It has hired a full-time coordinator, Winston Lill, who was an executive assistant to deLesseps S. Morrison when he was mayor and U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States.

Lill, who recently met with Washington officials, began work Monday.

The committee is composed of citizens representing "most of the major elements of New Orleans that will be affected under the act," according to a spokesman.

Presently the committee prefers to remain anonymous, believing a better idea of the projects that are most needed in New Orleans can be reached without the pressure of publicity.

FINANCIAL BACKING

It has received temporary financial backing from a local foundation.

The spokesman for the group said agreement on specific projects for New Orleans is still to be reached.

"We don't want to rush into any recommendations. We want to hit at the basic roots of poverty," he said.

The committee "may consider" the following projects for New Orleans, he said, as well as other programs:

Services and activities to develop new employment opportunities.

Strengthening the teaching of basic education skills, especially reading, writing, and mathematics.

GUIDANCE SERVICES

Providing comprehensive academic counseling and guidance services and school social work services.

Providing after-school study centers; after-school tutoring; and summer, weekend, and after-school academic classes.

Establishing programs for the benefit of preschool children.

Reducing adult illiteracy.

Developing and carrying out special education or other programs for migrant or transient families.

Improving the living conditions of the elderly.

Arranging for or providing health examinations and health education for school children.

AID FOR HANDICAPPED

Rehabilitation and retraining of physically or mentally handicapped persons.

Providing health, rehabilitation, employment, educational, and related services to young men not qualified for military service.

Providing community child care centers and youth activity centers.

Improving housing and living facilities and home management skills.

Providing services to enable families from rural areas to meet problems of urban living.

Providing recreation and physical fitness services and facilities.

OTHER CITIES

New Orleans is not the only city making plans to approach the Johnson administration with applications for projects.

Atlanta, for example, was ready on the day the President signed the bill into law to apply for $1 million for specific programs.

In Atlanta, a 13-man city-county "Economic Opportunity Authority" had the approval of the city council last week and needed only the expected recognition of the county commission.

Houston has a "Businessmen's Advisory Council of the Anti-Poverty Program" and Houston's Mayor Louie Welch is accepting recommendations on job-training programs.

The feeling among several New Orleans committee members was, however, that the committee here is making satisfactory progress that will assure the city getting the best possible program for New Orleans problems.

Washington predicts that community action projects will begin in some cities by mid-October. Federal funds will cover up to 90 percent of the costs.

[From the Times-Picayune, Aug. 26, 1964]

WAR ON POVERTY—COMMUNITYWIDE ATTACK ON PROBLEMS IS NEW AIM—UNITY OF ORLEANS CIVIC GROUPS PLANNED—II

(By Lee Stinnett)

The war on poverty could unite New Orleans civic forces for the first time into a truly communitywide attack on local economic problems.

If this happens, as is widely predicted among the city's professional welfare, civic, and cultural leaders concerned, the Economic Opportunity Act may have a more profound effect on New Orleans than any immediate economic gains.

It is believed by most of the people who have been concerned with poverty in the area that the establishment of a citywide community action group to implement the act will be the basis for a more united and extensive approach to problems in the immediate future.

The $947.5-million program, signed by President Johnson last week, calls for the participation of freely formed citizens' action groups and gives preference to programs which involve "maximum citizen participation."

NEW APPROACH

"Long after the act goes out of effect, there will still be the effect of the organization laid down to implement it," said Germinal Messina, district supervisor of the Louisiana Division of Employment Security.

New Orleans has had for many years civic, welfare, and service organizations that have been fighting—actively and imaginatively—the problems the Economic Opportunity Act is concerned with.

But Winston Lill, the newly appointed coordinator of the local committee, and others say there has never been a communitywide approach to the total situation. Each organization has necessarily had its own field and there has been a lack of coordination and perhaps some duplication.

The funds of the private organizations have been limited. School funds have not been available for the extensive adult education and vocational training that is needed. And city, State, and Federal Governments have been preoccupied with the necessary business of providing and administering public welfare and public health projects.

NO MIRACLES

Under the EOA, the community action groups will present applications for a local program. Since more applications are anticipated than there will be funds for, communities will probably compete with one another for the most imaginative program giving the best results. Thus community interest will be stimulated.

While a feeling of general optimism exists among the people concerned with the new act, most of them feel the Community should be warned not to expect miracles in minutes.

"It's not a magic wand," said one official.

While Lill believes that the city will get "in excess of" $1 million to "fight the roots of poverty," few would hope the ills of any urban area could be cured immediately with these funds.

Some communities—New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, to name a few—have had communitywide groups fighting their problems with local funds for 10 years or more. No one would say these cities have transformed their areas of poverty into utopias.

PROBLEMS COMPLEX

The problems of urban areas are complex and many are not even fully understood yet.

Some of the problems have been developing for generations.

They stem from automation, from country-to-city migration, from the dynamic growth and change of the Nation's economy itself, and from other factors that are beyond the control of the cities themselves and perhaps beyond the control of the Federal Government.

But the problems exist—even in New Orleans.

In the parish itself, according to the 1960 census, there are 51,383 families with annual incomes of less than $3,000—the "poverty line" set by the Johnson administration.

In 1964, $22 million in public welfare will be doled out in Orleans Parish, which is considerably more money than will be spent to eradicating the causes of the need for welfare.

The complexity of the problems was cited by A. P. Stoddard, president of the AFL–CIO of New Orleans, who cited the waterfront situation as an example.

Stoddard said there are from 6,000 to 6,500 jobs each day available for some 15,000 longshoremen seeking jobs.

HIRING SYSTEM

Presently, workers are selected on a day-to-day basis each morning by the dock foreman. And the surplus workers are turned away each day.

Though the minimum wage is $2.75 per hour, many of them can work only 500 hours a year, thus falling well below the poverty line.

A U.S. Department of Labor study has recommended that the system of hiring be stabilized and that men with longevity be preferred. The recommendation is a factor in the current negotiations between the International Longshoremen Association and the New Orleans Steamship Association.

If the stabilization occurs, Stoddard pointed out, there would be a great problem of training men thrown out of work.

And the ills of the longshoremen not only affect themselves and their families, but the whole community—as was evident in a recent strike that tied up the port for several months.

MEMBERS LISTED

Thomas P. Godchaux, temporary chairman of the New Orleans Committee on Economic Opportunity Act, announced the names of the members of the committee Tuesday.

They are:

Mayor Victor H. Schiro, city of New Orleans; Thomas F. Donelon, president of Jefferson Parish; Charles J. Eagan, Jr., president of the Jefferson Parish Council; Dr. Albert W. Dent, president of Dillard University; Dr. Homer L. Hitt, president of Louisiana State University in New Orelans; Herbert E. Longenecker, president of Tulane University; the Reverend Andrew C. Smith, president of Loyola University; Norman C. Francis, assistant to the president of Xavier University; State Senator Michael H. O'Keefe; State Representative Maurice E. Landrieu;

Msgr. Henry C. Bezou, superintendent of the Archdiocesan School Board; O. Perry Walker, superintendent of the Orleans Parish School Board; Nash C. Roberts, Jr., member, State board of education; Matthew R. Sutherland, member, Orleans Parish School Board; Daniel A. Ellis, member, Orleans Parish School Board; Stoddard; John F. Tims, president of the Times-Picayune Publishing Corp.

Mrs. Louis Abramson, Jr.; Dr. Leonard L. Burns; T. Sterling Dunn; Clifford F. Favrot; Darwin S. Fenner; Louis L. Freeman; Frank Friedler, Jr.; J. Mason Guillory; David Hunter; Philip E. James; Mrs. Harry B. Kelleher; Herman S. Kohlmeyer, Jr.; Stephen B. Lemann; Harry McCall, Jr.; Lawrence Merrigan; Mrs. Leo Mervis; Ashton Phelps; Roy M. Schwarz; Edgar B. Stern, Jr.; Mrs. Charles Stitch; Daniel C. Thompson; Laurence M. Williams; and Louis Johnson, who represents St. Bernard Parish.

ELLIS COMMENT

As Mayor Schiro's liaison representative, Ellis called the new act "well-intentioned and vastly humane."

"It will give every American community the opportunity to develop a comprehensive plan to fight its own poverty and help them to carry out their plans. This program asks men and women throughout the country to prepare long-range plans for the attack on poverty in their own local communities."

Lill will be retained by his business associates while he is serving as coordinator.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Aug. 27, 1964]

WAR ON POVERTY—PROJECTS WILL EMPHASIZE SELF-IMPROVEMENT WORK—UPGRADING BASIC OCCUPATIONAL SKILLS EOA AIM—III

(By Lee Stinnett)

When the New Orleans "war on poverty" begins—

Grasscutters may find themselves being trained as scientific "landscape gardeners."

Clerks and saleswomen may be elevated to stenographers.

And people in depressed areas may start organizing themselves into community improvement associations.

The specific projects for New Orleans have not been determined by the New Orleans Committee on Economic Opportunity Act.

But these ideas, and many others, have been suggested by consultants to the committee.

In any case, the projects will emphasize self-improvement within the "poverty group" itself. Handouts or the imposed assistance by the so-called "do-gooders" will be avoided.

CONCEPT OF ACT SEEN

This is the concept of the Economic Opportunity Act, recently passed by Congress and signed by the President, as interpreted by the community's social welfare and service professionals.

The purpose of the EOA is to upgrade basic occupational and literacy skills to break the "cycle of poverty" that has been perpetuated among a "sizable number" of Americans for decades.

Winston Lill, coordinator of the New Orleans committee for the EOA program, explained the "cycle of poverty."

"There are pockets of poverty within every city which tend to exist generation after generation.

"The poverty is generally continued within each family. The children tend to repeat the father's pattern."

EXPERTS STRESS GOALS

According to the New Orleans experts and professionals who have been concerned with poverty, the EOA is designated to attack the cycle on the basis of advanced sociological knowledge.

Albert G. Rosenberg, associate director of the New Orleans Social Welfare Planning Council, said certain provisions of the new act are "very farsighted."

He mentioned the clause that gives preference to programs involving the "maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups involved."

Rather than suggesting outside control of a community's problems, the act gives maximum control—and responsibility—to the communities themselves, Rosenberg said.

The Federal Government will only provide the funds, establish broad guidelines and insure that projects with the most promising results are encouraged.

"WILL BE TAILOR MADE"

"Thus the program will be tailor made by the local people. If Washington told us specifically what we would have to do, it probably wouldn't work," Rosenberg said.

He said that the establishment of neighborhood improvement associations within the poverty areas themselves could also be started with finances and leadership provided by the act.

"To do something for the poverty class is fine—as far as it goes. But do it with them—this is the vital part," Rosenberg said.

A key clause in the EOA states that preference will be given to projects that give promise of having a "permanent effect on the increase in capacity of groups and individuals to deal with problems without further assistance."

The plan is to train people of low-income groups in skills that are needed in the Nation's economy and thus permanently affect their self sufficiency.

AVAILABLE YEAR-ROUND

There are some types of skilled and semi-skilled jobs that are available year-round in the New Orleans area, according to Germinal Messina, district supervisor of the Louisiana Division of Employment Security.

"In some cases if we had trained people, we could fill jobs," he stated, mentioning a constant need for stenographers, engineers, draftsmen, welders and machinists.

"When people are trained in these skills, the act will have the effect of a general upgrading. Jobs on the bottom of the employment scale will be left vacant when people move up, and these can be filled by even lower-paid people and by the unemployed," Messina said.

J. Harvey Kerns, executive director of the Urban League of Greater New Orleans, cited a recent refresher course for stenographers conducted in New Orleans by the league as an example of how job-skill training projects can work.

THE 85 GIRLS SELECTED

Eighty-five Negro girls, who were not fully qualified as stenographers, were selected from over 200 applicants for the 12-week course.

Most of them were doing work in small businesses, restaurants or at other odd jobs. They averaged about $25 to $30 a week.

At the completion of the course in July, every girl who passed the standard typing requirements of 50 words per minute was placed in a job.

And the low-paying jobs were left vacant for those who moved on will be available for more people.

Kerns said the league has another 200 applicants for a similar course to be conducted in the future.

SMALL BUSINESS LOAN

To further stimulate the job opportunity program, the EOA provides for low-interest loans up to $25,000 for small business concerns.

It is hoped that these loans will help businesses expand their operations and hire more employees.

J. D. Henderson, director of the southern division of the National Small Business Association, however, was not optimistic that these loans would have any large-scale effect in New Orleans.

He said, "From past experience from programs such as this, the small business person finds it quite difficult to get the loans that have been advertised."

He said he would counsel businessmen to "do business with the banks, because that is what banks are for."

He said banks are more conservative and give better advice to businessmen.

Henderson stated, however, that he wouldn't "blame anyone for taking advantage" of low-interest loans if they were made available and predicted that the government would be "flooded with applications."

What Next in Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. BATTIN
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, Norman Kraeft, the national agriculture editor for the American Broadcasting Co., on August 13, 1964, had an interesting and informative program dealing with the 1965 wheat program. The problem has been compounded by the Secretary's failure to announce the feed grain program for 1965. Winter wheat farmers are asked to sign up for a program without knowing what all will be expected of them.

For the Members' information I insert the text of Mr. Kraeft's broadcast, the "American Farm Daily," in the RECORD following these remarks:

Perhaps an accurate description of Agriculture Secretary Freeman and his associates, whose actions on behalf of the farmer seem to say that the Government can manage the farmer's affairs better than the farmer can, would be "The Dead-End Kids." It would seem that Mr. Freeman is near some kind of a dead end when the organization that has supported him most consistently and vigorously, the National Farmers Union, recommends a reversal of a major Freeman action. Top officials of Farmers Union, including president James Patton, said yesterday, "We are deeply disturbed by the 1965 wheat program as announced last week by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. We recommend reversal of the Department's action on wheat."

Now, Farmers Union was in the forefront of those groups supporting Secretary Freeman in his strenuous last-minute efforts earlier this year to leapfrog his wheat certificate plan into law. The new wheat law has seen little but trouble ever since it went into effect. Now, the best that Mr. Freeman can muster for the 1965 version of his wheat program—always remembering that Mr. Freeman must operate in the weighty shadow of the Budget Bureau—has his best friends telling him what his enemies have been telling him about his wheat program for some time. Farmers Union criticism of the Freeman move on 1965-crop wheat pulls the curtains away from the fact that the Freeman wheat program is as unworkable as it is unpopular.

Under Secretary Freeman during the past 4 years, Government payments have represented a growing share of the farmers' income and the marketplace has contributed a diminishing share. Apparently, though, the Budget Bureau is blowing the whistle. Where does Mr. Freeman turn next to solve the farm problem?

Poverty in Appalachia—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in the 1960's, the United States has reached a recordbreaking level of affluence, but many of our people do not even have the opportunity to work for a fair share of the wealth of this country. The endemic unemployment and problems of the Appalachia poverty belt, and other pockets of poverty throughout the United States, cannot be ended by feeble and piecemeal programs. It is only possible to alleviate their most egregious and obvious economic problems by thorough and comprehensive programs. The causes rather than the effects of the disease must be treated.

In a recent series of articles on Appalachia in the Miami Herald, Lee Winfrey, who was born and grew up in east Tennessee, graphically informed the people of Florida on the scope of the poverty problem. In the first of a five-part series on poverty, Winfrey describes the difficulties encountered by a resident of Appalachia who in 50 years never made so much money that he had to pay income tax. One cannot help but speculate on what might have happened to this individual if, a half century ago, President Johnson's plan for a job corps had been an ongoing program. Under the President's proposal, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity will establish residential centers to provide

young men and women with education, vocational training, and useful work experience in order to increase their employability. The bill is not a panacea, but it will, at the very least, reduce the reliance of the unskilled on such chance events as Winfrey describes in this article.

The article follows:

ED'S LIFE: JUST SQUEAKED BY FOR 50 YEARS

(By Lee Winfrey)

CONCORD, TENN.—I have known Ed Wallace all my life. When I went to work in Washington, I found out he and I are now statistics.

I am a minor statistic: One of more than 2 million natives who left the land called Appalachia in the decade 1950–60.

Ed is a major statistic: the archetype of the Appalachian that President Lyndon Johnson wants to help.

Ed is 68. He has been working for more than 50 years. In not a single of of those years did he make so much money that he had to pay an income tax.

When I was growing up in Concord, a small east Tennessee town 15 miles from Knoxville, one of Ed's sons was my principal playmate. I could follow an uphill path, beneath tall trees past banks of honeysuckle, and get to their house in 5 minutes.

It was a two-room clapboard house in the center of a flat, bare field. In the back was a kitchen about 7 feet square and in the front was a larger room where Ed, his wife Willie, and their children lived and slept.

A kerosene lamp furnished light. There was neither rug nor radio. From a zinc bucket in which a dipper floated, they drank water carried several hundred yards from a spring. In the back there was a privy.

None of this was uncommon in east Tennessee 15 or 20 years ago. In much of Appalachia, it is not rare today.

Last week, I visited Ed for the first time in several years. Outwardly, his status seemed substantially improved.

He lives now in a green and yellow, prefabricated house that is neat as a pin. The yard is scrupulously clean, meticulously mowed, and the privy in back is odorless.

The house is misleading. Ed, as he was all his life, is living on the brink.

Michael Harrington, whose book "The Other America," inspired the war on poverty, contends that the poor have become invisible, that we no longer see them.

There is some truth in what he says. I have known Ed for more than 20 years, but until last week I never bothered to extract his life story. I found him to be a case example of a man who was born poor, lived poor, and remains poor, a beleaguered man who has spent his entire life running to catch up.

Ed was one of four children of a laborer who worked in a Concord stone quarry that has long since closed. When he was 14 or 15 years old and in the fourth grade, Ed quit school.

A kind man named Will Hackney put Ed to work in his mill grinding meal. "That was 1910 or 1912," said Ed. "I was a miller for almost 20 years."

The years in the mill were the best of Ed's life. He made little money—50 cents a day when he began, $1 a day when he became proficient—but there were other compensations. Years ago in the middle South, employers were paternal. Will Hackney took care of Ed.

When Ed married Willie in 1917, "Mr. Hackey went to town (Knoxville) and got my license." When Ed was about to be drafted in World War I, Will Hackney got him a deferment.

"I had to register," Ed recalls. "Sam Calloway came and filled my papers out for me. I was 21 and weighed 140 pounds. I had learnt the mill and could handle the wheat sacks. Sam said, 'what you want to join?' I said, 'put down the heavy artilleries. I want a horse and a gun and a bayonet, that's all I want.'"

But Will Hackney said he was sick and couldn't operate the mill without Ed. After Ed was deferred, he consoled his young millhand with tales of German submarine warfare:

"He'd get the paper and show me where they was sinkin' them boats and tell me, 'Ed, you'd have never got across.'"

In 1926, Will Hackney died, leaving no sons. Ed ran the mill for his widow for about a year, until a flood broke down the wooden dam that furnished the mill's water power. Then the mill closed and the only skill Ed knew was useless.

He scraped together a living as a farm fieldhand and an odd jobs man for a few years. Until the New Deal instituted the Work Progress Administration—the WPA.

The WPA paid Ed 30 cents an hour—$2.40 a day—and taught him a new skill: how to use a shovel. "That's where I learnt to slope banks (inclines)," Ed recalled.

Ed stayed with the WPA 5 years, until Queenie Hobbs, the local constable, hired him away for 50 cents an hour to mow and maintain Pleasant Forest Cemetery about an eighth of a mile from where my parents live.

There Ed's skill with the shovel proved valuable. Queenie let him keep the money he got from digging graves—a job that took about 7 hours and paid $10.

Ed stayed in the graveyard 6 years, enjoying a modicum of prosperity. For the first time in his life, he switched from roll-your-owns to "ready rolls" (machine-made cigarettes).

Aging finally, past 50, his six children all gone (five married, one dead), Ed changed jobs again. A man building a boat dock hired him to help. "That," said Ed, "is where I learnt to carpenter and mason."

Ed worked 6 years for Bob Burch at $20 a week. Then he reached 65, retirement age, and learned a bitter truth.

In all his life, Ed never worked for a payroll-type employer who deducted social security taxes for him. Ed never paid anything in, so he can't get anything out. He is ineligible for social security.

The day I saw him, he stood on the half-acre of ground he owns, in front of the $1,700 house has has paid every penny for, his wife in the hospital with shoulder trouble. He has never had a bank account and in his billfold was a single dollar bill, folded once, end to end.

He and Willie live on old age welfare checks—$37.90 comes to each of them monthly—and occasional dollars from odd jobs.

It seems like a shame. Ed is no John Henry, the legendary steel driver who worked himself to death in Appalachia, but he has always been busy at something.

Only once in his life, during the desperate depression, did he ever drink much, and he has never been a gambler.

All his life he has jumped about like a grasshopper, learning whatever was necessary to get by. Now he is at the lag end of his life with little but two skinny pension checks to brace him against the years ahead.

When I walked away from him, oddly, all I could think of was an inane signoff I had heard from a hillbilly music discjocky over an Appalachian radio station a few days before.

"Keep smilin', neighbors" the cheer-'em-up deejay advised. "The sunshine is good for yore teeth."

Poverty in Appalachia—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in the May 16 issue of the Miami Herald, Lee Winfrey's second article on poverty in Appalachia describes how it is possible, if one possesses a special skill, to break the grip of widespread unemployment and the psychological inertia created by interminable welfare checks. Unfortunately most people are not gifted with the special ability to play the guitar, as the protagonist in this story is. The people of Appalachia, and other underdeveloped segments of the country, must be taught new and diverse skills if they are to have the opportunity to be raised to an economic status consonant with the dignity of the human person. President Johnson's war on poverty provides that the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity may transfer funds to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in order to assist States in carrying out experimental, pilot, and demonstration projects for unemployed men and women whose families are receiving assistance under the "aid to families with dependent children" program. The participants in the projects will receive vocational training and assistance in job placement. For fiscal year 1965, $150 million is authorized for this part of the President's program. With this proposal, we will at long last begin to focus attention on helping the recipients of welfare payments to end the monthly wait for the postman and actively participate in productive, rewarding work.

The article follows:

DOC WATSON MAKES IT USING NATURAL RESOURCE: MUSIC

(By Lee Winfrey)

DEEP GAP, N.C.—"Doc's not here," Rosa Lee Watson said. "He's on tour and won't be back for about 10 days."

The news disappointed me, for I am a sometime guitar player. I had driven over the mountain from Knoxville to hear Doc Watson, who is one of the three or four best guitar pickers in all of Appalachia.

A New York promoter named Ralph Rinzler, making field recordings in the Blue Ridge Mountains, discovered Doc in 1960 in this isolated valley near the North Carolina-Tennessee line. He put Doc on record and took him to New York City.

Doc needed little but exposure. He was already 37 years old, a fully matured musician at the top of his power. The so-called revival of folk music didn't revive anything for Doc: He had known all the songs since childhood.

"He left home most recently in March," his wife said. His schedule included stops at Purdue, UCLA, and the University of Chicago, and two of the most important coffeehouses on the folk music circuit—the Second Fret in Philadelphia and the Gaslight in New York.

"He's been gone so long that Eddy Merle has learned to play and he doesn't know a thing about it," Mrs. Watson said.

Eddy Merle Watson, 15, is the older of Doc's two children. He has Doc's gift for the guitar; after 7 weeks of practice, he already plays better than a teacher I once had in Miami.

None of this is unique, for Appalachia abounds in musicians skilled upon the guitar and the fiddle, the banjo and the mandolin. But there is one thing unusual about Doc Watson.

He has been blind since the day he was born.

There are no pockets of poverty in Watauga County, where Doc Watson lives. There is only one pocket of prosperity—the county seat of Boone, a summer resort with a growing vacation trade and an attractive State teachers college.

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics figure that an annual wage of less than $4,000 means poverty for a family of four. In Watauga County, 58 percent of the families are making less than $3,000.

Dave Mast, the county welfare director, figures that $400,000 a year is now being paid out in welfare grants in Watauga County. For several years, Doc Watson has been getting some of that help.

"The policy used to be," said Mrs. Ruth D. Baker, "that when someone went to work, you'd go out and cut the check off right away. That made the program self-defeating, because many were afraid to go to work. Now we gradually reduce the money, but continue much of the welfare program."

Mrs. Baker is a welfare caseworker specializing in dependent children. She believes that the Federal-State welfare program is greatly misunderstood.

"So many people have an idea that welfare is just the check. The check is only a fourth of it. The check just provides a measure of security while you go to work on the real problem."

The "real problems" are four, she believes: isolation, inbreeding, ignorance and inertia.

"Few people know how these mountains were ravaged during the Civil War," she said. "Both sides raided for food and horses. That was when the mountain people first became suspicious of the outsider—the 'furriner.'"

Isolated in their coves and glens, the mountain people married their friends and neighbors. Often, there was no one around to marry except relatives—a cousin or a niece.

The inbreeding produced congenital defects which run today through many mountain bloodlines. Blindness, for example, runs through the Watson family. Doc's sister is blind, too.

For decades in the mountains, there were no schools, and even today they are just catching up. Watauga County has some good schools now, but many of the children begin school ill-prepared, handicapped at the very start by their poor lives at home, and they fall behind quickly and soon drop out.

They find little work to be had in Watauga County. Boone has a total of three industrial plants, all relatively new and all relatively small. Since the country has a population of 27,000, they do almost nothing to fill the trenches of poverty in Deep Gap and Stony Fork.

What is left to do is called, by the bureaucrats, "subsistence farming." That means a farmer whose hillside plot yields just a few more pecks than is necessary to keep his family from starving.

We live now in a charitable country where it is difficult to starve. The welfare workers will bring you surplus food. But the dole is a solution for no one but the most debased human being, and that worries welfare worker Ruth Baker very much.

"We live in a society that makes no provision for the reject," she contends, "and yet our society is creating more rejects all the time."

Mrs. Baker is well aware that her clients lack marketable skills. But she says further: "I'm frankly worried about automation. It's producing more out-of-date people all the time. After a while, where are all these people on the sidelines going to get the money to buy what the machines produce?"

The State of North Carolina recently announced special plans for Watauga County and the neighboring counties of Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey, which are even poorer. Armed with $7 million from the Ford Foundation and $2.5 million from two North Carolina foundations, the State plans a sustained atack on the problems of the Blue Ridge.

Perched on a hillside above Wildcat Road in Deep Gap lives Levi Ira Watson, whose family needs some of that help.

Levi and Doc are doubly related. Levi married Doc's sister, who is also Levi's second cousin. So Levi and Doc are second cousins and brothers-in-law, too. Mountain genealogies are often like that.

Anyway, Levi was doing pretty good until 1961. A tall, thin mountaineer with a fourth grade education, he was averaging $65 to $70 a week cutting timber.

Despite the demands of 10 children, Levi was stretching his money. He owned his home, with a television set inside, and 32 acres around it.

Then one day his powersaw hit a knot, jumped back and hit him in the groin. He went to Watauga Hospital and had a hernia operation. While he was laid up idle, degenerative arthritis, which grows worse when a man is inactive, settled deep in his bones.

Now he is 50 years old, a semi-invalid for the last 3 years. He helps with the family garden, chops some of the firewood, and shoots an occasional squirrel to pad out the family's surplus food diet with a little fresh meat.

His wife makes pin money by such devices as "roping." Roping is a mountain term for making a certain kind of Christmas decoration.

White Pine and Ivy are wrapped on wire with string. The maker gets $1.75 for a decoration 25 yards long. It takes about an hour to rope that much. It may take all day to gather the raw material.

Only an incurable optimist would predict a more bountiful future for Levi's 10 children. The hardscrabble land isn't going to get any flatter or more fertile. The local timber industry is going down, not up. New industries are not rushing to relocate in the ridges.

The problems of Levi Watson's children are shared, to a large extent, by hundreds of other children in these hills.

Doc Wilson is beating the game, but he is a decided exception. Not one man in a million can play a guitar like him.

For most of his neighbors, Deep Gap is a valley getting deeper all the time.

Poverty in Appalachia—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in the third article of his five-part series on poverty in Appalachia, Lee Winfrey talks with a Kentucky timber cutter who made $400 last year. The interesting thing about this particular inhabitant of our economic underworld is that he recently hosted President Johnson when the President visited Appalachia. Today, largely as a result of President Johnson's efforts and proposals in regard to poverty in America, our poor are no longer totally invisible members of society, but rather one of the most intensely studied groups in the country. It is now time to rationally and systematically apply these studies and our knowledge of the scope of poverty in meaningful and effective programs.

In Kentucky where the President visited, one-third of the labor force is unemployed. One provision of the President's plan would give loans to small businesses for training and employing long-term unemployed individuals or to promote management skills. This proposal will not solve the unemployment problem, but it is one aspect of the comprehensive campaign against all the various components of poverty which is needed now. Mr. Winfrey's article of May 17, from the Miami Herald, follows:

L.B.J. COMES, GOES, BUT POVERTY STAYS

(By Lee Winfrey)

INEZ, KY.—For Tom Fletcher, life is a series of accidents with him as the victim.

Sometimes the accidents are pleasant, like the visit of President Lyndon Johnson to his 3-room hillside house last month. Fletcher has no idea how he was chosen.

"Two fellers from Paintsville come here about 10:30 or 11 in the morning. Said he (the President) might get here. They come back about 2 and said for sure he was comin'. He got here about 5 o'clock.

Fletcher does not recall much of the conversation.

"It kinda shook a feller up. I tried to get him to take a chair, but he just set down on his hunker. He stayed about 30 minutes."

The Fletcher porch has no steps up to it, but it is very new. The newness of the roof beams glares at you, for they have not been painted. Fletcher is not exactly sure how the new porch got there.

"Some way it's through—through the President, some way. Through Kennedy."

"The housing program, I guess you'd call it," his wife explained.

In the wooden house overlooking Rockcastle Creek, President Johnson left hope, but little else. For the Fletchers, nothing basic has changed.

They still subsist on Government surplus food. "We've been gettin' them since they been given' 'em out," Mrs. Fletcher said.

Work is still hard to find. Fletcher, a 38-year-old timber cutter, made $400 last year. Since the President left, he has worked 4 more days and made 16 more dollars.

Martin County is a hard place to find work. It is desperately poor, the only county in Kentucky without a radio station or a newspaper, either daily or weekly. There is no hospital, either. A third of the labor force is unemployed.

From Fletcher's front porch, you can see seven other houses. In only one of them is there a man with a job. "If you get any work around here, you have to go off," said Fletcher's brother, Henry, 26.

Henry Fletcher, a carpenter, works in Ohio, sometimes. "I've been back from Columbus since December," he said. "I was back up there last week, but couldn't get any work."

President Johnson left the Fletchers with the admonition to "keep those kids in school." He meant five of the eight, since the two oldest quit before he came and another is too young to go.

The day I was there, all five were in Grassy Elementary School 2 miles up the road. The oldest, Harold, 15, is in the fourth grade, the high-water mark for each of his parents.

In return for keeping their promise to him, the Fletchers have a childlike faith that Johnson will do something for them and for Appalachia. "He seems like a good-hearted man," Mrs. Fletcher said.

They have few suggestions as to what wonders the President might work. "Some kind of a little factory, maybe," Mrs. Fletcher said.

Her husband thought for a moment or two. "Yeah," he said finally. "Yeah, that's good."

Farther south in Kentucky, in his law office in Whitesburg, Harry M. Caudill is less certain that effective help is on its way.

Caudill, 42, a former State representative, is the author of "Night Comes to the Cumberlands," a widely read history of eastern Kentucky. His book, published last year with an introduction by Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, is a bitter attack on the land companies, the timber companies and the coal operators, whom Caudill accuses of looting eastern Kentucky and leaving it impoverished.

"Timid" is the word that Caudill applies to the program drawn up by the President's Appalachian Regional Commission. "It won't arouse much support from liberals and it shouldn't draw much opposition from conservatives," he said.

The program calls for spending $228 million in the first year, with $90 million of that for roads. "We've been promised roads before as the solution to our ills," said Caudill. "They never are."

The Commission's 93-page report, issued last month after a 1-year study, earmarked $3 million, for a study of the coal industry. At the insistence of Pennsylvania Gov. William Scranton, another 10 million was added. Caudill's attitude toward the Commission's coal policy borders on contempt.

"After a year of study, it calls for another study. That is the course that weak men take when confronted with a demanding problem.

"The whole study proceeds on the basis that most people in Appalachia are farmers," he said. "In eastern Kentucky, West Virginia, and western Pennsylvania, that is not true. The people here are unemployed coal miners. Industrial workers, not farmers."

President Johnson, in a recent speech, warned businessmen that they faced a possible revolution if they did not solve the problem of poverty. The comment drew much scoffing, but Caudill takes the possibility quite seriously.

"The coal industry is the first in this country to be completely dislocated by automation," he said. "Other industries are going to follow. If we don't solve the problem of obsolete workers in this industry, it is going to multiply our problems later.

"In 1962–63, we had near anarchy in eastern Kentucky. You've heard of the roving pickets. They were nothing more than big bands of men going about trying to compel the coal industry to employ them. It was a form of revolt, revolution in its incipient stage."

Appalachia is big, as large as California, with 15 million people in it. Along the spine of the mountains from Pennsylvania south to Alabama, one-third of the families live on less than $3,000 a year.

The novelist Thomas Wolfe, who came from Appalachia, wrote once about the region:

"It is the place of autumnal moons hung low and orange at the frosty edges of the pines; it is the place of frost and silence; of the clean dry shocks and the opulence of enormous pumpkins that yellow on hard clotted earth; it is the place of the stir and feathery stumble of the hens upon their roosts; the frosty, broken barking of the dogs, the great barn-shapes and solid shadows in the running sweep of the moon-whited countryside, the wailing whistle of the fast express.

From Inez south to Deep Gap, some are wondering if this is the year when the train of plenty starts stopping for them.

Poverty in Appalachia—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the miseries of poverty are manifest in many ways and what is a tragic personal event can also be a catastrophe for the community. Individual unemployment becomes compounded among the citizens of an area and ghost towns start to appear.

The fourth article by Lee Winfrey in the May 18 issue of the Miami Herald's series on poverty in Appalachia tells the story of a little mining town in Tennessee which is typical of all coal towns in the poverty belt. Once a prosperous company town, it is now at less than one-eighth of its peak population because the company closed down its operations.

President Johnson's program, which aims at changing the basic structure of poverty insetad of dealing only with one or two isolated aspects of it, calls for community action programs to save towns like the one talked about in this article. Education, employment, job training and counseling, health, vocational rehabilitation, housing, home management, and welfare would all be aided through Federal grants to States and communities to help them mobilize and utilize public and private resources in the war on poverty. Technical assistance in preparing and administering community action programs is also provided for in these proposals. Maximum possible participation by local residents is stressed to help the poor not only to raise their own individual standards of living, but also to substitute a totally human environment for the awful environment which now exists in so many places.

The President's program is a first deep breath in the resuscitation of our dying communities.

The article follows:

ONCE BOOMING COAL CENTER NOW GHOST TOWN

(By Lee Winfrey)

PRUDEN, TENN.—Charles Cross, 61, looked down at the valley where he spent half his life and said, "It's a ghost town."

Charles Cross, who is my uncle, worked 32 years in this mining camp set squarely on the border between east Tennessee and southeastern Kentucky. He left 10 years ago and since then almost everyone else has moved out, too.

The story of Pruden is the story of coal. It is, in many ways, a melancholy tale.

Uncle Charles was a sophomore studying agriculture at the University of Tennessee when his uncle, C. A. Griffith, invited him to come and work in Pruden. Griffith was the vice president and general manager of Prudent Coal & Coke Co., which built and owned the town.

The year was 1922. "I went to work loading coal, $5.94 for an 8-hour day," Uncle Charles recollected.

An underground coal mine begins at the driftmouth, which is the hole in the ground where the miners enter, and it ends at the coal face, where the highest-paid miners work at the most dangerous job.

There, miners with a mechanical cutter tear away the coal in a narrow band along the floor level. When they are through, the coal seam hangs in a great block, clinging to the ceiling with a trench cut out beneath it.

Holes are drilled in this coal face. Powder charges are stuffed in the holes. When they are ignited, in a process called "shooting the coal," the coal is blasted loose and tumbles down in a glittering heap.

Uncle Charles was one of the loaders who shoveled up this coal into little gondola cars which carried it to the driftmouth. For his wage of $5.94, he shoveled about 10 tons a day.

Then he went back to Lexington, passed an examination and became the foreman of the Back Creek mine. From there, he advanced to superintendent, the working executive in charge of all six mines in Pruden.

I remember those times, visiting in Pruden as a teenager and seeing Uncle Charles come home at night. It was hard to think of him as an executive. He wore a miner's helmet, with a little electric lamp in the front that always fascinated me, and his face was silted and dark with layers of coal dust, like a blackface minstrel with a not quite completed makeup job.

I did not know it then, but the Pruden mines were already going down. During the peak years of the late 1930's and the early 1940's, the Southern Railway carried an average of almost 2,000 tons a day away from the Pruden mines. Some 500 men worked "under the hill" mining the coal, and another 125 or so outside.

In the narrow valley between the high ridges, 2,500 people lived. They lived in houses rented from the company, and they shopped at commissaries the company owned. The company ran the town.

Then two things began to happen at once. The United Mine Workers began to push the wage scale up past $20 a day, and the coal seams began to grow narrower. Labor costs rose as the remaining coal deposits shrank.

By 1954, a year of Eisenhower prosperity for most of the rest of the country, Uncle Charles could see the handwriting on the coal face. "I decided," he said, "that I had better get out while I could."

Now he travels through east Tennessee, southeastern Kentucky, and north Georgia, selling dynamite to strip mine operators, roadbuilders, and construction men. Last week, he drove me back to Pruden for a visit to his old hometown.

Only about 30 miners work there now, less than 5 percent of the boomtime work force. Represented by the Southern Miners Union, whose wage scale is well below the UMW's, they toil for a small company which began local operations only 2 months ago.

Only 300 people live in the whole town now, less than one-eighth of the peak population. A few still mine coal, two or three try to farm the steep ridges, a handful enjoy UMW retirement checks, several draw social security.

Unlike many Kentucky companies, Pruden Coal & Coke bent considerable effort toward finding new jobs for its men when it closed down in 1957. "I wrote letters for weeks to Michigan and Ohio," said H. D. Gross, the company's oldtime bookkeeper, who lives now beside the abandoned main commissary. "That's where you'll find the Pruden young folks now."

Hardly one-fifth of the old coal camp houses are still standing. When the mines closed, the land company (which owns the top of the ground and leased the mineral

rights to the coal company) dismantled all the empty houses. Young trees grow now where houses stood.

In the best of times, there was never anything in the "business district" except one theater, one cafe, one babershop and one service station. They were all in one building. Last week all were closed and workmen were tearing down the building.

It is not hard to foresee the day when there will be nothing in the valley but trees and brush, and Pruden only a memory in the minds of a few Kentucky-born rubber workers in Akron or auto workers in Detroit.

At that, the valley is lucky. For in the ridges round about, the strip miners are at work.

Uncle Charles is a rather fatalistic man and the strip mining doesn't seem to bother him much. He seems to accept it as just another branch of the coal business.

It bothers me. Strip mining is ugly and I don't see how anything worse could happen to the land.

In strip mining, the operators don't tunnel into the mountains and bring the coal out. With bulldozers, they simply rip off the top or side of the mountain and lay the coal bare. It's cheaper.

Except that it ruins the land. Down the sides of the mountain tumble the hardpan clay, the slate and shale torn up by the 'dozers. Inert, it lies barren until rainwater washes it down to clog the mountain streams.

Throughout southeastern Kentucky, the pattern is much the same. The big operators are gone or going, moving out to west Kentucky where the coal seams are still thick. The UMW is not even a shadow of its old self, beaten by the nonunion operators taking advantage of surplus labor. Along the ridges, scars open up as the strip mines proliferate.

Pruden is lucky. One of the better companies came there and went, and now it is a ghost.

Poverty in Appalachia—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, historically the United States as a Nation has literally grown with its roots in the soil. Farm life has always been held as an ideal of the American way of life. But we are in a new age today, and hard toil in the fields will not produce a good living all the time.

Agriculture has been transformed since World War II ended. The mechanization of farming has sent many people to the cities, but it has also left behind a peculiar group—the property-owning poor. These people live on their small plots of land in a harsh and bitter poverty.

In the last of a series of five articles on Appalachia in the May 19 issue of the Miami Herald, Lee Winfrey points out one of the characteristics of the rural poor: It is hard for them to leave their homes in the country. Not only do they have no place to go or know how they would get there if they did, but their spirit is sapped by the simple struggle for survival.

President Johnson's war on poverty includes a program for the rural poor consisting of loans to individuals and corporations. The money could be used to acquire land and redevelop it into family farms and to operate and improve family-sized farms by provisions for fences, farm buildings, water development, and other facilities. Grants of up to $1,500 could be authorized to low-income rural families if the money was likely to produce a permanent increase in their income.

Although the program will not put an end to farm poverty, Congress and the country cannot expect to reap the harvest of a healthy America in the future unless they sow wisely today by planting the seeds embodied in the President's proposals.

The article follows:

HARLAN COUNTY EXISTS ON DOLE

(By Lee Winfrey)

HARLAN, KY.—In Harlan County, Christmas comes 12 times a year. It comes on the third day of each month and they call it "blue check day."

Uncle Sam is the Santa Claus and he sends his gifts in plain brown envelopes. His presents are welfare checks—aid to the old, aid to the blind and disabled, aid to dependent children.

On blue check day in May, in this mining town of 4,200 the Harlan National Bank cashed 1,794 welfare checks worth $84,957.07. There is another bank in town and numerous storekeepers who will take a Government check as quick as a dollar.

Harlan County is a county on the dole. Many people here are resentful and they would rather work, but there is nothing for them to do.

Harlan sits on top of some of the richest coal beds in the world. Since the first loaded railroad car was shipped out in 1911, more than 500 million tons have been dug out of the Harlan County hills. It is estimated that 2 billion tons are left.

The coal industry is sick. Harlan, its stepchild, is enfeebled, too.

Two sets of figures sum up the story.

In 1942, the county's peak year, 12,500 miners produced 14,740,796 tons. Last year, armed with new machines that threw hundreds of their fellows out of work, 3,171 miners dug out 5,820,200 tons—the smallest production in Harlan County since 1920.

The other set of figures relates to population. In 1950, there were 72,000 people in Harlan County. By 1960, there were only 52,000. The able bodied and the capable are leaving. Stranded behind are the old, the crippled, and the very young.

TVA AMONG THOSE BLAMED

Everyone blames everyone else. The coal operators blame the United Mine Workers for pushing the wage scale up to $125 a week. We are the only industry put under the thumb of a dictatorial union," say C. D. McDowell, president of the Harlan County Coal Operators Association.

The miners blame the big rail mines for closing down, and the smaller truck mines for refusing to pay the UMW scale. "I wouldn't swap the UMW for all of 'em," says Jess Kinder, 65, who idles now on the courthouse steps, shored up by $206 a month from social security and the UMW retirement fund.

The operators point to the Tennessee Valley Authority, beloved in Tennessee for making the ravaged hillsides green, now often cursed in southeastern Kentucky as the scourge of the coal industry.

"TVA, buying 20 million tons a year for its steamplants, is the biggest single coal purchaser in the country," said operator McDowell. "They've forced the price of coal down a dollar a ton cheaper than it was 10 years ago. If TVA had never existed, the coal operators would be at least a billion dollars richer."

In their box-like coal camp houses, the idle miners care less and less about the futile argument.

In 1959 and again in the bitter winter of 1962–63, violence erupted in the coal fields, beatings and shootings and dynamitings as roving pickets attempted to force the nonunion operators to pay the UMW scale and the 40-cents-a-ton royalty to the UMW retirement fund.

They failed. Now the UMW, pointing to a slump in welfare payments, is selling the last of the 10 fine hospitals it built in eastern Kentucky to care for its men. Abandoned by their last friend, many old miners feel no guilt as they take all they can get from the Government.

A FEW MINERS FIND WAY OUT

Commonly expressed in the coal region is the thought that many of these men will never work again. For the real villain in the coal industry is an innocent bystander: the American homeowner. He simply doesn't want to heat his home with coal any longer. He uses oil or gas.

Harlan is a one-industry town. There is nothing in these bleak hills but coal. Down at the county employment service office, 2,105 people signed up in March. The office found work for 59 of them—mostly on the unemployed parents program, a roadside make work project that pays $1 an hour.

Here and there, encouragingly, is a man finding a way to help himself. One is Howard Brewer, 49, of nearby Cawood, a miner for 26 years.

Brewer was once a local union officer for the UMW, once a roving picket, too. "I quit when they took my hospital card November a year ago," he said. "I was working in a truck mine where they weren't paying royalty."

In a sort of secondary boycott, the UMW would punish negligent truck mines by taking from the miners the cards which entitled them to care at the big UMW hospitals. Implicit was the assumption that the miners would then force their bosses to cough up.

Often, it didn't work that way. The operators simply hired other workers, leaving the strikers with neither job nor union.

After 7 or 8 months of idleness, Brewer found a way out down at the Harlan area vocational school. The Federal Government has financed this program for the past 2 years through the Manpower Defense Training Act and the Area Redevelopment Administration.

There Brewer is learning to be a mine machine repairman, learning how to fix the automatic loaders, the shuttle cars, and the cutting machines that make the mines go today. As human miners grow increasingly obsolete, men to fix the machines become more valuable.

Even so, Brewer says, "I figure I'll have to leave, where, I don't know. I've got hopes they'll help us some here. It's an evident fact men our age have got to have help. I've been in Indiana as long as 3 weeks hunting work, and always lost out on account of my age."

HARD TO LEAVE HARLAN COUNTY

For many, Harlan County is a hard place to leave. The hills seem very tall and the roads leading out are narrow. "The welfare" is like a drug, sapping the spirit and the energy of those who accept it. The backwardness and isolation of the region are often pathetic.

One evening I drove out through Clover Fork, east of Harlan toward Evarts. It is dark and bloody ground: At Evarts in 1931, company guards and miners fought the first

gunbattle in the UMW's violent, years-long drive to organize the Harlan coalfields.

Four people were going up the road in the gathering dusk: an old woman, an old man with a baby in his arms, and a teenage boy. They were going to Wednesday night prayer meeting, a Baptist tradition through most of Appalachia.

I stopped and gave them a ride and when they got in, I moved some things over into my lap to make room for them. Among the items was a common service station road map.

The boy pointed to the map. "That's what you use to tell where you're goin', ain't it?' he said.

I thought he was making some kind of a joke. I laughed and said yes.

Then he said, "That's the way my brother Jimmy does, too." And I realized he wasn't joking and I stopped laughing.

An ordinary road map, the easiest way to learn how to get out of Harlan County, was a magical mystery to him.

Sargent Shriver's New Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed fitting that President Johnson chose Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver to lead the fight against poverty in our Nation.

Mr. Shriver's career has been characterized by the ability to accept difficult challenges and to meet them triumphantly. The most obvious example is the success he has made of the Peace Corps during the 3 years in which he has been its Director and guiding spirit.

Many doubted the success of this program because its concept was new and untested, and the pitfalls were many. Mr. Shriver, recognizing the problems which might arise, worked diligently to build the Peace Corps into an organization which would represent the best in American life and traditions.

His success can be measured in worldwide acceptance of the Peace Corps and the efforts of other nations to emulate it. It can also be determined by the numbers of converted skeptics who today admit their previous error of judgment.

The President's antipoverty program likewise is untested. It faces pitfalls. It has its critics. Mr. Shriver is undaunted by these facts. He has thrown himself into the work of eradicating poverty in our Nation with the same verve and determination that has characterized his tenure with the Peace Corps.

If the past is an indication of the future, we may be confident that these new efforts of Mr. Shriver will be similarly crowned with success. Poverty, long a scourge of mankind, has a new and strong adversary.

Mr. Shriver's many accomplishments were the subject of an article in the Sunday editorial section of the Milwaukee Journal on August 30. Written by Paul E. Salsini of the Journal staff, the piece gives a concise and interesting glimpse into the life and work of this outstanding American. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

"GENERAL" SHRIVER'S HUMANE WAR

(By Paul E. Salsini)

In the 3 years that the Peace Corps has marched around the world, Sargent Shriver has achieved a public image as the man who slogs with his youthful volunteers through the mud of Borneo, Guatemala, Nigeria, and other farflung outposts.

For the next 3 years at least, the Nation may expect to see Shriver striding the streets of Harlem, visiting a shack in the Appalachians, or talking with a farmer in northern Wisconsin.

Shriver is still the Director of the Peace Corps, but he has turned his attention from the poor abroad to the poor at home. Having made a whooping success of the Corps, he has been promoted by President Johnson to "general" commanding the administration's forces in the new, 3-year, all-out war on poverty.

It will be, by far, the most difficult job the 48-year-old Shriver has had in his long career as a businessman and public servant. The Peace Corps was demanding enough, with its dramatic plan to send young people—and oldsters—abroad to help train the unskilled in underdeveloped countries.

JOB 30 TIMES AS BIG

The antipoverty program is a different matter. The $947.5 million which Congress authorized for the first year is 30 times the original budget of the Peace Corps. Moreover, it is designed to reach a great many more people, in a great many more ways.

It is a sweeping program for school dropouts to work in conservation camps or urban training centers, for local communities to start their own poverty wars, for farm families to get 15-year loans, for small businesses to hire the chronically unemployed, for heads of families on relief to get job and training opportunities and for volunteers to assist in mental health, migrant, Indian, and other Federal help programs.

Such a broad program will merely dent the hard core of poverty in the country. According to census figures, a fifth of the Nation's 47 million families are classified as poor—earning less than $3,000 a year. Wisconsin's percentage is only slightly less than average—17.4 percent—and Governor Reynolds' new task force on poverty will start the State program at its meeting Monday in Madison.

The sweep of the antipoverty provisions has come under sharp criticism. It has been called a hodgepodge and a duplication of existing agencies' work.

As head of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Shriver will have one of the most powerful jobs in Washington. He will receive $22,500 a year, compared with his nonpaying Peace Corps job.

Shriver will coordinate all programs in the bill and administer key sections. He has broad authority to distribute funds, can forgive the repayment of farmers' loans and can contract with local public and private agencies without going through State channels.

But Shriver's job will also be a delicate one. Unlike the Peace Corps, his programs will be right under the noses of critical Congressmen. He will be dealing with people a great portion of the Nation would like to ignore—the unseen poor, reliefers, and Negroes.

Also, Shriver will be under the constant watchful eye of President Johnson, who has called him "one of the most brilliant, most able and most competent officials in the Government." The antipoverty bill was Johnson's first major personal legislative achievement and he has indicated that he attaches great importance to its success. Shriver will be a special assistant to the President to direct the program.

Observers agree that it will be up to Shriver to make the war on poverty a success. Already he has been working 12 hours a day to make it so. He was one of the few Democrats who stayed away from the party's convention last week to continue to work in Washington. He has continued as Peace Corps Director, he quips, because "a fellow with a growing family has to have two jobs."

Shriver has said that his goal is to achieve a "practical, manageable, understandable" way effectively to attack poverty. He adds: "I'm not at all interested in running a handout program or a leaf raking program or 'something for nothing' program. (The poverty war) will be a practical program."

Shriver is likely to control the antipoverty program as firmly as he dominated the Peace Corps. A sturdy, 6-foot, 175-pound figure, he demands a great deal from himself—and others. He is a perfectionist who expects the nearly impossible from his staff. A sign in his office reads: "Nice guys don't win ball games."

Success as the top general in the war on poverty could cap a highly successful career for Shriver. He has been a lawyer, magazine editor and working politician. He has helped run the Merchandise Mart in Chicago, been president of that city's school board and been an active Catholic layman, especially in the Catholic Interracial Council. (In recognition of his contributions to Catholic interests, he will receive the Cardinal Newman Award Saturday at the National Newman Congress, in Milwaukee's Pfister Hotel.)

Shriver's success as Peace Corps Director overshadowed the fact that he was appointed by his brother-in-law, the late President Kennedy. It gave him a public image of his own, rather than being merely one of the Kennedy clan. In some quarters, his do-gooder role earned him the title "Mr. Clean."

A NAVAL OFFICER

Shriver's wife is the former Eunice Kennedy, whom he met in 1945 when he was assistant to the editor of Newsweek magazine. A member of an old Maryland family, Shriver was graduated cum laude from Yale. He was a lieutenant commander in the Navy during World War II.

Joseph P. Kennedy, Eunice's father, was impressed with Shriver and took him into his business organization. Shriver was sent to Chicago to do a survey of the Merchandise Mart, the world's largest commercial building, which Kennedy then owned. Eventually, Shriver was named assistant general manager. He married the boss' daughter in 1953. They have four children.

Although he took an active role in his brother-in-law's 1960 campaign, Shriver never has run for a political office. He was mentioned this year as a possible running mate for President Johnson.

When asked about his possible future candidacy, he said, in what must be regarded as understatement: "I always maintain an interest in public service."

Communist Condemns Goldwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, politics indeed makes strange bedfellows and one of these "fellows" happens to be a woman, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, a noted

Communist in the United States. She deplores BARRY GOLDWATER, as is reported in today's New York Times:

U.S. REDS ACCUSE HARLEM LEFTISTS—SAY PEIPING FACTION STIRRED TROUBLE DURING RIOTS

Moscow, September 1.—A leader of the Communist Party of the United States accused the pro-Chinese Communists today of acting as troublemakers in the recent race riots in Harlem.

Mrs. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, writing in Pravda, condemned the Chinese Communists and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER in equal terms and pledged the loyalty of the Communist Party of the United States to the Kremlin.

Her article was commemorating the 45th anniversary of the party. She is the party's national chairman.

The "irresponsible policies of the Chinese leaders resemble the positions (on nuclear war) taken by GOLDWATER and may lead to a world holocaust," she wrote in the Soviet party newspaper.

"Our party is mustering its forces and all people under its influence to defeat GOLDWATER," she said. She charged that Mr. GOLDWATER "was against trade unions, Negroes, Communists, social security, assistance to the aged, and unemployment insurance," but that he was "for nuclear war if necessary."

Mr. GOLDWATER's candidacy was approved by the Chinese Communists on the ground that what was worst for the United States was best for Peiping, Mrs. Flynn wrote.

She said that the Communist Party of the United States supported the Kremlin's "peaceful foreign policy aimed at disarmament and the liquidation of colonialism."

Like "all Communist parties in capitalist countries," she said, the American Communist Party has had to fight factionalism. Several years ago the party's extreme left advocated dissolution of party and was expelled for this, she wrote. The expelled faction then formed the Progressive Workers Movement, she said.

She charged that this movement, whose "views coincide with those of Chinese Communist leaders," committed "adventurist actions and provocations" during the recent events in Harlem.

A Birch Leader Speaks, Disgustingly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in Atlantic City last month we Democrats unanimously and enthusiastically included in our platform the following statement:

We condemn extremism, whether from the right or left, including the extreme tactics of such organizations as the Communist Party, the Ku Klux Klan and the John Birch Society.

This is in sharp contrast to the performance of the Republican elements now in control of that party. They successfully resisted all efforts to put a specific stamp of disapproval on the John Birch Society. And the Republican nominee for President has consistently told us what fine people are in the society and that he has only some disagreement with one leader, Robert Welch.

The congressional district I represent has just been visited by another Birch leader, Dr. Revilo Oliver, member of the society's national council. His remarks are disgusting and shocking. He calls the three civil rights leaders slain in Mississippi "cockroaches." He says the funeral of the late President Kennedy was "well rehearsed" and "up to the technical standards of Cleopatra and Ben Hur."

We can be proud that one of our Nation's two great political parties has condemned an organization headed by such people as Dr. Oliver. We have plainly said to the Birchers: "We don't want your votes."

The Tucson Daily Citizen, which normally supports Republicans, sharply rebuked Dr. Oliver and suggested he peers at the world "through paranoid spectacles." I think the Citizen has performed a fine public service in calling this man to account.

Following is the Citizen's report of Dr. Oliver's speech and the paper's editorial of condemnation:

[From the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Citizen, Aug. 25, 1964]

SLAIN RIGHTS WORKERS CALLED "COCKROACHES"

(By Eric Cavaliero)

The three civil rights workers killed in the Deep South this summer were "cockroaches who crawled into the State of Mississippi to incite violence," Dr. Revilo P. Oliver said here last night.

The professor of classics at the University of Illinois and national council member of the John Birch Society told a Tucson Press Club forum:

"I'm truly astonished at the amount of excitement this has occasioned. I noticed in Washington a white woman was raped while praying in her home church, but I don't hear one peep of indignation from the liberals.

"I'm not sure who killed those people in Mississippi," he added. "I strongly suspect that the murder may have followed a common Communist pattern. They either do the work themselves or get someone else to do it for them.

"Those people are not entitled to one-tenth of the consideration or sympathy they have aroused."

He described the John Birch Society as "a patriotic organization whose principal function is to educate the American people * * * we are trying to distribute information that is not getting out in other channels.

"We are trying to call people's attention to significant events of which they have never heard," he added, "as well as those they have heard but forgotten."

Oliver quoted a newspaper report which suggested that Dallas police were ready to arrest Lee Harvey Oswald and Jack Ruby at the time that an assassination attempt was made on Maj. Gen. Edwin Walker.

"The story says they did not carry it out as they had been told by a high official in the Justice Department, they must not do so because it was a matter of national interest," he added. "The story describes this official in such a way that it could only be Bobby Sox Kennedy."

In a talk last night at Doolen Junior High School, Oliver suggested that if Communist plans had not gone astray, we would have had "a national Saturnalia of legalized violence under cover of which the international conspiracy could have gained control of the whole Nation."

He received a standing ovation from a near-capacity crowd as he added:

"You may owe your life or at least your liberty to the vigilance and sagacity of Officer J. D. Tippit, the policeman who stopped Lee Harvey Oswald on the street and was murdered by the conspiracy's well-trained but not infallible agent.

"It's easy to see what could have happened had everything gone smoothly in Dallas," he added. "There could have been a complete breakdown of law and order everywhere.

"The numerous vermin that have been living for years in ill-concealed anticipation of the glorious day when they will be able to hack Americans to pieces could have started looting, burning, and murdering."

Oliver said Oswald had been trained in Moscow and assigned to Dallas. He would have made his escape after the assassination, but for Tippit's sharp police work.

Debunking what he called the "adoration" for the late President, Oliver said: "Jack Kennedy was almost the equal of the actor who takes the role of Perry Mason in the television series. He was able to recite quite convincingly the lines written by Salinger, Schlesinger, and other word twisters whom the taxpayers hire to confuse them.

"At times he sounded American and made sense, and he seemed entirely credible until you realized how his achievements differed from his announced intentions."

He said Kennedy's "well-rehearsed" funeral was "up to the technical standards of Cleopatra and Ben Hur."

Oliver said a "Kennedy cult" has grown up since the assassination.

"I have received letters from people who wanted to know how it was possible for anyone to be so debased as to criticize the greatest man who ever lived," he said.

He quoted a letter from a man who called Oliver a "hatemonger" and then threatened to squash his eyes out. "That one is from a lovemonger," Oliver said.

"The adoration of a semidivine leader is an example of the Socialist mentality," he added.

"Liberal intellectuals stand on their heads and tell you that the world is upside down," he said. "Not one of them ever proposed or approved anything that would bring $1 of profit to the American people.

"They have always taken for granted that the taxpayers' money should go to people who are too stupid, too lazy, or too savage to work."

He cited the Central Intelligence Agency as "a body that has done the work of the Soviet secret police for years."

Oliver's appearance here was sponsored by the American Opinion Bookstore, 1695 North Magnolia Avenue.

[From the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Citizen, Aug. 27, 1964]

TIME FOR THE BIRCHERS TO "PUT UP OR SHUT UP"

There's a crude saying a betting man will use to challenge his opponent in an argument. "Put up or shut up," the saying goes.

We think it's time to say "put up or shut up" to some of the leaders of the John Birch Society.

And here is what we mean: "Put up the proof to support your charges, or stop making those charges."

We direct this demand to one Revilo P. Oliver, who was in Tucson Monday and made two speeches that night. He appeared at a Tucson Press Club forum and at a public gathering at Doolen Junior High School.

Dr. Oliver is an educated man. He is, in fact, a professor of classics at the University of Illinois. He is also a national council member of the John Birch Society.

He made some pretty wild and irresponsible statements while he was here. He spoke of the late President Kennedy's "well-rehearsed" funeral. Speaking of three civil rights workers killed this summer, he re-

ferred to "cockroaches who crawled into the State of Mississippi to incite violence."

In an apparent reference to last November's tragedy in Dallas, Dr. Oliver suggested that if Communist plans had not gone astray, we would have had "a national Saturnalia of legalized violence under cover of which the international conspiracy could have gained control of the whole Nation."

The way the plans went astray, of course, is that police caught the Marxist who killed the President. Some leftwing liberals already had blamed Dallas-rightwingers for the assassination. If Lee Oswald had not been caught, the radical liberals undoubtedly would have broadened and intensified their attack in an effort to discredit and vilify many legitimate conservative organizations.

But to suggest that this would have become an orgy of legalized violence is to peer at the world through paranoid spectacles.

Dr. Oliver described the John Birch Society as "a patriotic organization whose principal function is to educate the American people" about the Communist conspiracy.

We're all for that, if they'll stick to it. There is a Communist conspiracy which threatens America and all the free world. The U.S. Government does not seem sufficiently alert to the problem or adept at coping with it.

But irresponsible and unprovable statements such as those made by Dr. Oliver are not effective weapons against communism. In the long run, Birchers who talk like that do more to hurt than help the anti-Communist cause.

Welfare and Pension Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, the recent conviction of labor leaders who misappropriated welfare and pension funds of their unions have prompted a number of my constituents to inquire as to the possibility of depleted welfare funds and Federal protection in this area.

These funds are established to provide death, disability, and retirement benefits for employees, and represent an incentive for increased production and continued employment. They are a part of the worker's compensation and he has a vested claim in them just as he does to his private savings account.

Regretfully, I find that existing Federal banking and labor statutes do not protect the worker against unscrupulous employers or trustees who may raid the fund. This is particularly true of small corporations which, in desperation and on the verge of bankruptcy, sometimes resort to "borrowing" from the employees retirement fund. When bankruptcy actually occurs in such a case, the welfare pension fund is lost and its purpose defeated along with what remains of the assets of the defunct business.

The U.S. Department of Labor informs me that while they are aware of these criminal acts they presently have no jurisdiction or legal means to prevent raids on pension funds. Unfortunately, their records disclose many cases of this nature.

Certainly this glaring deficiency must be corrected with appropriate penalties, including heavy fines and jail sentences.

These funds are trust funds and should be accorded the same careful protection as those of deceased persons held in trust for the benefit of widows and orphans. It can be accomplished by Government supervision, insurance, or investment standards to limit the range of trustee discretion.

I am well aware that it is too late in the present session to obtain constructive action on what is a highly-controversial matter. However, I am today submitting a proposed bill for record purposes and study, and I urge its careful consideration by interested Members who may feel disposed to join me in pressing this matter at the opening of the next session of Congress.

Marshall W. Amis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on September 30 a distinguished public servant will retire from the public service. He is Marshall W. Amis, who has served admirably and effectively as regional director of the Public Housing Administration in Fort Worth, Tex., for many years.

Since his record of service is an inspiration to many, and since through his dedicated years of work in our Federal Government, he has assisted so many Americans to achieve a better and more comfortable life, I am including here a statement of his public service written by George Parker, the regional attorney for the Public Housing Administration in the Fort Worth regional office:

STATEMENT IN HONOR OF MARSHALL W. AMIS, ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM PUBLIC SERVICE, SEPTEMBER 30, 1964

Marshall W. Amis has served with great distinction and success as regional director of the Public Housing Administration since the regional office was first established in Fort Worth on June 30, 1939, except for approximately 5 years (1948–53), while Mr. Amis acted as general counsel of the agency in Washington, D.C. Mr. Amis will complete nearly 33 years of devoted exemplary Federal service on September 30, 1964, when he reaches the age of compulsory retirement, and we believe that it is particularly fitting and timely that this outstanding public servant be recognized on the occasion of his retirement.

The best evidence of the exceptional ability and outstanding public service shown by Marshall Amis in his long, exemplary and fruitful career as a public servant is the record of his administration of the Public Housing Administration regional office for more than 20 years. It is a record (1) of great accomplishment, (2) of impeccable integrity and outstanding citizenship, and (3) a wise and prudent administration of Federal funds entrusted into his stewardship.

It is also timely to honor Marshall Amis in view of the national program to conduct an all-out war on poverty. Mr. Amis has been a dedicated warrior against poverty throughout his many years of public service and his accomplishments in providing better housing for the poverty-stricken families of the Southwestern States and in eliminating slums and substandard housing is an outstanding testimonial that in a great democracy such as ours there are no unimportant people and that we as a nation want for every child and family the opportunity of achieving their fullest potential as citizens.

Mr. Amis was born September 13, 1894, in Newton County, Miss. His father was a Meridian, Miss., attorney and also was judge of the equity court there. He was educated in public schools at Meridian and was valedictorian of his high school graduating class. In 1917 Amis was graduated from the University of Mississippi with two degrees, bachelor of arts and bachelor of laws. Both were earned magna cum laude.

1. ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Public Housing Administration Fort Worth Regional Office administers the Federal program of financial assistance to local communities to provide low-rent decent, safe and sanitary housing for its lowest income families and the elimination of substandard housing in the eight Southwestern States, including Texas. The five low-rent housing projects of the housing authority of the city of Fort Worth that have eliminated much substandard housing and provided 1,074 decent, safe, and sanitary homes for low-income Fort Worth families is an example of Mr. Amis' leadership and administration of the program in this area. Since 1939 more than 65,000 low-rent housing units have been provided in the Southwestern States and more than 48,000 substandard shacks and slums have been eliminated as part of the program.

When it is considered that the local housing authorities are encouraged to utilize their low-rent housing units as stepping stones for self-improvement of low-income families, preparatory to advancement into homes of their own, Mr. Amis' efforts through the years have undoubtedly resulted in the rehabilitation and uplifting of hundreds of thousands of low-income families. Almost every day we receive reports of low-income families that have progressed up the economic scale through the temporary help received in obtaining a decent place to live at a rent sufficiently low to be met by their limited means. A doctor who is now serving on the board of one of our local housing authorities recently told a member of our office that without the temporary help of living in a low-rent housing project while in medical school he could not have completed his medical education and supported his wife and small children. Another heartwarming example of the success of Mr. Amis' dedicated war on poverty was the recent announcement that the valedictorian of a high school in this area was a product of a low-rent housing project whose family had formerly resided in substandard housing. Thousands of young people in the Southwestern area have escaped the bonds of poverty through the help of a decent, safe, and sanitary home made possible by Marshall Amis' leadership.

In addition to his accomplishments with respect to the low-rent housing program, Mr. Amis and his office rendered outstanding and efficient service to the Nation in providing most of the temporary housing for service personnel and warworkers in the Southwestern area during World War II. Thousands of units were provided in a fast, efficient, and economical manner, ranging from permanent housing to trailer villages put into operation almost overnight. In Texas alone over 32,000 units of war housing were developed under Mr. Amis' leadership. After the war was won and the veterans came home seeking a place to start life again, Mr.

Amis and his organization did a prodigious job of providing temporary housing for veterans through the reuse and conversion of temporary war housing and military barracks. Thousands of veterans in the Southwest owe a great debt to the efficiency and redtape cutting ability of Marshall Amis in getting temporary housing ready for them—certainly not fancy but decent and sanitary and happily accepted by the veterans until permanent housing of their own could be attained.

2. A RECORD OF INTEGRITY AND DEVOTION TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE

We can think of no finer example of an able, devoted public servant of the greatest integrity and good citizenship than Marshall W. Amis. In his nearly 33 years of public service he has set an outstanding example for his office subordinates and associates. In his more than 20 years as Director of the Fort Worth Public Housing Administration office, there has been no instance of laxity or loss to the taxpayers in the administration of millions of dollars of Federal funds, neither in his own office nor in the projects financed under his supervision. In every case where an irregularity arose it was dealt with swiftly and promptly without scandal or loss to the taxpayers. Mr. Amis has set a wonderful example for his employees as a fine Christian citizen. He is a devoted member of the First Methodist Church and takes a personal interest that every PHA employee pays his poll tax and exercises his responsibility as a citizen. There has never been a single year since the establishment of the Fort Worth Regional Office that the office has not substantially oversubscribed its quota to the United Fund, the Savings Bond Campaign and other charitable and patriotic activities. Mr. Amis is an active member of the Fort Worth Rotary Club and is past president of the Forth Worth Federal Business Association. He is a veteran of World War I and served as Captain, Battery A, 334th Field Artillery, 87th Division of the A.E.F.

3. THE TAXPAYERS FRIEND

Marshall Amis is widely known and honored as a Government official with an outstanding record of wise and frugal expenditure of the Federal funds entrusted to his stewardship. Not only are the low-rent housing projects developed in this area financed at lower costs than any other regional area in the United States, but Mr. Amis does it with fewer employees, lower administrative expense, but yet with greater tangible results. For example, there are less than half as many employees in the Fort Worth regional office per low-rent housing project administered, than the average of all the other PHA regional offices. The Fort Worth office achieves lower office overhead expense than other regional offices through the simple process of getting by with more than 25 percent less space per employee, despite the greater workload than other PHA offices. The results achieved in the low-rent housing program under Mr. Amis' administration are equally gratifying. The program administered by the Fort Worth regional office has achieved the lowest rents and is serving the lowest income families of any other PHA regional office, including the southeastern region. The median gross rent (including gas, electricity, and water) achieved in the Southwestern area projects was the very low figure of $34.39 for the year ending June 30, 1963. The national average median gross rent, including utilities, was $45.34. The median income of the low-income families housed in the Southwestern area was $1,976 per year, the lowest in the Nation. The national median income of families housed in PHA financed housing was the very respectable figure of $2,464, but nearly $500 higher than that achieved under Mr. Amis' administration.

Mr. Amis emphasizes in his dealings with communities the importance of providing better housing for low-income families with children. The average family housed in Southwestern low-rent housing projects, including many elderly families without children, is nearly four children per family. This is also the best record of any PHA office in helping larger families.

G. A. PARKER,
Regional Attorney, Fort Worth Regional Office, Public Housing Administration.

Extension and Amendment of Public Law 480

SPEECH
OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12298) to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to put in perspective some of the precedents in the use of this law. For that purpose, I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas or members of the committee precisely what aid we have given to the United Arab Republic under Public Law 480. I wonder if any of them could tell us in the first instance under how many titles of the law the United Arab Republic receives aid.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The United Arab Republic receives aid under title I. We have sold to the United Arab Republic in the last 10 years under title I $1,129,700,000 worth of commodities. Then we have given the United Arab Republic certain aid under title II which is, of course, the program where we give the aid rather than sell it and that comes to a total in the last 10 years of $25,348,000.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Is that $25 billion?

Mr. POAGE. No, it is $25,348,000.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Under title I is there any delineation as to the nature of the country we are giving aid to, as to whether it is a friendly country, a neutral country, or an unfriendly country, or any other status?

Mr. POAGE. The law says "to friendly countries."

Mr. ROSENTHAL. That is friendly countries? And all during this 10-year period we sold them over a billion dollars worth of commodities, they have qualified under this section as a friendly country?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I wonder if the gentleman from New Jersey who is a member of the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs, and who has been a vigorous opponent of this amendment and a great proponent of foreign aid, will tell me how in any way, shape, or form the United Arab Republic can be defined as a "friendly" country?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think the determination in the aid bill is one where the President must make the determination that they are involved in aggression. I believe one of the things the State Department is trying to do is to protect the status of Israel and one of the ways we can do that best is by having some leverage in the Near East and even though that is a worn out argument as the previous gentleman said, the fact of the matter is that warfare has not broken out between Israel and Egypt.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The gentleman is going one step beyond the point I want to make. Are you prepared to state here and now that without the advocacy of the State Department and by your own definition of the word "friendly", you are prepared to define the United Arab Republic as a friendly country?

Mr. GALLAGHER. No, I do not think the United Arab Republic is a friendly country. I do not think Mr. Nasser is a very friendly person. I am interested, however, in the national interest of the United States and in our interest in the Near East and our interest in the State of Israel.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. We can come to that in a minute. But if I may continue, if you are prepared to say that the United Arab Republic is not a friendly country, then in no way can you justify aid to that country under the existing legislation.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the gentleman will permit me, my definition of friendly and the definition of the State Department of the word "friendly" may be two different things. I am talking about some of the acts—some of the noise and some of the acts that Mr. Nasser has carried out against Israel and I am pointing out that they have not been very friendly. But I do not think we should at this point be in the position of casting Mr. Nasser and the rest of the Near East into the same role and say that they are all Communists.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. That is precisely the point I make. I am not willing to substitute the judgment of the Department of State for my own judgment. I am willing to stand with you in defining the word "friendly." Both of us agree that the United Arab Republic has not been a friendly country, notwithstanding any propaganda that the Department of State puts out.

Mr. GALLAGHER. But we are talking about our Nation.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. If you and I believe in our definition of the word "friendly," then we simply cannot continue giving ai dto the United Arab Republic, regardless of what the State Department tells us. They are going to tell us about stability and maintaining a flexible hand. These are told, tired, and worn out clichés. It seems to me on the face of it we are continuing to violate the law by giving aid to a country that is most unfriendly to the interests of the United States.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the gentleman will let me clear up our definitions here—a friendly nation could be considered as one that is not unfriendly to the United States or even a nation that is not at war with the United States. So there is a broad area of definition involved here. The gentleman is accepting his definition in one category.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, I am accepting your definition.

Mr. GALLAGHER. No, I think what we are trying to do is to accept the definition that is going to best serve the interest of the United States. That is what we are talking about.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I think we are all reasonable men, and we know what the word "friendly" means, and we know what the word "neutral" means, and we know what the word "unfriendly" means. I think you join with me, regardless of what the Department of State says, that the United Arab Republic is not a friendly nation, and if they do not fit that definition, they cannot receive assistance under this law.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I must point out to the gentleman that he is speaking for himself on this point.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Supreme Court and the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, four full pages of Fortune magazine for August 1964 are devoted to a layman's dissent, by Mr. Felix Morley, to the recent Supreme Court decisions on reapportionment of State legislatures. It is an informative, logical, and persuasive dissent and I respectfully urge all my colleagues to read it. It is entitled "The Supreme Court and the Republic."

The "dissent" follows:

THE SUPREME COURT AND THE REPUBLIC

(By Felix Morley)

(This is a layman's, not a lawyer's, dissent from the recent Supreme Court decisions on reapportionment. Mr. Morley is a journalist and educator, onetime editor of the Washington Post, and subsequently president of Haverford College. He is also an authority on constitutional history and the author of "The Power in the People" and "Freedom and Federalism." His views, considered alongside the Court's, point up the profound difficulties of maintaining our system of republican government.)

In his final opinion as a Supreme Court Justice, delivered from that Bench on March 26, 1962, Felix Frankfurter quietly observed that: "What is actually asked of the Court in this case is to choose * * * among competing theories of political philosophy."

The case was *Baker* v. *Carr*, establishing jurisdiction for Federal courts over the system of representation in the general assembly of Tennessee, and, in effect, ordering that representation in the lower house be made proportionate to the geographic spread of population. Justice Frankfurter, in his monumental dissent, pointed out that arithmetical equality in voting "was not the system chosen by the Constitution" and "is not predominantly practised by the States today." The case, he concluded, "is of that class of political controversy which, by the nature of its subject, is unfit for Federal judicial action."

That, however, was not the majority opinion. And the theory of judicial control over legislative composition has now been carried much further by the Supreme Court's judgment of June 15, on six similar cases appealed from Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, New York, and Virginia. In all of these Justice Harlan, associated with Frankfurter in the Tennessee dissent, again denies validity to the argument that the legislatures of these States "are apportioned in ways that violate the Federal Constitution."

The progression to the current cases from that of 1962 is noteworthy. In the Tennessee ruling the Court established its right to intervene, justifying this by the "invidious discrimination" among electoral districts of the lower house with very unequal population. In the current cases the right of intervention is assumed. Local efforts to rectify imbalance without profound disturbance of traditional patterns are found inadequate. And not just one but both houses of the affected State legislatures are told that they must reapportion on the principle of "one person, one vote."

With this decision, which demands reorganization of legislative arrangements in almost every State, the import of Justice Frankfurter's prescient observation becomes more clear. What the Court is doing is to impose on the States a new conception of representative government, far more egalitarian than that established by the Founding Fathers. The effect is no less revolutionary because ordained by an agency—the Federal judiciary—not customarily associated with profound political upheavals.

Nor is it to be expected that the resultant tremors will be confined to State capitols and local political organizations. In *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, the Supreme Court decided, some months ago, that "our Constitution's plain objective" is to provide "equal representation for equal numbers of people." This goes for the Federal House of Representatives as clearly as for the State legislatures. And if the U.S. Senate is safeguarded by very special constitutional guarantees the current decisions nonetheless imply that its system of representation—two Senators alike from sparsely and heavily populated States—is somehow un-American and undesirable.

THE CHOICE

The "competing theories of political philosophy" to which Justice Frankfurter referred are that of a federal republic, on the one hand, and that of a unitary democracy on the other. "Totalitarian" would be a more descriptive adjective than unitary, except that it has acquired a strongly derogatory flavor. The point is that the opposite to the division of governmental power essential for a federal republic is the concentration of governmental power necessary to make a democracy operative.

Democracy, in its political sense of unqualified majority rule, upholds the principle of "winner takes all." Carried to a logical conclusion it means that minorities have no rights which "the will of the people" may not override. Vox populi, vox dei, as the old Romans said. The trouble there was that ambitious generals soon saw themselves as spokesmen of all the people and therefore as godlike rulers. Thus representative government, lacking careful institutional restraint, soon ceased to be democratic even as it claimed that objective. We see the same phenomenon operating in Communist countries today, called "democratic people's republics" by their dictators on the assumption that they are the only legitimate interpreters of the popular will.

The Greeks, for a brief but glorious period, were able to avoid this political degeneration, simply by stressing the excellence for which they were taught to strive in every aspect of life. Government should be representative, serving the interests of all, impartially. But those who conduct it should be, in every sense, an "elect" group, chosen by a very limited suffrage.

The authors of the Constitution, for the most part good classical scholars, paid close attention to the Greek and Roman precedents. While firm believers in representative government, they found democracy, in its political as contrasted with its social sense, abhorrent. The word is not mentioned in the Constitution and became especially mistrusted when the doctrine of absolute equality led to the reign of terror in France. This prompted the famous aphorism of John Adams, our second President: "There never was a democracy that did not commit suicide."

THE MEANING OF FEDERALISM

In fact, it was impossible for the Government of the United States, in origin, to be really democratic. It had to take Federal form to achieve the Union of the 13 originally independent States. The essence of federalism is the reservation to its component parts of certain defined powers, which of itself involves a limitation of the powers of the general government. No matter what their collective desires, the people of a federation are not entitled to decide matters reserved to the authority of the constituent States. In a federation, majority opinion is therefore sometimes ineffective, unless it coincides with the public opinion of autonomous localities.

That much is true of any federation, but in our own the curbing of democracy was originally carried further. Some of these curbs on popular control have been removed, but others of great significance remain. Congress, for instance, "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Here is a clear contraction of democracy but not of representative government, which serves to protect those very minorities that democracy is disposed to crush. Under our system an opinionated religious sect, like the Amish, is safeguarded not by sending representatives to Congress but simply because the conventional majority there is denied the democratic power to suppress.

While deeply interested in political personalities and detail, most contemporary Americans are far more ignorant of political theory than were their forefathers. This presumably explains why the present Supreme Court can effectively suggest that representative government is necessarily democratic, and that democracy is necessarily representative. Yet illustrations of the important difference between the two are all around us. As the electoral system has developed it will be the rule, not the exception, in November for a simple majority, or even a plurality, of the voters in each State to decide the entire electoral vote of that State. This accords with the democratic principle of "winner takes all." But it is difficult to find anything representative in the procedure.

There are many indications that the objective of some Americans today is to substitute pure democracy for our traditional system of representative government. One way to accomplish this is to take all intelligent content out of the technical political term "democracy," and to make it a "good" word surrounded with a mystique calculated to make people react with spontaneous favor to its utterance. Over the years this has been done. Today it is almost embarrassing to recall that James Madison considered po-

litical democracy "incompatible with personal security or the rights of property."

The second way to weaken representative government is to erode the Federal structure by a continuous and progressive centralization of governmental functions. This process, too, was underway long before the day of F.D.R., who probably deserves less credit, or discredit, than he generally receives for the concentration of power in Washington.

But the movement to eliminate the States as sovereign entities is greatly impeded by the fact that local self-government, though often inefficient and not infrequently corrupt, is still generally regarded as preferable to dictation by distant bureaucrats. At many points along the road to socialism the Congress has dug in its heels, showing strong skepticism toward the provision of "bread and circuses," as the old Romans characterized the various new and fair deals by which the unconquerable empire was undermined from within.

A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

There is, however, an infrequently used device by which the executive may overcome the obstruction of a recalcitrant legislature. It can summon the third arm of Government, which is the judiciary, to its aid, and if the judges are compliant, giving fluid interpretation to the laws, representative government may in effect be frustrated. Such a policy is dangerous and a great deal depends on the manner in which it is undertaken. King Charles I of England called on the judiciary to support the divine right of kings, as did Louis XVI a century and a half later in France. In both cases the monarchs were decapitated for their pains.

It is a more subtle and promising tactic to have the judges find legislative obstruction "undemocratic" since the charisma of democracy protects the executive against any charge of arrogance, seems favorable to everybody, and accords with the general sense of justice, in which the judicial profession is assumed to be expert. And though the Supreme Court is, ironically, the most undemocratic of our institutions it is working assiduously in favor of more democratic representation.

"The right to vote freely for the candidate of one's choice is of the essence of a democratic society, and any restrictions on that right strike at the heart of representative government." So says Chief Justice Warren in his controlling opinion on the latest apportionment cases. But the right to vote freely is not at issue in any of these cases. The issue is merely whether there is improper discrimination when all votes are not equally weighted on a nose-count basis. And that question does not affect "the heart" of representative government. Its major concern is quality of representation while that of democratic government is quantity in election. New York was not underpresented at the Philadelphia Convention of 1787 because it had only one delegate—Alexander Hamilton—to sign the Constitution, whereas Delaware had five, whose names would today be recognized by very few.

NOT TREES OR ACRES

Confusion of qualitative and quantitative values, in Chief Justice Warren's opinion of June 15, leads to a tortured reasoning not likely to become more impressive as it is subjected to the test of time. The opinion relies, in large part, on that clause of the 14th amendment which says that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." Taking this clause out of context it is laboriously argued that equal protection is denied unless representatives speak for an arithmetically equal number of people. "Legislators," says the current judgment, "represent people, not trees or acres." That is the theory of pure democracy, which reduces individuals to so many faceless integers, to be electronically numbered and herded about like sheep. The theory of representative government is that those who make the laws should consider their constituents not merely in quantity but also in quality. Their interests, too, merit consideration and these include trees, acres, and countless other properties, tangible and intangible. To ignore these manifold interests is to debase human nature.

That is what happens when representative government concentrates wholly on democratic principles. But if it ignores these principles entirely it also ceases to be representative. By the latter mistake the States collectively have invited the further blow to their sovereignty that the Court has now delivered. In many of the local legislatures there has been no redistricting for decades, so that rural areas continue to dominate the State capitols in a manner palpably unfair to the swollen metropolitan ganglia. Chief Justice Warren points out that "the last apportionment of the Alabama Legislature was based on the 1900 Federal census, despite the requirement of the State constitution that the legislature be reapportioned decennially." Few would deny that the Supreme Court has both the authority and the duty to request a State to observe its own constitutional provisions.

Unfortunately, the decision in regard to Alabama and the five others goes far beyond any such timely admonition. It rules that both houses must be apportioned strictly on the basis of population, asserting that "the fundamental principle of representative government in this country is one of equal representation for equal number of people * * *" If the U.S. Senate seems to refute this dictum it is because that body is a case apart, constituted not on the basis of logic but of compromise at the Constitutional Convention of 1787.

MORE THAN A CONVENIENCE

Compromise between the large and small States certainly played a part in the decision to make representation in the Senate equal for all, while adjusting it to a population ratio in the lower House. But the suggestion that this arrangement was merely a matter of convenience is not sustainable. When the Constitution was drafted many of the State legislatures already had senates formed on a geographical basis, regardless of population. And it was this arrangement that made the eventual equivalence of two Senators from each State in the Union not merely plausible but also logical. As Madison wrote, in No. 62 of the Federalist, "* * * in a compound republic, partaking both of the national and federal character, the government ought to be founded on a mixture of the principles of proportional and equal representation."

Nor is it convincing for the Court to say that there is no analogy between the Federal and State Governments, and therefore a State senate based on geographic considerations "is impermissible." The Constitution does not concern itself with the organization of State government, except to guarantee that in each case the form shall be "republican." But the record shows that the counties were generally regarded as having the same relation to the States as these would have to the General Government, with senates in both sovereignties serving as "an anchor against popular fluctuations." This is particularly emphasized in No. 63 of the Federalist, where Madison closes six arguments for a distinctive second chamber by saying: "It adds no small weight to all these considerations to recollect that history informs us of no long-lived republic which had not a Senate."

UNHEEDED ADVICE

Madison is discussing all legislative bodies, not just the U.S. Congress, when he argues for an upper house "distinct" and "dissimilar in genius" from the more numerically representative legislative chamber. Then comes a passage that is poignant reading in connection with the Supreme Court's decision of June 15. "This [distinctive senate] is a precaution founded on such clear principles, and now so well understood in the United States, that it would be more than superfluous to enlarge on it."

Since the Founding Fathers are practically ignored, it is scarcely surprising that the Warren opinion pays no attention to the arguments of John Stuart Mill, in his classic essay on "Representative Government." In this, first published in 1861, the reasons for bicameral legislatures based on differing principles are set forth in universal terms. In a passage that might have been written for the Warren court, Mill says: "It is important that no set of persons should, in great affairs, be able even temporarily to make their sic volo (thus I wish) prevail without asking anyone else for his consent." He then argues that the most effective check on legislative blundering is provided when the second chamber is organized on a wholly different principle from that of its opposite number. "One being supposed democratic, the other will naturally be constituted with a view to its being some restraint upon the democracy."

That, of course, is the principle of check and balance underlying bicameralism in the State legislatures as well as in Congress. To strike at that principle in the case of the States is to injure it for the Nation as a whole. With tiresome statistical detail Chief Justice Warren emphasizes that in the Alabama State Senate "members representing 25.1 percent of the people of Alabama" can theoretically control that body. This the Court calls "invidious discrimination." But it is also true that Senators representing only 16.4 percent of the people of the United States form a majority of that body. What is invidious for 50 Capitoline geese can scarcely be admirable for the more august gander who cackles across the park from the Supreme Court's majestic home.

A final flaw in the reapportionment policy that has been ordered is that it can never be accurate. In its 1964 opinion the Court takes statistics from the 1960 census to show disparities. But population changes daily. The most meticulous reapportionment during the next few months would be outdated when made, and continuously more so until replaced after the 1970 census.

So the assumption that "dilution" of a vote is unconstitutional leads on to the unanswerable question: How much dilution? As population mounts it would appear that the condition of the country steadily deteriorates. In the first Congress no Member of the House represented more than 30,000 people. Currently, with many more Representatives, the average is one for approximately 425,000. The only way to stop this progressive "debasement" would be to cut off all immigration and then exactly equalize the numbers of births and deaths.

NOT A RIGHT BUT A PRIVILEGE

Reluctantly the Court concedes that "it may not be possible to draw congressional districts with mathematical precision." And this is fortunate, since if it were possible the most dangerous flaw in the argument might be concealed by feasibility. Representative Government, as Mill so cogently argued a century ago, is not a right but a privilege, successful only when voters are "willing and able to fulfill the duties and discharge the functions which it imposes on them." To emphasize his point Mill was intentionally provocative. He would exclude from the franchise not only the illiterate and incompetent but also all who receive any form of relief from public funds. He also advocated multiple voting by university graduates, on the dubious assumption that higher education would have improved their minds. "It is not useful, but hurtful, that the Constitu-

tion of the country should declare ignorance to be entitled to as much political power as knowledge."

A SUPERFLUOUS COURT?

Yet this, swinging to the opposite extreme, is precisely what the Supreme Court declares in its strongly egalitarian ruling. Equality means, literally, deficient in quality and to eliminate quality has never been a dominant American objective, in the choosing of legislative bodies or in any other function. Though "all men are created equal," in the sense of being entitled to equal social consideration and legal protection, they do not remain equal in their abilities and accomplishment. Equal opportunity has never implied that competition is undesirable. The customs and laws of the country have always encouraged individuals to "get ahead"—which means to become unequal.

Justice Harlan has the importance of excellence in mind when he warns that the reapportionment edicts have "portents for our society and the Court itself which should be recognized." We shall have a very different society if a dead level of mediocrity is successfully established as the national image. If the Federal structure is destroyed to gain this objective, there will no longer be any function for the Supreme Court. Its only constitutional purpose is to maintain the delicate balance between the National and State Governments. If the latter lose their autonomy the Court becomes superfluous.

There is no similar organ in the Soviet Union, where totalitarian democracy is triumphant, at the cost of representative government.

The Layman's View of Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Allyn M. Schiffer, one of my distinguished constituents, is active in credit and collection fields, and heads a large and successful commercial agency known as Allyn M. Schiffer, Inc., at 770 Lexington Avenue, New York City. Mr. Schiffer is considered an expert on the subject of credit. He has lectured before business groups and schools in this country and abroad, and is the coauthor of "Credit and Collection Know-How" and also the recently published book, "Profitable Use of Credit in Selling and Collecting," published by Fairchild Publications, Inc., of New York City.

Recently Mr. Schiffer wrote a most interesting article in the July 1964 issue of Commercial Law Journal, entitled "The Layman's View of Bankruptcy." I am taking the liberty of inserting Mr. Schiffer's excellent article in the RECORD for the edification of my colleagues in the Congress:

THE LAYMAN'S VIEW OF BANKRUPTCY
(By Allyn M. Schiffer)

"Bankruptcy." What a frightening word. Prior to the great depression of 1929, generally speaking, a man's entire business life came to an end with bankruptcy. When a business "took bankruptcy," the proprietor lived for the day when he could retrieve a lost reputation, sometimes by repaying his just debts to creditors, who had "staked" him in his enterprise. With the advent of the depression, a new approach was tried in the form of Government aid through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In addition, after the 1929 crash, the Bankruptcy Act was expanded so that utilities and publicly held corporations could reorganize under sections 77 and 77B (now chapter X) respectively, instead of liquidating. This allowed the firm to continue in business as a going concern. Unlike actual bankruptcy, the new sections improved on the equity receivership to enable a debtor to submit a reorganization plan for the approval of its creditors. Later, chapter XI was added. Under this amendment to the bankruptcy laws, any business can propose an arrangement with its unsecured creditors. Chapter XI is available to individuals, partnerships, and corporations, whether owned by a few or many shareholders.

What effect has all this new legislation had upon business in general? Very few firms filing under chapter XI or X have been able to pay off dollar for dollar to creditors. Why? Is it because bankruptcy legislation perhaps appears to put the stamp of approval on business tactics that jeopardize a creditor's position? The Wall Street Journal (May 20, 1963), headlined "Big Jump Reported in Bankruptcy Frauds." It is not an easy matter to prove fraud. Proof of fraud generally requires the production of facts showing a "state of mind." Eliciting such facts from witnesses and documents involves substantial services on the part of attorneys, accountants, creditors, credit, and collection agents. The objective of a prosecution, if it is to be successful, must be the presentation of proof that a bankrupt, or debtor under chapter XI or X, has "hidden," "gambled," or "diverted" assets. However, a petitioner under the bankruptcy laws is not always fraudulent. Perhaps he has been a poor manager or frittered away his assets negligently. This, of course, is not comforting to creditors. In a recent chapter XI proceeding, the attorney for the petitioner stated that "there has not been a certified audit for 47 years." How appalling.

Can suppliers be blamed for the increasing number of petitions under the Bankruptcy Act? The urge for increased sales on the part of management may be a factor. Credit executives, to meet competition, may find themselves in a dilemma, unless they can convince their management of the extent to which the credit risk overbalances the advantage of higher sales. The National Association of Credit Men through its Fraud Prevention Department is bending ever effort to work with the U.S. Department of Justice "to uproot the parasitical growth." (November 1963 issue—Credit and Financial Management.) The small recovery realized by creditors on their claims is equally appalling. Some suppliers have turned to credit insurance to reduce their losses. However, credit insurance companies charge premiums, and a credit executive must evaluate the cost of his policy with the profit on sales and the cost of collection. Credit departments can obtain some protection by selling to purchasers on a guaranty or copurchasing basis. Such action serves as an additional "cushion" in the event of bankruptcy or chapters X or XI. Despite the precautions taken by creditors, the recovery in a proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act remains small. Frequently the Government receives the lion's share. Federal, State, and local taxes are entitled to priority over general creditors. Some effort is being made to place a limitation on the priority of tax claims in bankruptcy. (H.R. 3438.) Should this bill become law, unpaid tax claims over 3 or more years would be dischargeable and would not have priority under the Bankruptcy Act. This would be a small step forward toward helping creditors share in a greater portion of the assets.

Today, a bankruptcy petition may have a salutary purpose. By discharging his debts, it may give the petitioner a new lease on his business life. It may enable him to reappraise his talents and abilities and to use them to advantage in a new undertaking, and also to accept a new responsibility in the business community. Unfortunately a few will not accept the law as it was intended to operate. Some men go in and out of business like the proverbial revolving door. They find it not too difficult to reincorporate, buy up the assets of the bankrupt firm under a different corporate name, and even continue the same business at the same old address. They may sell their business under the bulk sales law. They may comply with all the provisions of the law, but still the creditors end up with a small settlement. Creditors can only resent such action, unless they choose protracted litigation to set aside the sale at an expense that would prove burdensome. It may be desirable to amend the bankruptcy law to declare a bulk sale an act of bankruptcy. This would permit creditors faced with a questionable bulk sale to invoke the provisions of the bankruptcy law.

In 1898, when the current Bankruptcy Act was enacted, very little attention was given to the salaried employee or wage earner. Now we are confronted with the rising tide of "consumer credit." During the depression only straight or ordinary bankruptcy was available to individuals or nonbusiness debtors to extricate themselves from their accumulated debts. So, in 1938, the Bankruptcy Act was amended by adding chapter XIII. This enables the wage earner to extend or settle his indebtedness and to make payments in the form of installments under the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court, without the necessity of becoming a bankrupt. Chapter XIII should assist both creditors and debtors. Employers should also find it beneficial because it should lessen the number of garnishments. So far as the debtor is concerned, it removes the stigma of actual bankruptcy.

Much is being said by leaders in religion, education, and public affairs about the deterioration of the moral climate of American life. The business community is a prime target of such criticism. Whether our false set of business values is attributable to envy, greed, a driving ambition for power, or inadequate leadership, the provisions of our bankruptcy law appear to afford an avenue to a "way of life" for those who would abuse it. A layman considers this sufficient basis for a reappraisal of our Bankruptcy Act. An improved law, however, is not enough. If the risk in the extension of credit is to be lessened, it will be incumbent upon our lawyers, accountants, credit associations, government officials, and the collection industry to cooperate with businessmen in a grand venture devoted to the elevation of the moral and ethical standards under which our business affairs are conducted.

A Blundering Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office, in its factual report, sets forth the shocking attitude taken by this administration in its handling of aid to Vietnam. The lives of our military men, which have been given for the cause of democracy and freedom,

are wasted when our foreign policy is permitted to take the course indicated by the GAO report.

John McMullin outlines some of the facts in his article which appears in the Long Island Press on August 26:

WASTE IN AID TO VIETNAM COMPILED IN 119-PAGE REPORT

(By John McMullan)

WASHINGTON.—The blunderings of U.S. aid policy in South Vietnam are detailed with embarrassing precision in a little-published report by the Government's General Accounting Office.

From expensive perfume and scotch whisky to cars and fertilizer, U.S. aid too often has eased the life of Saigon's rich instead of the country's poor, the GAO found.

GAO barks so often at waste and mismanagement in U.S. Government that its voice often is muffled into the nearest filing cabinet.

Its 119-page, two-booklet indictment of U.S. Vietnam policy met the usual fate despite these findings:

Kerosene, used almost entirely by low-income groups in rural areas for illumination, was taxed at the excessively high rate of 40 percent of the retail price by the Saigon Government.

"On the other hand, alcoholic beverages, traditionally considered a luxury, were relatively undertaxed." Imports of Scotch whiskey rose from 9,000 gallons in 1958 to 19,000 gallons in 1962.

Gasoline, used mostly by the wealthy residents in the capital of Saigon was kept at a retail price far below that in other southeast Asian countries because imports were financed by the U.S. Agency for International Development.

One thousand cars were imported into South Vietnam in 1960 and again in 1961, which "further accentuated the disparity between the low living standard in the countryside and the opulence in the cities.

While the Vietnamese Government's foreign exchange was being "used to finance the importation of passenger cars," the GAO auditors added, "AID was meeting the country's more essential transportation requirements by providing funds for the importation of buses, trucks, and repair parts."

Expensive perfume, affordable only by the rich, was taxed at 10 percent. But the cheap brands often were taxed as high as 35 percent.

Fertilizer was imported "during the demand season when prices are highest." GAO estimated that $240,000 could have been saved by bringing it in during the off-season and storing it.

Providing electricity in small cities and rural areas was recognized as important in winning the loyalty of the people for the South Vietnamese Government. Yet 3 years after one set of 50 diesel generators was imported in 1959, 6 of them were still in a Government warehouse.

Many cities had no drinkable water, so drilling 5,000 wells by 1965 became a top-priority project. "As of June 30, 1962, only 1,108 wells had been drilled," GAO noted.

Rat infestations were causing low morale among farmers in June 1961, and an emergency appeal was sent to AID headquarters in Washington. Thirteen months later the shipment came in by air, after the crops were ruined. (Extra cost of the air transportation was estimated by GAO at $20,000).

GAO's scrutiny of United States-Vietnam foulups cover 1958–62, through both Republican and Democratic administrations.

The report is a compilation, and at the same time an authentication, of piecemeal revelations of corruption and mismanagement within the South Vietnamese Government—and of weaknesses in U.S. policy and direction that permitted the abuses.

South Vietnam's tax structure and collection system were criticized by GAO, which found that "little action resulted" from recommendations made by U.S. advisers.

"The unsound and complicated system of a basic exchange rate, intertwined with a series of varying taxes, has continued as a burdensome drag on the country's progress toward economic development," the report stated.

At the time of GAO's review "one-quarter of the properties in the Saigon-Cholon area were not on the tax roll and only about 60 percent of the property taxes actually assessed were collected.

"The large Chinese business community in Cholon paid little or no taxes." Asked why, a top Vietnamese official explained that the tax collectors did not understand the records.

Only 15,000 individuals in a country of 13 million population paid income taxes.

GAO auditors complained that "certain policies and practices applied by aid in the administration of nonproject assistance and of local currency increased the cost of U.S. aid substantially."

As a result, South Vietnam's foreign exchange reserves grew considerably. "Higher levels of consumption were encouraged than were warranted by the state of Vietnam economy, and positive incentive for the Government of Vietnam to mobilize its own resources was weakened," the Government watchdogs said.

U.S. aid officials thought that it might help the poor Vietnamese to see what wonders had been wrought in the outside world. They agreeably went along with some of the imports that GAO critiicized in its report.

So GAO inspectors found Vietnamese who formerly had worn cotton socks, delighted with AID-financed nylons. GAO pointed out that nylon "cost nearly $3 a pound against a cost of only about 46 cents a pound for rayon and cotton yarn.

"It seems to us," GAO said, "so long as outside assistance on a large scale is required by Vietnam, the import beyond token amounts of commodities not required or of marginal necessity to that country's economic survival or development adds an unjustified burden on the United States."

Between fiscal years 1955 and 1962, AID obligated $1.5 billion for the economic and technical assistance program in Vietnam.

Some Vietnamese businessmen apparently knew when they had a good thing, GAO said, in effect.

This led to imported pharmaceuticals being priced higher than necessary "because of commissions and promotional allowances paid to Vietnamese importers by pharmaceutical suppliers."

Twenty-one drug suppliers have had claims amounting to $806,000 filed against them by AID, of which $414,000 has been collected.

Is the situation in South Vietnam better today under a new regime?

Government auditors concede that certain corrections were promised at the conclusion of their field work, but they are continuing to review the South Vietnam procedures.

"We are by no means convinced," the GAO report concluded, "that measures such as these reportedly taken will solve the deficiencies disclosed by our review, at least not without top agency management exercising close control and supervision."

Kennedy-Johnson Rivalry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the August 26, 1964, issue of the Peoria Journal Star points up the growing friction between the Kennedy clan and the Johnson camp as both attempt to build their authority, based on illegitimate power.

Under unanimous consent, the editorial follows:

BOBBY'S CLAN

Bobby Kennedy's appearance at the Johnson convention, dragging a reluctant Mayor Wagner with him, has nothing to do with the work of the convention—boosting Lyndon Johnson's "image" and political stock. Bobby is there to boost Bobby.

He resigned as a delegate in favor of making an entrance as a candidate for Senator in the State of New York. Meanwhile, Jacqueline Kennedy declined to be a part of the Johnson convention because of "painful memories."

The Kennedys are in this convention, in their own way, and in there punching—but fighting their own fight, not Lyndon Johnson's.

While Bobby is a reject for Vice President, he has, in effect, overruled the President by running for the Senate from New York.

After all, President Johnson said that he wasn't considering Bobby for Vice President because Bobby was "so important" as Attorney General that he'd be needed on that job and wouldn't have time to campaign.

He might not have time to campaign for Vice President in Johnson's estimation, but he has made it clear he'll find time to campaign for Senator.

(Meanwhile, Johnson also finds plenty of time from his duties as President for campaigning.)

This election will decide a lot of things concerning the Kennedy future as well as Johnson's, whether the President likes it or not.

If PIERRE SALINGER wins in California, there's not much doubt who will take over the California organization, nor to whom that organization will be loyal. It is to be remembered that PIERRE SALINGER worked for Robert Kennedy before he was known to John F. Kennedy, and was recommended to the job of press secretary by his friend, Bobby.

If Bobby, himself, wins in New York, after riding straight over Mayor Wagner, already, who is going to emerge as the real power in the New York delegation, do you think?

TED KENNEDY, of course, is already the Senator from Massachusetts and a political power in the party in that State, after beating the McCormacks in an election that sees the party there firmly in hand.

New York and California combines the east and west coasts and the two biggest single political power centers in the United States.

The third largest in many ways, and the geographical balance certainly, is the State of Illinois.

And there is a string in the bow of the family for Illinois as well, for Sargent Shriver, personable head of the successful Peace Corps, the most famous Kennedy brother-in-law and another specific reject for Vice President, has his political roots in Illinois, is a bona fide resident of Illinois, and will doubtless be heard from one of these days in local politics.

What seems to be building behind the scenes of the Atlantic City convention, and in spite of the obvious disapproval of President Johnson, is one of the most unique political power structures in American history—if it succeeds.

And at its head, undoubtedly, is the man who was the real campaign manager for his famous brother in 1960, one of the canniest and hardest-driving political organizers this land has known—Robert Kennedy.

And look where he sits. If Johnson should be beaten (and Kerner beaten in Illinois), where do you think the party leadership would instantly go? And if Johnson wins,

and with him come Salinger and Bobby Kennedy to the Senate from California and New York, who wins the broadest political base in modern politics from which to work?

Bobby has a good chance of winning party power, either way.

Our Postal Service Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 21, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to recommend an article appearing in the "Federal Issue" of the George Washington University magazine, summer 1964, written by the distinguished Deputy Postmaster General, Mr. Frederick C. Belen.

Mr. Belen describes the causes of today's rapidly increasing demands upon the U.S. postal system. He also takes note of the many successful programs initiated by the Post Office Department in its efforts to cut costs while responding to these demands. He concludes by stressing that only through the cooperation an initiative of private citizens can the goals of the Department be met.

Because Mr. Belen's article contains a wealth of relevant information and emphasizes the Department's attempts to economize in its operations, I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TODAY'S CHANGED POSTAL SYSTEM

Just as everyday life in our country has changed dramatically within our own lifetimes—so has the postal service.

Thirty or forty years ago, there was usually ample parking, highways weren't so crowded, or cities so congested—and we thought nothing of getting 15 or 20 minutes' undivided attention from the butcher, the salesgirl, and many others.

Today, public facilities and business facilities—though larger—must be shared with proportionately more people—tens of millions more. This is true of the postal service. It means we must increase our productivity if we are to maintain essential services at a high level.

Thirty years ago, we had 176 pieces of mail for each American. Today, we have nearly 370 pieces each for a substantially larger population.

Thirty years ago we had 308,000 employees—over half as many as today—to handle one-third our present volume of mail. Twenty years ago we had 389,000 employees—nearly two-thirds the present force to handle half as much mail. Even 10 years ago we had 507,000 employees—five-sixths of today's force to handle two-thirds the volume.

Over the years, the hand-in-hand march of manpower costs and mail volume has been reduced somewhat, but it was a slow process.

To give you an interesting illustration of what can happen without constant improvements in economy and efficiency—if we were still operating at 1935 productivity levels of 81,206 pieces processed per man-year—we would have a staff of 1 million in 1970 for a volume projected at 82 billion pieces and a payroll of about $6.37 billion—about $1.3 billion more than our total appropriation for the next fiscal year.

In addition to the need to control manpower costs, the other urgent need today is to meet vastly changed service conditions—such as the cut in 30 years in mail trains from 10,000 to 1,200—and today's vast service requirements. For example:

The Federal Government today mails 500 million checks annually and many millions more are in prospect.

Giant businesses—insurance, savings and loan, utilities, others—do upwards of 90 percent of their business by mail.

The direct mail industry conducts a $28 billion annual business by mail.

More than 30 million Americans move annually—and usually each move is a service matter.

We must add a million and a half new stops each year to city delivery services—largely to keep up with "suburban sprawl."

Many more similar instances could be cited—but the point is that mail service is as essential today to modern commerce and industry as water, light or heat.

Even our principal communications "competitor"—the telephone industry—depends on postal service for its existence, sending more than one-half billion pieces yearly—in bills, notices, etc.—not counting the tremendous mail volume it gets back.

And the trend is growing. Government checks in the mails will increase by tens of millions; Census Bureau use of the mails will involve additional millions of pieces as population soars.

One reason is that we have had a revolution in mailing habits of many individuals. Today, the housewife seldom goes all over town paying bills personally. Unike her mother a generation ago, she mails in checks.

We began activities in 1961 which are now achieving dramatic results.

To illustrate—in 1960—official projections by the Postmaster General placed anticipated employment at 632,000 for the end of the 1964 fiscal year—right now—but we're actually using 42,000 fewer employees.

Today, we are employing just about the same number of employees as we had 2 years ago—in spite of an increase of 4 billion pieces in mail volume and 3½ million more city delivery stops.

Annual increases in employment in the 5 years prior to 1962—required to handle similar increased workloads—ranged between 10,000 and 20,000 a year and averaged 14,772. On that basis we would now have some 30,000 more employees than we had 2 years ago. Instead we have about the same number.

But even that does not give the whole picture.

Planning for our 1965 budget also actually started in 1960—as part of the normal 5-year "look-ahead" process.

As seen then, our 1965 budget would be $5,015 million.

Our estimated budget for 1965 will be $391 million less, taking into account $389 million in pay increases since 1960.

Even more recently under this Administration—when we had substantial economies underway—our achievements have exceeded our own expectations.

In May, 1963, we had our 1965 "preview" budget developed.

That was for $125 million more than the amount we now seek. Let me explain this further:

Between the time of that preview for our budget in 1963 and the actual submission of the 1965 national budget in January, President Johnson called for economy and frugality in all Government operations.

Naturally, Postmaster General John A. Gronouski was determined that we would play our part in any such governmentwide program, and we have carried out our determination to do so. During the year, starting July 1, for example, we will be operating with a manpower economy involving 9,000 less positions than would be required normally to handle our mail volume of more than 72 billion pieces of mail.

After the national budget had been submitted to Congress in January, we planned a series of additional savings that were feasible—without hurting services or threatening any career employee's livelihood—which will make it possible to provide even better service at less cost.

One key to making constructive changes has been Postmaster General Gronouski's new concept of "flexibility," giving postmasters at local levels authority—actually responsiblity—to come up with programs, where necessary, for modifications in national directives to fit local conditions. This makes for sound, progressive administration throughout the postal system to meet realistic situations, and to iron out the one-in-a-hundred or one-in-a-thousand local situations that can cause problems and minimize the effectiveness of the best conceived national directives.

Another key to this achievement is in customer cooperation. About half our mail is of commercial origin.

Of this half, about 50 percent is sent by about 20,000 large mailers.

Under our nationwide improved mail service program (NIMS) we have organized these mailers into 293 individual mail user councils in major cities.

And, through cooperative efforts—presorting of bills, statements, etc.; early-in-the-day mail deposits made according to prearranged agreements, and similar cooperative efforts—we have removed much of the barrier to better mail service, such as the crushing, after-5 p.m. deposits that once descended on us, jamming our post offices and hampering our efforts to increase efficiency.

Today, as a result, we have before us a vista of economy—with—service in the postal system such as we have never known before.

I believe there is an unexplored potential for similar public-governmental teamwork in some other areas of Federal service.

Young persons just embarking on a Federal career—or planning on one—should be aware of the tremendous demands for services faced by our Government in the years ahead, and create new concepts of how we may meet these demands efficiently with less dependence on tax dollars and greater dependence on the cooperation of private sources and their resources—where they can be used with propriety and with mutal advantages.

Mentally Retarded in Harlan County, Ky.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the August 27, 1964, issue of the Times-Argus of Central City, Ky., is worthy of the attention of this House. I commend it to all who read the RECORD:

We see in the daily press that California egghead, Dr. Stafford Warren, who is the special advisor to President Johnson on the mentally retarded, has gone into a trance at his California office and come up with a solution to all the problems of one part of the Appalachia region. This is a territory that is greatly worrying Washington this election year.

All the way from California, President Johnson's mentally retarded advisor, has decided that the majority of the 35,000 people of Harlan County, Ky., are mentally retarded. He has decided that he, with the

help of Washington bureaucrats, can solve all the problems of these poor backward hillbillies.

President Johnson's mentally retarded adviser has suggested that the Federal Government ship the whole caboodle of nitwits in Harlan County to California. All 35,000 of them. When they get there, he said, even they would be smart enough to replace 35,000 Mexican "wetbacks" doing farm labor in California. Presumably the 35,000 Mexicans would then be freed of their farm chores and could become California educators and additional mentally retarded advisers to the President.

We are amazed at the brilliance of this initial brainstorm by Dr. Warren, who is the mentally retarded adviser to President Johnson. But, we are likewise aghast at his failure to think big, and at his rank discrimination against other Kentuckians by making plans for only one Kentucky county.

So, we hereby declare ourselves as allies and cohorts of that noted California egghead, Dr. Stafford Warren, who is the mentally retarded adviser to President Johnson. Henceforth we are going to devote ourselves to helping him take care of the exodus of additional Kentucky counties.

We have suspected for some time that our old newspaper friends on the Harlan Daily Enterprise have been losing their marbles. And we suspect that Dr. Warren, the mentally retarded adviser to President Johnson, is right in his long-distance diagnosis of the remainder of the Harlan Countians. Probably every blessed one of the 35,000 residents of Harlan County are barely smart enough to replace Mexican farmhands in California if they were transported to the land of milk and honey and given a California college education.

But, much as we admire Dr. Warren, the mentally retarded adviser to the President, he does need help. He and the President just don't have enough time to personally take care of all the people of Kentucky.

So, we are going to suggest, even insist, that this mass migration plan also include other Kentucky counties. We will have to give top priority to Prestonburg and Floyd County. Now there's a good mountain county where folks can be just as retarded as Harlan County. Why, they even have Bert Combs who has made a name for himself lecturing to backward subjects at Harvard. Although they aren't necessarily considered capable by Dr. Warren, who is the mentally retarded adviser to the President, of being good farmhands, they could be happy playing cowboys and Indians all day long on the L.B.J. Ranch. In time, perhaps, evolution and life on the Lone Star Prairie would enable these mountaineers to grow both legs the same length.

There must be no discrimination against the West and we must give next priority to our next-door-neighbors in Christian County, whom we know to be just as backwards as the next place.

We are making plans with Dr. Warren, President Johnson's mentally retarded adviser, to have Ned Breathitt, who recently went off the deep end on physical fitness, lead his fellow countians afoot all the way to Alabama. There they can make their happy homes in the turpentine forest recreation center owned and operated by none other than Ladybird. Now that Ladybird has retired all her tenants to palatial homes there is a big opportunity and need for some good Christian countians in her Alabama fiefdom.

This is as far as we have gotten at presstime on the master plan for the mass exodus of the population of Kentucky. However, we are momentarily expecting a vision and a revelation on how to part the waters of Kentucky Lake. As soon as this comes through we will announce our plan for moving the people of Paducah and McCracken County. This will have to be a big move, however, as those characters have been way, way out ever since Alben Barkley first put them into orbit at Government expense.

All this is not to say that we do not have plans for all the other counties and people of Kentucky. As resident Kentucky agents for Dr. Stafford Warren, mentally retarded adviser to President Johnson, we will have something and somewhere for all Kentucky counties.

Except Muhlenberg, that is.

When we get everyone else moved, it is part of our master plan to declare the creation of the Republic of Muhlenberg. We will then apply for foreign aid from the United States, the U.N., Russia, China, Congo, Castro, and Moon Maid's father and live happily ever after.

The CIA at Bay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the investigation of tax-exempt foundations currently being conducted by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, has produced fruitful evidence of the need for expanded inquiries into the activities of these foundations, their eligibility for tax-exempt status, as well as the grant by the Central Intelligence Agency of hitherto unreported Federal funds into these foundations.

The work of Mr. PATMAN'S committee is heartening news throughout the country.

The following editorial in the Cleveland Press of Tuesday, September 1, is indicative of editorial reaction:

THE CIA AT BAY

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, in the course of his deep probe of tax-exempt foundations is giving the Central Intelligence Agency some embarrassment.

The Congressman has turned up information, verified by the Internal Revenue Service, that the CIA was giving money to the J. M. Kaplan Fund, a New York foundation, or, as PATMAN put it, the Kaplan Fund was used "as a conduit for channeling CIA funds."

The purpose of this indirect use of taxpayer money is not known, nor is anyone anxious to uncover the legitimately secret operations of the CIA which of necessity must be hush-hush.

But PATMAN asks why the CIA was spending tax money with a foundation which has been under intensive investigation by both his congressional subcommittee and by the IRS. When PATMAN went to CIA for an answer, he didn't get it, he said.

"I feel like I've been trifled with," he said.

Two different Directors of IRS have recommended that the Kaplan Foundation's tax-exempt status be revoked, and IRS is still probing.

It does not necessarily follow that whatever service the Kaplan Fund provided the CIA was not worth whatever CIA paid it. But somebody ought to know.

Congress should set up a watchdog committee to keep tabs on CIA and all the other hush-hush agencies. The public doesn't ask what they are doing, but the public has a right to believe that Congress knows what they are doing, and why. This type of system has worked very well with the Atomic Energy Commission, which is partly secret. It is even more important that there be a check on CIA and like agencies.

The more secret an agency, the more liberties it is likely to take—unless it is accountable to somebody who is accountable to the voters.

The Death of Representative Patrick Callaghan, of Pittsfield, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Pittsfield, Mass., was saddened recently by the death of a fine and good man, State Representative Patrick Callaghan.

He was an effective legislator and outstanding public servant who will be greatly missed.

Mr. Speaker, Pat Callaghan was a leader in Pittsfield for many years. A native of London, England, he came to this country in 1913, and had lived an active life up until the recent illness that caused his death.

First elected to the city council in 1945, Pat Callaghan served as council president for 8 consecutive years and was serving his fourth term as councilman at large when he made his successful bid in 1960 for State representative.

He was reelected to that post in 1962, and in June announced his candidacy for a third term. His death came as a great surprise and shock to all who knew and loved him.

Mr. Speaker, Pat Callaghan had qualities of heart and mind that made him the warm and gracious human being that he was. These qualities, to which can be added personal conviction and direction, were the basis of his distinguished life.

In the human areas in which he moved, his influence was profound because of these qualities.

An engineer at General Electric Co. for many years before his retirement in 1960, Pat Callaghan had a sure grasp of the many issues facing his city. He faithfully executed his duties and brought to every task high standards.

He was an Army veteran of World War I, a member of the Pittsfield Post 68, American Legion, and the Pittsfield Barracks 398, Veterans of World War I. He was also a member of the Holy Name Society, Knights of Columbus, and had served as a trustee at the St. Luke's Hospital in his native city.

He was the kind of man who contributed so greatly to our way of life in Massachusetts. His service at statehouse was in the finest traditions of public service.

In all of my associations with him, I have found him to be a sterling human being.

In thinking about his wonderful live, and his many friends, I do think I could add to an outstanding tribute given to him by the Berkshire Eagle in Pittsfield.

The tribute appeared in the "In Brief" section on the editorial page, and describes how the Berkshires reacted to his death. I am pleased to place this tribute in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to accompany my own statement. I also want to extend my sincere and deep sympathies to his family.

The article follows:

IN BRIEF

The death of Representative Patrick E. Callaghan yesterday came as a shock to a large number of Berkshire residents who claimed him as a friend as well as to many others who knew him only as an eminently honest and earnest public servant with a long record of conscientious service to his community. As a city councilman from ward 1 he played a vital part in the municipal advances of the capeless years; as president of the city council he set a standard of fairness and impartiality that has rarely been matched in that office; and as a legislator he dedicated himself on a full-time basis to the best interests not only of his district but of the entire area. The legislature could use many more like him.

The Silver Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to the attention of my colleagues the following address by Mr. John B. Stevens, vice president of the International Silver Co. and chairman of the Silver Users Association which was presented to the Retail Jewelers of America, in opposition to H.R. 10534, H.R. 10560, and H.R. 10561. These bills are pending before the Banking and Currency Committee here in the House and would raise the market price of silver.

The address follows:

THE SILVER SITUATION

I appreciate very much the opportunity to speak to you for a few minutes about silver. The Silver Users Association is following the situation very closely. You have probably heard of the activities of the association, which acquires, studies, and disseminates all available information about silver, and takes such action as is necessary to insure that silver is recognized as a commodity.

Silver is very much in the news—both as a commodity and as money. The present shortage of coins has turned the spotlight on silver in a dramatic way.

There are persistent rumors that the price is going to skyrocket. This is very disturbing news to those of us who deal in silver products. We are now paying $1.29 per ounce, which is a rise of over 40 percent in the last 2½ years. All of us are aware of the fact that when the price of silver goes up, the volume of unit sales goes down. This is particularly and painfully true of sterling silver holloware.

I should like to say at the outset that the price of silver is not going to rise above the present level of $1.293 per ounce as long as the Treasury carries out its obligation and pledge to redeem silver certificates with silver. Furthermore, even if silver certificates were retired, as long as the Treasury has silver, it would sell it at the present price in order to protect the existing coins in our monetary system. If the price should rise now, our existing coins would be hoarded or melted down. The Treasury obviously cannot permit this to happen. Subsidiary coins—that is, half dollars, quarters, and dimes must circulate, or business would come to a halt. These coins are not intended to have intrinsic value. They are merely a medium of exchange. So you see what I mean when I say that the price of silver will not—indeed cannot rise under the present circumstances.

There are now 1.4 billion ounces of silver in the Treasury as backing for silver certificates. Holders of these certificates are redeeming them at the current rate of about 5 million ounces per month. However, there are other demands on the Treasury stocks. According to mint estimates, by next July they will be using up silver for coinage at the rate of 275 million ounces a year. Obviously, the Treasury stocks will not last very long. This is the compelling reason why a shift to some other material for use in subsidiary coins is necessary. Free world production is only 210 million ounces annually, most of which is produced in the Western Hemisphere. With our coinage requirements of 275 million ounces, there will not be enough for this purpose alone and none for industry. As a matter of fact, at hearings held last week by the House Banking and Currency Committee, a resolution was considered which stated that "worldwide consumption of silver substantially exceeds worldwide production, and there is, therefore, no prospect of a replenishment of U.S. monetary silver supply." Fortunately, there are other materials which may be used in coinage. Our present 5-cent piece is made of cupro-nickel—75 percent copper and 25 percent nickel. This is a highly satisfactory metal for use in coins and is now used exclusively in coinage by Great Britain and other countries.

There are those who would change the present situation and who seek a higher market price for silver. Legislation to this effect, sponsored by the mining interests, has repeatedly been introduced in Congress. This accounts for the many rumors about price rises.

As recently as last week, on August 13, hearings were held by the House Banking and Currency Committee on the following bills:

H.R. 10534, which would permit the market price of silver to rise to $1.45 per ounce.

H.R. 10560, which would permit the price to rise to $2.58 per ounce.

H.R. 10561, which would require the Treasury to redeem silver certificates with silver dollars and not with bullion. This would mean that the Treasury would have to mint silver dollars at the taxpayers expense and then the holder of the certificate would have to pay the cost of melting them down for bullion.

This last bill would also prohibit the sale of excess silver to private purchasers—in other words, the silver users—all of us who must have silver to make the products which you sell. This bill would also prevent the Treasury from selling silver to keep the existing silver coins from being melted down.

These bills are being, and will continue to be, vigorously opposed. Just pause and think what doubling the present market price of silver would mean in terms of a sterling silver place setting or items in sterling holloware.

We shall keep you informed of the silver situation. Perhaps you will wish to let your Members of Congress know what you think about these schemes to do something more, for those who have already greatly benefited at your expense—and at the expense of your customers.

The State of Labor Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, Labor Day provides an excellent occasion for an annual public reappraisal of the state of American labor. We ask, where does labor stand today, and where is it headed?

As a nation we have certainly come a long way since our humble beginnings. Our output of goods and services averaged $585 billion in 1963.

Total employment averaged 68.8 million during 1963 and surpassed 70 million in several months for the first time in U.S. history. Also in 1963, weekly earnings for factory workers averaged $99.38, and personal income after taxes reached an annual average of $2,160 for each individual in the population.

However, our blessings are mixed and today we face many national contradictions. Our successes in space inspire our pride. Our failures in city slums, in industry-forsaken towns, and on small, inefficient farms inspire our compassion and demand our attention.

Last year the shocking conditions in which 36 million people, one-fifth of our population, live gained widespread attention. Recognition of the problem of poverty began with more or less independent notice of closely related problems facing the labor force, especially that of chronic high-level unemployment.

The problem of unemployment is the most general of the lot and is actually a composite of the others, which include such major challenges as labor force growth, automation and technological change, shifting employment patterns, and rising education and training requirements.

Several converging trends caused the labor force to expand by 1.1 million in 1963, and annual increases are expected to be still greater in the future. One recent trend contributing to the increase is that of younger persons entering the labor force in greater numbers than ever before as postwar babies reach working age: a million more youngsters will turn 18 next year than did this year. Also married women are entering the labor force in greater numbers to supplement family income and provide better opportunities for their offspring.

These contributions to labor force growth join with concomitant trends to create and aggravate our chronic unemployment problem. Largely because of increased productivity, agriculture, mining, rail transport, and some manufacturing industries continue to release workers who must seek work in other in-

dustries without marketable training or experience.

At the same time, the requirements of new industries and technology create the need for drastic upgrading of the education and training of our labor force. Manpower demand is growing most in professional and technical, clerical, and service occupations for which education and training requirements are relatively high to start and increasing steadily.

The importance of education to labor is most dramatically seen in the fact that two-thirds of our unemployed have less than a high school education.

Besides being undereducated and unskilled, such other characteristics as being young, aged, or nonwhite also single out those who are forced to pay the price in anguish and deprivation for the shifting patterns of supply and demand of the Nation's manpower.

Many of the programs designed to alleviate these problems have already been legislated and are bringing forth results. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 took cognizance that present and prospective manpower needs must be clearly identified and adequately met if our economic growth is to increase. Because employment has not been growing at an adequate rate, our monetary, fiscal, and other economic policies must stimulate greater job growth. Outstanding examples of these efforts are the income tax reduction and the area redevelopment programs.

The Equal Pay Act prohibits pay discrimination against women. A voluntary program developed by the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity seeks to provide greater job openings to members of minority groups. A recent executive order prohibits Federal contractors and subcontractors from setting maximum age limits, and new apprenticeship regulations adopted by the Secretary of Labor promotes equal opportunity in apprenticeship programs.

To meet educational needs, Federal legislation has provided financial assistance for expanding and updating vocational education, construction of facilities for higher education, aid to medical and dental education, and student support programs in other vital areas.

Legislated programs for rehabilitation will help the mentally ill and retarded, persons on public assistance, actual or potential juvenile delinquents, and unemployables who need more than normal job training.

A tripartite Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy has undertaken to study the impact of automation and technological change on workers, unions, and firms, and the problems of adjustment arising from such developments.

The broadest proposed legislation is the Economic Opportunity Act which translates President Johnson's avowed war on poverty into five separate but related programs to help improverished Americans help themselves that they might share in the abundance enjoyed by the other four-fifths of their countrymen.

We have seen then that while American labor is setting new historical records for itself, it is also beset by a whole complex of worrisome problems. We can derive consolation in the many programs we have undertaken to solve these problems and draw strength from the faith I am sure we all have in the will, determination, and ability of our Nation's people and leadership to make and keep America strong, free, and great.

Lucio—To Be Confused With Horatio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker I recall that Lucio is a fantastic character in Shakespeare's "Measure for Measure." Without being absolutely depraved or intentionally bad, he has become, through lack of thoughtful consideration, both vicious and dissolute. Talkative and dissipated, he is totally ungoverned by temperament.

On this point, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the August 31, 1964, issue of the Chicago Tribune:

NOT TO BE CONFUSED WITH HERBERT HOOVER

The only resemblance between HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY, the Democratic vice-presidential nominee, and Herbert Hoover is in the capital letters. The thing to be noted about HUBERT is that he is a little to the right of Castro. But he has lately made a frantic effort to put on a William McKinley starched 3-inch collar and pass himself off as a "moderate."

This flight from firebrand "liberalism" has even propelled HUBERT into business circles which view him with unalloyed suspicion, there to ladle out blarney and pose as one of the fellows.

"I suggest," he told the American Management Association in New York on July 10, "that we drop once and for all the myth of hostility toward business by Government and get on with a fruitful business-Government partnership. * * * To make the promise of America a reality will take cooperation and respect between business and Government and above all intelligence and courage."

That's lovely, if the businessmen choose to forget that Senator HUMPHREY was a founding father of Americans for Democratic Action, has been its national chairman, and is now a member of its executive committee. As James Burnham has observed, "On every specific issue in every field, ADA supports Government control, planning, financing, or takeover." Any "partnership" of business with men in Government who have that outlook is not going to be comfortable.

Senator HUMPHREY is for easy money, deficit financing, unbalanced budgets, and, necessarily, inflation.

"Public debt figures, or a chart picturing them," he says airily, "provide no basis in themselves for concluding that a government is or is not wasteful." To him "there are worse things in life than an unbalanced budget." What the Federal Reserve Board should do is "ease credit."

While he is now trying to allay the fears of business, he said in the West Virginia Democratic presidential primary in 1960, "The Federal tax laws are rigged against the middle- and low-income families—and for the big corporations."

Senator HUMPHREY is a 100-percent welfare stater. He is for every proposal of that sort. There would be no limit to the size, scope, and intrusiveness of government if he had his way. As Senator GOLDWATER remarked, the presence of HUMPHREY on the ticket destroys the fiction that the Johnson party has the faintest attachment to conservatism.

Senator HUMPHREY has been a militant in the civil rights battles. At the 1948 national convention he inflamed the southern Democrats during a floor fight to put liberal amendments into the rights plank, stating, among other things, "The time has come to get out of the shadows of States rights." The ADA with which he is identified is for open occupancy laws.

The plaintive remarks of Senator SMATHERS, of Florida, after having been ordered by President Johnson to second the HUMPHREY nomination, express the universal feeling of the South that HUBERT will be as welcome a candidate in that sector as Typhoid Mary. "I know," SMATHERS said resignedly, "the difficulty of carrying that load in the South."

One other notation on HUBERT. He is a veritable wind machine, addicted to nonstop garrulity. When he went to Russia, he and Khrushchev talked for 8 hours and 25 minutes straight. Immediately after that gabfest, Khrushchev went before the Communist Party's central committee and harangued it for 6 hours. HUBERT must be catching.

The GI Bill Is 20 Years Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 21, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the attention devoted to the GI bill on its 20th anniversary is well deserved. Helping to terminate an enormous American war effort while aiding in the creation of a long and fruitful peace, the GI bill is certainly one of the most successful acts of legislation in the history of this country.

Administrator John S. Gleason, the distinguished head of the Veterans' Administration, has written a thorough and illuminating analysis of the measure. Appearing in the Federal issue of the George Washington University magazine, summer, 1964, Mr. Gleason's article describes the bill's contents, operation, and impact. In order that this information may be better known, I wish to insert it into the RECORD:

THE GI BILL AT 20
(By John S. Gleason, Jr.)

Immediately after the guns stopped shooting, the bombs stopped raining down, and the lights went on again all over the world, the United States emerged from World War II to confront a serious domestic crisis.

The largest military force in U.S. history was encamped all over the world hoping for quick discharges and jobs, houses, and education on their return. Mindful of the upheaval, unemployment, and bonus marches that followed the relatively short and smaller First World War, there was widespread fear about the potentially explosive reaction of 15.3 million World War II veterans whose lives had been uprooted in a longer, more farflung and disruptive war.

One economist predicted a whopping 19 million unemployed if the postwar economy dropped back to its 1940 level of output. More conservative estimates placed the figure at a staggering 8 million. A sociologist, recalling that Hitler and Mussolini had recruited idle veterans, wrote gloomily: "Veterans have written many a bloody page of history and those pages have stood forever as a record of their days of anger."

That the United States won victory in this great peacetime battle is a tribute to an unique piece of legislation—the GI bill of rights.

Exactly 16 days after D-day, when U.S. Armed Forces made history with the sword, President Roosevelt made another kind of history with the stroke of his pen. He signed the GI bill of rights on June 22, 1944.

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the birth of this historic example of long-range planning, which has been compared with the Morrill Act creating land-grant colleges, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Marshall plan.

What was the GI bill of rights, actually titled "The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944"? It provided for loans, education, readjustment allowances for veterans, and expanded veterans hospitals and employment service.

There were those who scoffed at the proposal for the GI bill. They called it an "all time gravy train," aiming particularly heavy fire at the readjustment allowances. Yet only 10 percent exhausted this benefit. Some opponents claimed that veterans returning to school under the GI bill would breed "educational hobo jungles" on college campuses. Instead, they raised the intellectual level of the entire country.

Gloomy prophets dourly predicted that GI homes would be a haven for "deadbeats," that veterans would move in when housing was scarce and then walk out from their obligations. On the contrary, veterans have proved to be excellent credit risks.

But the opposition faded away along with their dire predictions. "With the signing of this bill," said President Roosevelt at a White House ceremony, "a well-rounded program of special veterans' benefits is nearly completed. It gives emphatic notice to the men and women of our Armed Forces that the American people do not intend to let them down."

The feeling was mutual. Veterans certainly did not intend to let America down. "They would be a potent force for good or evil in the years to come," as one veterans' leader predicted at the time. "They could make or break our country. But given the opportunity provided by the GI bill of rights, there was only one alternative—veterans would be a tremendous force for good, and help build a better America, after they had destroyed Nazi, Fascist, and Nipponese totalitarianism."

The words could not have been more prophetic. Here's a rundown on their GI bill record after 20 years.

1. Under the education and training provisions of the bill, 7,800,000 veterans—nearly half of all who served during the war—received training. With well over 2 million in college and another 3,500,000 in other schools, veterans filled every nook and corner of the dormitories, laboratories, and classrooms. They attended classes at 19,000 trade and technical schools, and quonset huts dotted 2,600 campuses from the University of Maine to the University of Southern California.

About 1,400,000 veterans increased their skills in on-the-job training, and about 700,000 learned the newest agricultural techniques in on-the-farm training.

Today we are a far stronger Nation for the infusion of the skills manpower gained through the GI bill: 450,000 engineers, 180,000 doctors, dentists, and nurses, 360,000 schoolteachers, 150,000 scientists, 243,000 accountants, 107,000 lawyers, 36,000 clergymen, 17,000 writers, 711,000 mechanics, 383,000 construction workers, 288,000 metalworkers, 138,000 electricians, and the almost 700,000 who trained for business and executive careers.

Altogether, it was the largest program of mass adult education ever undertaken at bargain rates. The $14.5 billion cost has been more than recouped.

The GI bill continues to pay for itself at close to $1 billion a year. The return comes from additional income tax paid by better-educated, higher-earning GI bill veterans.

2. Equally beneficial has been the long range effects of the GI bill loan program. Structural evidence of it dots the countryside. One out of every five homes built since the end of World War II was financed with a GI loan. As someone said, the landscape architect of postwar America has been the VA loan guarantee officer.

More than 5,268,000 World War II veterans were granted Veterans' Administration home, farm, or business loans totaling more than $43 billion. The almost 5 million home loans in this total helped touch off a postwar housing boom that turned Americans into a nation of homeowners. This infusion of credit, of course, resulted in an enormous stimulus to our national economy. For purchases of new housing dilate the economic arteries. Purchases of new furniture, new appliances, new cars follow; and school construction and other public works are not far behind as new suburban communities mushroom. (These are communities with good credit ratings, it might be said, for more than a third of the GI loans are paid in full.)

3. Often under fire, the GI bill readjustment allowance program helped tide nearly 9 million veterans through the initial period while they looked for jobs. The average stay on the rolls was only 19 weeks, and some $3.8 billion was expended in this program, only 900,000 veterans, or about 1 out of 10, exhausted their full rights to unemployment benefits. Most veterans just were not content with $20 a week, when they could be bringing home $100 from a job, or improving their skills and education.

It was an underappreciated bulwark against adversity for unemployed veterans. In most instances, the payments were not strung together. They were spread over periods when veterans were changing jobs, trying to find themselves in a new world.

4. Millions of veterans skipped school; most of the older, married, and previously employed veterans, headed back to the old jobs, or better ones, if they could land them. One of the lessons that World War I demobilization drove home was that a strong, well-financed, public employment service is indispensable to a smooth readjustment process.

One Government official evaluated the GI bill by paraphrasing Winston Churchill. "Never before," he said, "has so much been done for so many for so little."

A leading industrialist, who knew a good investment when he saw one, agreed. Said Henry Ford II:

"Millions of veterans, who otherwise might not have had the opportunity, have been enabled to enter college or to complete specialized training.

"The Nation gains by having created a great new source from which to draw its leaders."

Leaders they are and leaders they will be, for years to come, according to Dr. Amos Yoder, who made a survey of the GI bill's impact on men listed in the 1960–61 Who's Who. He found approximately 1,000 who had benefited. All were under 46 years, which, he said, is a sizable number when it is realized that almost all of the men who make Who's Who are older.

Since the past is also prologue, the lessons of the GI bill have great value on the contemporary scene. In his message to Congress outlining plans for a war on poverty, President Johnson pointed out that if annual earnings of 10 million among the poor could be raised by only $1,000, it will add $14 billion a year to the national output; reduce the $4 billion in public assistance payments; and lower the costs of fighting crime, delinquency, disease, and hunger.

"Our history has proved," President Johnson said, "that each time we broaden the base of abundance, giving more people the chance to produce and consume, we create new industry, higher production, increased earnings and better income for all." The GI bill is an excellent example of the wisdom of his words.

Address by Hon. John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Arkansas Farmers Union, Little Rock, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEC G. OLSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following address by John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, at the annual convention of the Arkansas Farmers Union, Marion Hotel, Little Rock, Ark., August 11, 1964:

It is a real privilege to attend again an annual convention of the Arkansas Farmers Union. Besides the satisfaction of renewing old friendships and making new ones, I get a special kind of lift from a meeting like this where farm people join forces to seek ways of making their communities, State, and country better.

Farmers Union stands as a champion of the family farm, one of America's greatest assets. Without your unfaltering support, this great rural institution would indeed face an uncertain future.

During the next few minutes, I invite you to explore with me some of the changes that have been taking place in our rural areas, the problems and the opportunities that stem from these changes, and how rural people can employ their own resources—with some assists from Government—to help make their communities better places in which to live.

Two problems stand out as requiring concerted action. First, despite recent gains, the farmer is still plagued by a cost-price squeeze. Second, many of our rural people, like many urban dwellers, are engulfed in poverty and unable to extricate themselves. The opportunities for education, jobs, and public services in rural areas lag behind those available to most cities.

In varying degrees the standards of living in rural areas throughout history have trailed those in the cities. But they need to no longer. With advanced technology in agriculture, coupled with rural electrification, telephones, all-weather roads, and a conviction that a lag by one segment of the economy is a drag on all, we have for the first time the raw materials for doing something about rural problems.

To view these rural problems in perspective, it is well to look back a few years to see what has been taking place in the rural areas. On the farm a technological revolution paralleling that in our urban centers has been going on. The use of improved crop varieties, more fertilizer, more labor-saving electric power and farm machinery,

together with improved farm management, has brought an unprecedented production explosion.

Substitution of power and mechanization for muscle power brought about an upsurge in the output per man. This fantastic abundance was undreamed of in the pre-World War II days. For the nonfarm population, it has meant more and better food in the market basket at relatively lower prices—less than 19 percent of take-home pay, lower than ever before in the history of mankind.

Some people appear to think that most farmers are in clover. But the fact is that over the years net farm income has not kept pace with farm production. In spite of the 18-percent increase in net income per farm since 1960, the per capita income of farm people still is only about 60 percent of that of nonfarm people.

Because the farmer is industry's best customer, the entire Nation has a stake in his welfare. We must help him help himself to attain better returns for the abundance of food and fiber he is producing.

A few people believe the way to solve the problems of agriculture is to do nothing—just get the Government out of the farm picture and let the ruthless law of supply and demand take over. If the farmer can't stand the pressure, they say, let him sell out and go to the city.

Recently we have seen some ugly advertising that uses such terms as "the myth of the family-sized farm." The inference seems to be, "Let the corporations do the job; it's more efficient that way."

You and I know that where members of a farm family work side by side, with their own money and their own future at stake, they are going to put more interest, more planning, and more energy into an enterprise than any absentee owner-producer. Family farming has proved not only an efficient means of production but a wholesome way of life. Our rural communities have turned out a quality of citizenship that has proved a great stabilizing force in this democracy.

At a time when the world is divided into two camps in a gigantic economic and ideological struggle, we cannot afford a sagging rural economy that forces rural people into the cities. We cannot afford a weakening of our social, political, and spiritual fiber that comes with the disappearance of our rural institutions.

Rather than to let the laws of the jungle operate in agriculture and the rural community, a wiser course is to take this miracle of abundance that the farmer has produced and use it to the benefit of all. We can build a better and stronger America without depopulating the countryside.

President Johnson describes the challenge of abundance as an opportunity to attain the great society. In an address to a University of Michigan graduating class, he said, "The challenge of the next half century is whether we have the wisdom to use our wealth to enrich and elevate our national life—and to advance the quality of American civilization."

The attainment of the great society will not come from any magic formula or Aladdin's lamp. It can only be built step-by-step, farm-by-farm, project-by-project, community-by-community throughout the country. It will require imaginative leadership. It will require financing and in some cases it will require Government assistance. Above all, it will require the commitment of the will, the energy and the resources of local people working together in their own communities.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and your national president, Jim Patton, have been inviting the attention of world leaders to the promising potentialities and perplexing problems of this new age of abundance.

The revolution of abundance for several years has been releasing hundreds of millions of man-hours of talent and energy no longer needed to do manual labor and routine chores. Our society cannot go forward on a base of idle hands and idle acres. A way must be found to employ both, not only in the war on frustration and privation, but also in the attainment of a new dimension in living standards. Truly we have the natural resources, the mechanisms and organization technique and the leadership to launch the great society—and with it to hasten the unfolding of the rural renaissance that is now underway.

As an individual, the ruralist—whether he is a farmer, laborer or owner of a small business—is unable to cope with some of the problems that surround him. Group action is necessary. That is one place where cooperatives can play a role.

The role of cooperatives in the past in such fields as electricity, telephones, purchasing, marketing, and processing is well known. There are, it seems to me, several jobs that cooperatives can do to give more help to the farmer. One of them is in the field of public relations.

The public knows little about how much time, cash, and sweat the farmer puts into the economy and how little he gets back in return. I don't think the problem is one of studied hostility. Rather it is a case of information lag. The men in the mines, the mills, the plants, and the refineries are oblivious to the fact that the farmer frequently is their best customer. This is a story that should be told and retold. Cooperatives, by telling the public the facts about the farmer's role, can build a solid foundation for economic health in the rural community. Without this indispensable underpinning, the family farm has no assurance that it will survive.

Many of you are members of cooperatives of various kinds. You know that they have given the farmer more muscle power. The rural electric cooperatives provide an excellent object lesson in the potentialities of working together. Before 1935, when the REA program was established, a farmer sometimes had to pay $1,000 or more to get a half-mile extension to his place. On top of this, he paid exorbitant rates for the electric energy he consumed. It ran as high as 15 cents a kilowatt-hour—or even higher. Last year members of rural electric systems financed by REA paid an average of 2.25 cents per kilowatt-hour for electricity.

This muscle power, effected through cooperation, also benefited farmers not served by rural electric cooperatives because construction charges were, for the most part, eliminated and rates went down. When the cooperatives could not purchase power at reasonable rates, they organized large power generation and transmission federations and, likewise, the wholesale rates went down.

REA-financed cooperatives have gone a long way toward giving rural people parity. While much remains to be done, their work demonstrates the effectiveness of cooperatives. REA borrowers generate only about 1 percent of the power produced in the United States and distribute only 4 percent of it. Yet they show that where there is good management, close cooperation and volume, coupled with Government technical assistance and credit, cooperatives can help the farmer meet problems he would be helpless to solve working individually.

I can assure you that the Department of Agriculture will work with farmers in building strong cooperatives. As you know, the Department was directed by the Cooperative Marketing Act to gather, interpret, and disseminate information that would promote the knowledge of cooperative principles and practices.

In May, Secretary Freeman directed the Department to implement recommendations of the National Advisory Committee on Cooperatives designed to encourage even greater teamwork between USDA and the Nation's farmer-owned cooperatives. A key recommendation of the committee was creation of a task force to explore the possibilities of "increasing the farmer's muscle in the marketplace."

We believe that helping cooperatives so that they in turn can help farmers maintain and improve their incomes will add strength to the entire Nation. Cooperatives are private businesses and if they are aggressive and well managed, they can contribute just as much as other free enterprises toward the general prosperity.

The family farm, the rural community and the small town scattered over the length and breadth of the land have served this Nation well. As a foundation for the personal liberties, the vigorous enterprise and the noble national conscience, they have helped make this country the showplace of the world. Surely as a Nation we cannot afford to permit this foundation to crumble.

There is an unprecedented challenge for all people, town and country, city and urban, to join hands to revitalize and strengthen the rural communities. As rural leaders you have your work cut out for you to enlist the cooperation of all and to encourage the despairing or faint of heart.

Rebuilding rural America is a people's program, conceived, initiated, and carried out by local people with the assistance of Federal and State Governments and of State educational institutions.

We in Washington have mobilized the technical and financial resources available in the Department to stimulate and encourage the nationwide effort to bolster the rural community. This effort is aimed at helping rural people utilize the products, manpower, land, and other resources made available by the revolution of abundance.

If we can direct the liberated energies and resources of our people into rebuilding of our decaying rural communities, the possibilities for achievement will be limitless.

I cannot begin to describe all the opportunities that are open for Rural Areas Development, which we call RAD. With assistance from REA's RAD staff, rural electric and telephone borrowers have helped launch 16,000 industrial and community development projects employing more than 100,000 people.

The assistance was mainly in the form of credit-finding and technical advice. Most of the financing came from private sources. A small part, not available through commercial channels, came from such agencies as the Area Redevelopment Administration, Small Business Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, and in some instances—where the purposes related to rural electrification—from REA.

These projects included food and fiber processing, marketing, general industry and business, forestry products, public facilities, hospitals, housing for the elderly, and outdoor recreation.

If anyone is inclined to look over his glasses when recreation is mentioned as a cash farm crop, we can point to numerous projects where idle acres and idle hands have been put to work, and profitably, in meeting the ever-growing recreational needs of city people.

We have just completed a survey of the use of private lands for recreation by various organizations. It shows that more than 51,800 organized groups with a total membership of 8.9 million already have leases or permits to use some 39 million acres of privately owned land for outdoor recreation.

Several Department agencies are helping farmers interested in recreational develop-

ment. The Soil Conservation Service can provide both technical and financial aid to local sponsors for the development of watershed projects for wildlife and recreation. It can also assist individuals and groups with technical help in developing recreational facilities.

Farmers Home Administration, in addition to its better-known tenant-purchase and rehabilitation loans, can also make loans to the farmer for income-producing facilities for recreation.

Recreation is just one of the many types of projects that offer means of converting idle manpower and land into uses that meet the needs of our people.

The Department's rural housing program last year provided 20,000 loans for a total of $186 million as a step toward erasing rural slums. The demand would easily have supported an insured loan program twice this size to help rural families build and repair homes.

Since this housing program began in 1949, some $680 million has been loaned, creating an estimated 163,000 man-years of employment and a market for a billion board feet of lumber and $340 million worth of materials and supplies. With losses running less than two one-hundredths of 1 percent, it can be readily seen that rural housing is a sound program.

The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service also provides a means of meeting the immediate and longtime requirements of our people. In 1963 this agency made available to farmers $220 million. This, coupled with investments in materials and services by farmers, brought the sums channeled into ACP practices to nearly a half billion dollars.

Through the nationwide ACP program, some 2 million farmers and ranchers have applied vital soil, water, woodland and wildlife conservation measures to their land since 1960. With the encouragement and help of local farmer-committeemen, some 300,000 in the past 2 years have started systematic conservation practices for the first time.

ACP attacks poverty and strengthens the economic base by helping shift land to needed uses, by improving the productivity of land for present and future generations, by reducing flood and drought disasters, by providing an adequate supply of water for farm and industrial use and by developing a large market for conservation goods and services.

Combined with the work of the soil conservation districts through the small watershed program, ACP demonstrates that conservation is a creative process for building the strength of our Nation that we have only begun to employ. In this fiscal year we expect to help some 1,800 local organizations develop land and water resources on 36 million acres. This will involve 4.1 million persons in 606 projects. The benefits to the Nation are limitless.

In the past 3½ years we have moved from a recession into the longest and strongest peacetime expansion of the 20th century, and we have done it with a remarkable record of price stability.

We have had the largest tax cut in history, pumping some $10 billion into the economy.

Our unemployment is down to the lowest point in 7 years.

Employment is at a record 71.7 million.

Our gross national product has increased 22 percent in 3 years.

Industrial production is up 25 percent since 1960.

Disposable personal income is up 18 percent, corporate profits before taxes are up 45 percent, wages and salaries are up 19 percent.

Net income per farm was up 18 percent in 1963, or $543, over 1960. Farmers over the past 3 years have earned $8.4 billion more in gross income and over $2½ billion more in net income than if 1960 prices and income had prevailed.

This incidentally, has meant 200,000 new jobs in stores and factories throughout the land.

These striking gains have come from aggressive farm and business management backed and encouraged by realistic administration policies. We in the Department of Agriculture naturally take pride in having had a part in framing and carrying out some of these policies.

We are pleased but not satisfied. Good though our progress has been, it is only beginning to meet the needs of the American people. A great deal remains to be done.

In today's world there is no room in rural America for poverty, unemployment, underemployment, or unfulfilled needs.

You and the millions like you across this great land can bring new and fuller meaning to the old traditions of neighborliness. You can banish the scourge of racial discrimination. You can supplant despair with hope.

President Johnson, in contrasting depression days with the great opportunities of today, said, "Franklin Roosevelt fought fear—now we seek to realize promise."

You in the Arkansas Farmers Union are the kind of people who are seeking to realize promise—promise of a better tomorrow for rural Arkansas, for all Americans.

Thank you.

Pep Pills Bought by Carton Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, last night a nationwide television audience learned how easy it is for any unscrupulous drug peddler to obtain pep pills and goof balls under present drug regulations. the program "CBS Evening News with Walter Cronkite," showed how a CBS producer, Jay McMullen, was able, with a simple letterhead and rented office, to obtain for cost of $600 an amount of barbiturates and amphetamines worth, on the black market, nearly one-half million dollars.

In presenting this program Mr. Cronkite pointed out that:

The traffic in barbiturate drugs and amphetamines (better known as pep pills and goof balls) is creating * * * a problem more widespread and serious than the traffic in heroin.

On March 12 of this year, I introduced a bill, H.R. 10409, which, if enacted, would prohibit such nonmedical purchases of dangerous drugs. My good friend from Connecticut, Senator DODD, a long-time crusader against the abuse of these drugs, introduced a companion bill, S. 2628, in the Senate. Through the efforts of Senator DODD and other good Senators who recognize this problem, such as Senator YARBOROUGH and Senator HILL, S. 2628 was passed by the Senate on August 13, 1964.

Senator DODD's bill, and my own, rests in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Our attack on this problem is simple. The legislation would set up a recordkeeping and control system which would limit traffic in dangerous drugs to those engaged in the legitimate drug business. It would impose recordkeeping requirements on all those engaged in the handling of these dangerous drugs and limit their sales to medical and pharmaceutical channels. It would require that records be made available at reasonable times to inspectors of the Food and Drug Administration for review and enforcement. In addition to setting up an orderly recordkeeping procedure for the legitimate drug business, we would also, with this legislation, impose stringent criminal penalties on those dregs of humanity who now make these drugs available to our sons and daughters.

It is my sincere hope that the interest engendered by Mr. Cronkite's program last night and that which will be further stimulated by his presentation this evening and Friday, will serve as a stimulus to move this much needed legislation from committee to the floor, so that every member of this body will be able to participate in the elimination of drug abuse in the United States.

The problem is great, and a solution is essential. Let us resolve it before this session ends.

Mr. Speaker, under consent previously granted, I insert at this point in the RECORD an article from today's New York Times describing the CBS presentation:

PEP PILLS BOUGHT BY CARTON IN TEST—DUMMY COMPANY WITHOUT LICENSE GETS SHIPMENTS FROM DRUG PRODUCERS

A television producer told a network audience last night that he had set up an unlicensed business that bought more than a million goofballs and pep pills from drug manufacturers in a 4-month experiment.

The producer, Jay McMullen, of the Columbia Broadcasting System, estimated that the shipments, which, he said, cost him only $600.28 were worth between $250,000 and $500,000 on the black market.

Mr. McMullen spoke on the program, "CBS Evening News With Walter Cronkite."

In introducing the producer, Mr. Cronkite said: "The traffic in barbiturate drugs and amphetamines (better known as pep pills and goofballs) is creating—according to authorities—a problem more widespread and serious than the traffic in heroin."

FACTFINDING STUDY

Mr. McMullen conducted the experiment as head of a network news "factfinding unit" established to chart "new areas in television journalism."

He told his audience that he had established a dummy concern, McMullen Services, in an office at 35 West 45th Street, and obtained 250 letterheads and envelopes.

Mr. McMullen's purpose, he said, was to find out the extent to which a would-be wholesaler, without registration or license number, could buy the drugs from legitimate manufacturers.

He said: "In many States, wholesalers of barbiturates, amphetamines or other prescription drugs are required to obtain a license and to keep records of purchases and sales.

"Those who repackage and sell in interstate commerce are generally required to register with the Food and Drug Administration and, according to the FDA, manufacturers should check on the legitimacy of a new wholesale buyer."

Another Victory for Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, with our lowering prestige throughout the world, there is another report of our foreign policy going downhill in the following article by George Weller in the Long Island Press of August 24. He tells us about the loss of our Libyan base:

U.S. LOSS OF LIBYAN BASE IS A VICTORY FOR NASSER

(By George Weller)

WASHINGTON.—United Arab Republic President Gamal Abdel Nasser has scored heavily in his campaign against American and British bases in the Middle East by Libya's announcement that the United States has agreed to give up its costly 20-year-old base at Wheelus Field.

The United States has already been forced by Morocco and Saudi Arabia, two other recipients of American aid, to give up airbases.

But Allan Lightner, American Ambassador in Libya, has cheated Nasser of part of his victory by deferring a final American agreement to withdraw until next year. The base contract expires in 1971. The United States has cited the "complexity, cost, and difficulty of relocating."

Nasser, who receives $200 million a year in American food aid, attacked the American base at Tripoli in a speech February 22. Nasser also attacked the British bases at Benghazi in Libya, at Aden and on Cyprus. He also began making shipments of arms to the Makarios forces in Cyprus pledged to expel the British.

The Libyan Cabinet, headed by Prime Minister Mahmud Muntasser, on the day after Nasser's speech, asked for negotiations to arrange the departure of the Americans. The Egyptians were jubilant at the 24-hour victory.

Behind the scenes, however, Libya's 74-year-old King Idriss, proud but frail, became indignant at the unseemly alacrity with which Muntasser appeared to be obeying Nasser's suggestions. He left his palace in protest, appealed directly to his followers, and then carried their indignant reproaches to the Cabinet. The Cabinet cooled off.

At the May meetings of the Arab summit in Cairo, Nasser was denied the satisfaction of explaining how he had been able to force the Americans to accept the principle of withdrawal from Libya. But he will be able to offer his triumph when the Arab chiefs of state come to Alexandria September 5.

The former American Ambassador in Cairo, the Minister-Educator John S. Badeau, expressed mild regret to Nasser over the Egyptian President's intervention against the United States.

Almost immediately Nasser granted a so-called fishing base to the Soviet trawling fleet, which is under naval jurisdiction, at the port of Benas, on the Red Sea. Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and Nasser spent 2 days there after they opened the high dam as Aswan, directly west of Benas.

The Soviets already control Hodeida, the most important port of the Egyptian satellite, the Republic of Yemen. The Soviets are also building the Somalian port of Berbera, thus gaining three footholds on or near the strategic Red Sea.

Badeau's successor as Ambassador, Lucius Battle, 46, is awaiting approval by the Senate. He is a former Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural Affairs. He has never served in the Middle East. What Washington plans to do about Soviet gains in the Red Sea is not clear.

American officials appear little perturbed by Nasser's campaign and Libya's bending before it against the will of King Idriss.

A trend to reclaim Wheelus Field was already latent in Libya's Government after organization for African unity, meeting in Ethiopia in October, demanded that all foreign bases be relinquished, U.S. officials believe. The Libyan Cabinet was yielding more to a general African fashion rather than to Nasser's needling, they feel.

Despite Nasser's strong incitement, there has been no anti-American campaign in the Libyan press. The 55-member Parliament is not divided into parties, and hence there has been little partisan agitation. American officials consider the Libyan negotiation has been carried on with decorum and understanding on both sides, despite Nasser's efforts to pressure the Libyans.

Crown Prince Hassan, 35, has been designated since 1956 as the heir to the throne. The Egyptians are facing a dilemma somewhat similar to Yemen where Nasser first won and then lost both the old and young Imams.

Libya is growing rich rapidly from its huge oil deposits, which have enabled the formerly poor government to start building new capital at Beida in the cool hills of Cyrenaica.

With this prize in their grasp, they do not wish to invite an invasion like Nasser's into Yemen, to dethrone a monarch.

Improving Immigration Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, may I commend to the attention of my colleagues this important editorial from the Wall Street Journal of August 18, 1964, urging revision of our immigration laws. As a longtime proponent of the elimination of the national origins quota system, I find it very encouraging that this influential newspaper supports this position. I can only reiterate the necessity for foreign policy, domestic well-being, and international amity of quick affirmative action on the immigration bills now before the Congress.

The editorial is as follows:

IMPROVING IMMIGRATION POLICY

We're convinced most Americans believe it's wrong to discriminate against someone simply because he was born in the wrong place. For some reason, though, efforts to get our national immigration laws in line with that ideal have met persistent failure.

A House subcommittee recently held hearings on the latest of many proposals to eliminate the immigration law's national origins system, which determines a nation's immigration quota by the proportion of the U.S. population of that national extraction in 1924. The current law also contains specific provisions beyond the national quotas to limit immigration of Orientals.

The latest proposals for change would distribute the overall quota of 165,000 immigrants without regard to national origins. Instead, up to half the quota would go to persons with special skills needed here, and up to another half to relatives of U.S. residents not eligible for nonquota status. Within these preferences, which are similar to ones currently used within national quotas, immigration permits would be granted in order of application. The bill contains provisions for moderating the change to a new system, such as retaining partial national quotas for 5 years.

These suggestions seem eminently reasonable, though they received scant attention in the last two sessions of Congress. They would insure that someone with talents the United States can use would not face lengthy delay because of his birthplace. They would eliminate hardships on separated families from Italy or Greece, who now sometimes must postpone reunion while large quotas for England and Ireland go unused.

It may be well to note that no one is suggesting anything as radical as abolishing limits on total immigration. This is obviously impractical, simply because more people would like to enter than we can accommodate without strain. The problem is how to select which applicants to admit.

There may be a certain amount of sense in accepting more immigrants from countries with close ethnic and cultural ties to the majority of our citizens. But it seems even more reasonable and fair to put the emphasis on such other qualifications as skills and kinship. And it seems only fair not to turn down qualified applicants while places in the total allocation go unused.

The national origins system has proved too cumbersome and inflexible to meet these simple tests of equity. The proposed changes might help put our immigration laws on somewhere near a rational basis.

All Government Contracts Awarded McCloskey Should Be Investigated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today urging that the House Government Operations Committee investigate all Government construction contracts awarded Matthew McCloskey within recent years to discover whether there were kickbacks into the Democrats' campaign treasury.

I make this request in light of the Tuesday disclosure by Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, that Mr. McCloskey kicked back $25,000 from the District of Columbia stadium contract into the 1960 Johnson campaign fund.

It is perfectly obvious that if Mr. McCloskey can kick back from one Government contract, he can do it for another. The suspicion is especially acute because of his duties as a Democratic fund raiser.

Mr. McCloskey has been favored with many millions of dollars worth of Government construction, both in Washington, D.C., and elsewhere. The U.S. Office of Education and National Aeronautical and Space Administration (NASA) Building, $11.9 million; the Bureau of Old Age Survivors Insurance Building in Baltimore, $23.9 million, the Naval Weapons Plant in Washington, cost considered classified military infor-

mation; the Rayburn Building, of which Mr. McCloskey was awarded $54 million of a total estimated cost of $86.4 million, and contracts for reconstruction of the east front of the Capitol Building totaling over $2 million are examples.

Senator WILLIAMS' investigation of the District of Columbia stadium contract indicates there is nothing in Mr. McCloskey's book of ethics to prevent him from siphoning off Government contract money into the Democratic treasury. What remains now for the Congress to discover is whether this practice extended to other Government contracts awarded this favored Democrat.

Who Will Win the Supersonic Race?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Charles Leedham has written imaginatively and perceptively on many subjects. He is the author of numerous timely articles and his latest book, an explanation of the Constitution for children, is scheduled for publication by Dodd, Mead this fall. Last week he contributed an important article to the New York Times magazine that I wish to have printed in the RECORD.

In the article he warns that U.S. prestige as well as dollar profits are at stake in competition to produce a new breed of jetliners. The Soviet Union and a combination of European countries have nearly completed the development of their own supersonic airliners, while U.S. companies cooperating with the Government are still debating designs. Mr. Leedham argues that this is a national question deserving national attention. His article describes the basic difficulties in our program and indicates what is and isn't being done to iron them out. It is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of this subject and merits attention.

The article follows:

WHO WILL WIN THE SUPERSONIC RACE?

(By Charles Leedham)

Well before the middle of the next decade—as early as 1971, according to some estimates—airline passengers will be streaking through the sky at speeds more than twice the speed of sound, in a fabulous new generation of jetliners capable of making the New York-London run in 2 hours or less. Unquestionably, it is an enticing prospect for some travelers, and they may care little who made the airplane that makes such travel possible. But to the deeply concerned American Government, it is a nagging and vital question. Will those airliners be built here or will our long-held dominance of civil aviation have slipped across the Atlantic to Europe? No one, at this point, has the remotest idea.

We are currently in the midst of an ultra-high-pressure race to build what is known as the SST, a supersonic transport for civil passenger service. The stakes are enormous, the risks are high, and it is a race this country can ill afford to stay out of. Yet at present we seem very likely to finish third, far behind Russia and a respectable distance behind a British-French cooperative effort—if we finish at all.

Our major present hope, in fact, is to finish last but with such a vastly superior SST that we will belatedly take the play away from the competition by virtue of sheer performance. This may yet happen, but our competitors are off and running hard while we are still trying to figure out whether the whole idea is economically feasible, haggling over who will pay for the necessary research and development, and searching for the best way to design and power such an aircraft.

Russia, which may already have a prototype SST undergoing flight tests—as with all things Russian, it is difficult to be sure—simply decided some years ago to have an SST quickly, and down the chain of command went The Word. Result: a transport reportedly capable of speeds up to 1,800 miles per hour, with a payload of up to 150 passengers, following quite closely the tested and proved design of the Soviet supersonic heavy bomber called Bounder.

If the Russian prototype is already being tested, the liner may possibly be used in limited passenger runs by Aeroflot, the Russian state airline, as early as 1965. The resulting propaganda loss for the United States can be imagined. The moment Premier Khrushchev steps out of a Russian SST onto a foreign airport, having flown there at 1,800 m.p.h. in an obviously civilian passenger plane and years ahead of any free-world SST, Russian prestige will soar and that of the West, particularly of America, will drop. It will be, in effect, another and smaller sputnik.

The British-French entry is also well along, at least in the design stages. The Concorde, the harmoniously named joint product of the British Aircraft Corporation and France's Sud Aviation, now has a settled design and specifications, and certain of the metal parts for a prototype have already been fabricated. The Concorde is to have a speed of 1,450 m.p.h., a passenger capacity of 118, and BAC-Sud hopes to have it in passenger service in 1971.

The status of the American SST is, at best, vague. Great gusts of publicity have appeared about a marvelous 2,000 miles per hour American airliner to be flying around 1970 but nobody yet knows whether it is actually possible, practical, or economic. The Federal Aviation Agency has held a design competition, and selected two airframe manufacturers (Boeing and Lockheed) and two engine manufacturers (General Electric and Pratt & Whitney) to do further research, but the administration has rejected the plans submitted as economically and technically impractical.

One of the basic problems is the risk involved in our present insistence on having ultimately the biggest, the best and the most expensive airliner aloft. The Russians have accelerated their program by using a modified heavy bomber as their basic plan. The Anglo-French combine has settled for a speed limitation of 1,450 miles per hour, the maximum attainable with souped-up current jet engines, and with the metals technology that is currently and most easily available to them.

In making its own late entry into the race, the United States is so far going for broke, banking on the future success of a "growth" airplane. The American SST is to be powered by engines as yet undeveloped but of massive thrust, and built of metals still very incompletely researched. The prize in this gamble, if it pays off, will be an airplane capable of speeds starting at 2,000 miles per hour, with rapid possible design improvement to speeds of 3,000 and even 4,000 miles per hour.

In these speed ranges "miles per hour" becomes obsolete terminology. Everything in the new realm of supersonics is described in terms of mach numbers (so named for the physicist Ernst Mach) as a relationship to the speed of sound. Mach 1 is the speed of sound (approximately 660 miles per hour at sea level), mach 2 is twice the speed of sound. The Concorde is spoken of as a mach 2.2 airplane, the future American entry as a mach 2.8 to mach 3 airplane.

The jump, however, to mach 3 is a very large one, when we have had no experience at all with passenger airplanes even above mach 1. It is as though, shortly after the development of the Ford trimotor, we had decided to skip all the intermediate steps in airplane improvement and start a crash program to develop a jetliner capable of flying at 600 miles per hour. We know that mach 3 is physically possible because we have at least one military airplane—the A–11 reconnaissance-interceptor—which has reached this speed, but we have no idea about sustained flight at mach 3.

This military success is one of the factors that pushed the American SST effort out on its mach 2 limb. When the FAA sent out its "Request for Proposals" to the manufacturers in August 1963, it specified only "a cruise speed capability of mach 2.2 or faster." In another section it noted: "Although it is technologically feasible to develop an aircraft having sustained cruising speed capability in the order of mach 3, the final test of a successful commercial transport will be safety and economic performance in airline service."

The Government has continued to emphasize "economic performance" and its opposition to subsidy, but these factors have until recently been shoved to the sidelines in the emphasis on speed.

The "Request for Proposals" put the airplane builders into competition with one another, and the unspoken pressures were on them to go for the "or faster" part of the specification. Mach 3, as witness the A–11, was patently a reachable speed. If one company had plodded along cautiously with a mach 2.2 program, it would have looked small and backward in the midst of publicity trumpetings about the aggressive mach 3 designs of its competitors.

And in the background there was the not so muted refrain, "We in America can certainly do better than the Europeans." The only way to do better in the supersonic field is to go faster, and the sights thus became set on the mach 3 SST.

One of the major technical problems is temperature. At mach 2.2, air friction raises the temperature of parts of an airplane's skin to 250 degrees Fahrenheit. This much the aluminum alloys we are familiar with in airplane construction can stand safety, but at higher temperatures they begin to soften and are useless. At mach 2.8 and mach 3, skin temperatures rise to 500–600 degrees, and in this range titanium and steels must be used.

The British-French combine willingly accepted the mach 2.2 limitation of aluminum in planning their Concorde, in return for the economies and speed of working with well-understood technology. We, on the other hand, are striking out into practically uncharted territory.

We do have engines capable of pushing an airplane to mach 3—on the A–11 and the yet-untested B–70—but these are military engines, with stupendously high fuel consumption, which cannot even be adapted to economically reasonable passenger service. We do have experience with titanium-steel construction, again with the A–11 and B–70, but such mach 3 flights as have been made have been only brief bursts at that speed.

For practical airliner use, the airplane frame must be able to stand tens of thousands of hours of continued, regular mach 3 temperatures, and we have as yet literally no idea what will happen to metals in that

kind of service. We cannot thus emulate the fast Russian approach, because we cannot accept ruinously high operations costs—as they will—or a limited prestige-only service by a bomber-derived airliner.

Another formidable problem is cosmic radiation. At the proposed cruising altitudes of the SST's—65,000 to 75,000 feet—there is little atmosphere above the airplane to protect crews and passengers from sudden bursts of intense cosmic radiation associated with flares on the surface of the sun. During these radiation periods, the SST's may have to fly at lower altitudes and at subsonic speeds, vastly increasing their operational costs and thus making them economically unattractive to the airlines.

The difficulty of sonic boom may turn out to be even worse. Contrary to popular belief, an airplane flying past the speed of sound does not generate a single thunderous boom, audible on the ground, just at the moment it "goes through the sound barrier." As it passes the speed of sound, it begins to create the boom and then, unfortunately, continues to produce it as long as the airplane stays above that speed.

Thus, an SST flying across the country would trail beneath and behind it a continual "carpet" of sonic boom, like the bow wave of a ship, sounding to every groundling beneath it, from coast to coast, like sudden explosions in the sky. No one knows—although the FAA has been trying to find out through controlled sonic boom experiments over Oklahoma City—whether the public will ever come to accept continued booms from SST's flying overhead on schedule.

One highly disturbing early result of the experiments is the discovery that sonic boom is sometimes magnified by certain combinations of atmospheric conditions. Given these conditions, an SST flying even as high as 75,000 feet could break windows and crack plaster on the ground. The Government now optimistically hopes that people will become accustomed to small, nondamaging booms when they are an everyday occurrence, but no amount of indoctrination or exposure could ever persuade the public to accept booms of plaster-cracking magnitude.

The problem could conceivably be severe enough to restrict SST flights to overwater routes only. Airline officials who are already worrying about high per-mile operating costs of the SST's shudder when they think of the added expenses of scheduling route and speed limitations imposed by unsolved technical problems.

Combined with these technical questions is the major and difficult problem of keeping the development and operation of the SST within the framework of the American private enterprise system. The Government has declared that building an SST is a matter of national importance, but at the same time it has insisted that it be developed privately by the aircraft companies, and that the aircraft be one that the airline companies can afford to purchase and operate without Federal subsidy.

Can such a massive project be undertaken by private industry when research and development costs alone are estimated at a minimum of $1 billion? No one yet has the answer.

The administration is more than willing to help, by advancing $750 million for development, but it currently expects to recapture that amount by charging a royalty of $200,000 to $500,000 on the eventual sale of each SST, plus a 1.5-percent royalty off the top of SST passenger revenues—to be levied on the airlines—until all is repaid. But the Government also expects the aircraft manufacturers to put in $250 million of their own money, with no guarantees against the loss of the entire sum if the Mach 3 SST turns out to be an impractical airplane.

This sort of risk the companies say they simply cannot take. They are backed by the special Presidential Advisory Committee, headed by Eugene R. Black, former president of the World Bank, which investigated the economics of the SST project and concluded:

"Should it come to pass that one or more of the negative eventualties we have discussed should occur, and should the program be closed out, losses could be so serious that these companies could disappear or be crippled. Except for one company, the other large frame and propulsion companies have a new worth in the quarter billion dollar area, hardly a safe position from which to take losses upward of $100 million each, even if some of these losses were to be passed on to subcontractors."

The administration is thus in a quandary. If the companies refuse to undertake the financial risk involved in the 75–25 percent split of development costs, the American SST program could end right there, with an incalculable loss of American prestige through dropping out of the SST race, compounded by financial and prestige penalties of future loss of civil aviation leadership to Europe.

If, on the other hand, the Government decides simply to absorb the development costs of the SST and treat it as a national project requiring national support, the Russians will be very quick to point out to all and sundry how the vaunted capitalist system was unable to handle a major project and had to be rescued by the Government. We are damned if we do, and damned if we don't.

Fortunately, a middle way is beginning to appear. Historically, the Government has kept itself largely out of the field of civilian aviation development, but the industry has depended heavily on the aviation technology of military aircraft developed entirely with Government funds. The SST project is the first in which the industry has been expected to go ahead on its own, pioneering into new fields of technology. The industry is, in fact, being heavily pressured by Washington to participate in the project.

Because the development of the SST's engines could be considered a contribution to future military aircraft, James Webb, NASA Administrator—and member of another Presidential SST advisory committee—has hinted that the Government may be willing to underwrite the $500 million cost of engine development. This would take half the anticipated private risk out of the picture, and would point toward further Government concessions in the airframe area which could also be considered contributory to military needs.

It is a quibble, for in the end the Government would still be subsidizing the development of the commercial SST but it is at least a solution with some face-saving properties.

The anticipated cost of these airplanes is immense. The Concorde is currently slated at between $10 and $12 million each, approximately twice the price of today's subsonic jet. When and if the American SST is in production, it may cost at least $25 million, and quite possibly as much as $40 million.

Airlines facing limited permissible usage of such aircraft (because of the sonic boom and radiation problems) might think long and hard before spending that kind of money for an airplane. They might limit their purchases to only a grudging few SST's to stay competitive on premium transoceanic runs, and once again the manufacturers would be in trouble—even if the Government had absorbed all the development expenses.

Worse, those few purchases might be Concordes, even with an American SST available. The difference in trans-Atlantic flight times between a mach 2.2 Concorde and a mach 2.8 SST is minimal, on the order of 20 minutes when climb and descent at subsonic speeds and ground maneuvering time are taken into account. Would it be worth paying at least twice as much for so small a saving?

Would it be worth the astronomical initial price and higher operating costs, the airlines are beginning to wonder publicly—particularly as in many cases SST flights will have little practical advantage over present subsonic schedules? On the New York-Paris route, for example, tourists now heavily prefer flights departing in the late evening, arriving in Paris early the next day. For early-morning Paris arrival, an SST would have to leave at approximately 4 a.m.

What the airlines find hard to believe is that the average passenger would prefer to wait around until 4 in the morning to pay a higher fare—SST flights will almost certainly carry a surcharge—when he could just as easily take an earlier subsonic jet and sleep away the trans-Atlantic hours at a lower cost.

And even if SST flight proves perfectly feasible and unlimited in routes, the emergence of a proven Concorde 2, 3 or even 5 years before the American product—which is quite possible—might still swing civil aviation leadership permanently to Europe. American airlines would be forced to invest heavily in Concordes to stay competitive with such foreign carriers as BOAC and Air France. By the time the American SST emerged, at $25 million each and with only marginally better performance, airline investment in the Concordes could be so heavy as to preclude more than token SST purchases.

Not only would American leadership and prestige be lost, but hundreds of millions of dollars would necessarily flow overseas for aircraft and parts, badly denting the balance-of-payments situation. Again, the Government might have to take another unhappy step back from the principles of private enterprise by directly subsidizing airline purchase of SST's, for their own sake and for the sake of the manufacturers.

Serious cracks are already beginning to appear in the Government's once-monolithic facade of confidence and determination that the mach 3 SST could and would be quickly developed, and entirely by private enterprise. Stories coming from Washington give a picture of much thrashing about behind the scenes, of Laocoon-like struggles with the rapidly growing problems and misgivings. There are "a variety of views about the pace of the program" within the Government, as Najeeb Halaby, Administrator of the FAA, recently acknowledged. Still, as of this moment, the administration publicly maintains that, somehow, all will be well in the end.

One possible solution, as yet relatively unexplored, would be for the United States to bite the bullet, and openly retreat from the mach 3 airplane to a relatively riskless mach 2.2 SST in direct competition with the Concorde. There is hardly any question but that, with the application of our existing technology, research and manufacturing capabilities—and without Federal subsidy—we could come out with a mach 2.2 airliner at least as soon as the Concorde, despite our late start, and possibly a little sooner.

We would then be in no worse than a standoff, slightly battered in prestige but at least still safely in the running. Work on the mach 3 and higher speed SST's could then be left to a more leisurely, far safer and surer program of concurrent development. It would be one way out of the present dilemma.

The answers and the decisions will probably not begin to emerge for another 5 months at least. The airplane companies have until then to submit new plans and designs, reworked closer to the ultimate desire of economic feasibility. In the meantime, the Commerce Department is studying the economics of airline and SST opera-

tion in the 1970's, while the National Academy of Sciences is working with the FAA on sonic-boom tests and evaluations. Special Presidential committees are also studying all aspects of the situation.

However the financing is handled, this is now a national project, and no longer really a matter for private enterprise. In the end, it will not be the aircraft companies or the airlines who will make the decisions but the President, acting on the advice and counsel of all his departments and committees.

Henry Ford and COPE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, this is going to be an interesting fall, with the AFL–CIO and Henry Ford both supporting the same candidate.

Ted Lewis, in today's New York Daily News, elaborates on the attitude of the party of the people:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News, Sept. 2, 1964]

CAPITOL STUFF

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, September 1.—Organized labor's endorsement today of the Johnson-Humphrey ticket only formalizes a position that had long been obvious. Nevertheless, the pronouncement does spotlight one of the most confusing aspects of this presidential campaign.

It throws the support of leaders of the 13 million members of the AFL–CIO behind Lyndon Johnson, the same man they violently opposed as John F. Kennedy's running mate in 1960.

Moreover—and this has never happened before—it lines them up behind the same ticket which certain management big shots such as Henry Ford 2d are also supporting.

This odd-ball situation is even more intriguing, as well as disturbing, to managers of the Democratic campaign. The big uncertainty is the size of the "backlash" vote among labor's rank-and-file, particularly in those working class congressional districts where the Negro "right-to-work" drive worries union jobholders.

Another definite uncertainty concerns the extent to which COPE (labor's basic get-out-the-vote setup) will be able to generate enthusiastic response. How, for example, can the precinct level job be done effectively in behalf of a presidential candidate whose legislative record on labor legislation was definitely so-so? Especially one who, this year at least, is wooing Republican Party "capitalists" and labor at the same time.

What the White House is banking on, of course, is that union members will go for Lyndon, not so much because they are for him but because they are dead set against BARRY GOLDWATER. The Republican candidate is supposed to get his comeuppance primarily because of his stand on right-to-work laws.

BACKLASH FEELING IN RANK-AND-FILE

This expectation does not run over into party contests where House seats, rather than the Presidency, are at stake. It is in these races that the "backlash" issue is worrying most the Democratic high command. They fear the loss of seats of liberal Democrats who in the past have had strong labor support.

Secret polls—even among United Steel Workers—have indicated that in industrial centers like Pittsburgh there is strong backlash feeling among labor's rank-and-file. Some of this could be translated into votes for GOLDWATER in November. Most of it is more likely to end up with support of Republican congressional candidates, instead of Democratic incumbents who voted the strong civil rights line.

COPE specializes in helping liberal Democratic Congressmen in so-called swing districts—those where victory comes by less than a 5 percent margin. And COPE at this time, its administrators privately admit, is scared to death about the backlash in close working-class districts. Above all, those in Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and Philadelphia districts where the housing pattern has been changing and Negroes are scrambling for jobs.

It has seldom been possible to translate the official backing of organized labor into November support of the rank-and-file anyway. This year especially, Democratic Party leaders admit, it is hazardous to predict.

BUT THE WIVES VOTED FOR EISENHOWER

It is all very well for Walter Reuther and George Meany, along with the AFL–CIO's entire executive council, plus all union presidents, to extol Johnson and downgrade Goldwater, as was their function today.

They or their counterparts did the same thing in an equally unqualified way in backing Adlai Stevenson against Dwight Eisenhower in 1952. But they couldn't deliver labor's vote then, either. The segment they were able to deliver was counterbalanced by the number of wives of union members who voted for Ike while their husbands went for Adlai.

Back in 1948, Tom Dewey thought he would grab the significant votes of the United Mine Workers because John L. Lewis, their chief, was supporting him. But the rank-and-file miners refused to follow Lewis and went for Truman.

So the so-called labor vote is most volatile. It could be significantly so in November if for no other reason than hesitancy to accept the "new Johnson."

WANTED NO PART OF JOHNSON ON 1960 TICKET

It is not easy for some to forget how Reuther, for example, fought Johnson's selection tooth and nail at the Los Angeles Democratic Convention in 1960.

The AFL–CIO sent a deputation of labor leaders—Reuther, Arthur Goldberg and Alex Rose of New York, among others—to wait on Kennedy and voice their heated objections. They wanted no part of Johnson in the Vice Presidential spot.

He would alienate the significant Negro vote in the North. Moreover, look at his voting record on labor legislation. During L.B.J.'s last 12 years in Congress he was credited by COPE with voting "right" only 45.9 percent of the time on labor issues.

It may be hard for Reuther and Meany to sell Johnson this year as labor's "hero," but obviously there must be grudging acceptance of him. His voting record on labor legislation might have been lousy, but Barry's has been certainly far lousier. So a choice had to be made. All admit that it would have been easier if the President was not bidding for management's vote at the same time.

Especially for Reuther and his automobile workers. They must be chagrined to be supporting Henry Ford's choice, and clearly the choice of Don Gordon, president of General Motors, and E. C. Quinn, vice president of Chrysler—two auto world moguls who kicked in $1,000 each at a Democratic fundraising dinner in Detroit.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board of independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind.*
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.* — 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.* — Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J.*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H.*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo.*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*
Eastland, James O., *Miss.* — 5101 Macomb St.
Edmondson, J. Howard, *Okla.*
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C.*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark.*
Goldwater, Barry, *Ariz.*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y.*
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C.*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C.*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Keating, Kenneth B., *N.Y.* — 2809 Dumbarton Ave.
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo.*
Long, Russell B., *La.*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak.*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*
Mechem, Edwin L., *N. Mex.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.* — 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa.* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis.*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I.*
Pearson, James B., *Kans.*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I.* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*
Salinger, Pierre, *Calif.*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala.* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C.*
Tower, John G., *Tex.*
Walters, Herbert S., *Tenn.*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del.*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex.*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Edmondson, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case, Hickenlooper, Curtis, and Keating.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McGovern, Edmondson, Walters, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Cooper, Boggs, and Mechem.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Humphrey, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Beall, Goldwater, and Case.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Bennett, Tower, Javits, Simpson, and Dominick.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, and Beall.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Hartke, McIntyre, Beall, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Smathers, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, and Mundt.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Pell, Ribicoff, Brewster, Salinger, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, Miller, and Pearson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Walters, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, Mechem, and Dominick.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy, Bayh, Burdick, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, Fong, and Scott.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy, Metcalf, Goldwater, Javits, Prouty, Tower, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Carlson, Fong, and Boggs.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Nelson, Salinger, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Miller, and Pearson.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED — TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.
First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.
Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.
Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.
Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.
Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.
Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.
Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.
Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.
Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.
Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Business and Financial Leaders Form Independent Committee To Support President Johnson and Senator Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant developments in the presidential campaign is the widespread support which President Johnson and his administration have won from the business and financial community in our country.

It is, therefore, not surprising that yesterday a group of prominent business and financial leaders from all parts of the country met in Washington to organize a National Independent Committee for President Johnson and Senator HUMPHREY. The purpose of the independent committee is to make possible a collective public endorsement of President Johnson and Senator HUMPHREY by outstanding people throughout the country who are well known for their accomplishments in nonpartisan and nonpolitical activities.

The organization meeting was attended by 26 of these nationally known executives; 19 others have agreed to serve as initial sponsors of the committee, but could not be in Washington yesterday. At this organization meeting, the group selected as cochairmen John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., Summit, N.J., and John L. Loeb, senior partner of Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., New York City. Chosen as vice chairmen were Carter L. Burgess, chairman, American Machine & Foundry Co., Pelham Manor, N.Y., Edgar F. Kaiser, chairman of Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Co., Oakland, Calif., and William A. Hewitt, president, Deere & Co., Moline, Ill.

The independent committee will attempt to acquaint the general public with the confidence that prominent national leaders in all walks of life have in President Johnson and will urge that he be given another 4 years of opportunity to serve all the people.

RESOLUTION

Mr. Speaker, a resolution relative to the purposes of the committee, approved at yesterday's meeting, reads as follows:

Resolved, That it is the basic purpose of this committee to express the collective confidence of its members in the national leadership of President Johnson and Senator HUMPHREY and to support their election in the conviction that their election will serve the best interest of the Nation; and it is further

Resolved, That this committee will seek to achieve this objective by enlisting the active support of American business and financial leaders of independent conviction and diverse political affiliation; and it is further

Resolved, That this committee will take appropriate measures to present to the American people President Johnson's and Senator HUMPHREY's outstanding records of long experience and proven performance. In this connection we will point out that the prosperious state of the Nation's economy is due in large measure to the confidence that has been engendered by President Johnson's efforts to reduce the burden of taxes, to hold down and decrease Federal expenditures and to give the free private enterprise system an opportunity to do its job. We will also point out that in foreign affairs President Johnson's firm but temperate policies have given the free peoples of the world a full measure of confidence in American leadership; and it is further

Resolved, That this committee will emphasize to the people of the United States the basic truth that continuity of policy and leadership in these crucial times is vital for the realization of America's destiny. The election of President Johnson and Senator HUMPHREY will provide a guarantee of this continuity. It is this committee's purpose to indicate that it is the conservative course in our national life to follow a man who is a leader and who is leading well.

SUPPORT FOR JOHNSON AND HUMPHREY BASED ON THEIR RECORDS

The committee will be concerned solely with the presidential and vice-presidential election, and will not take a position with regard to State or local candidates. It will be independent of other committees participating in the campaign, and will not endorse individual issues or planks in the party platforms. Thus, the committee's strong support for President Johnson and Senator HUMPHREY is based on their records as a whole and on a conviction that they will best serve the Nation in the years ahead.

Headquarters for the Independent Committee will be located in New York City. Since the committee will engage only in national activities, no State or local committees will be formed.

Business and financial leaders throughout the country will be encouraged to join the National Independent Committee, regardless of their political affiliation. Indeed, a large majority of the initial sponsors have voted for Republican presidential candidates in the past, but are convinced that President Johnson's outstanding record of achievement and his vast experience merit his election this year.

LIST OF ORIGINATING SPONSORS OF NATIONAL INDEPENDENT COMMITTEE FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND SENATOR HUMPHREY

(NOTE.—The persons listed below serve in their personal and individual capacity; the corporate and business affiliations listed are purely descriptive, carrying no implication of authorization or participation by the organization noted.)

Robert B. Anderson, New York, N.Y.
Ford Bell, chairman, Red Owl Stores, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.
T. Roland Berner, chairman, Curtiss-Wright Corp., New York, N.Y.
William R. Biggs, chairman, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.
Gordon Bilderback, Champaign, Ill.
Eugene R. Black, New York, N.Y.
Joseph L. Block, chairman, Inland Steel Co., Chicago, Ill.
Carter L. Burgess, chairman, American Machine & Foundry Co., New York, N.Y.
Paul C. Cabot, chairman, State Street Investment Corp., Boston, Mass.
Thomas D. Cabot, chairman, Cabot Corp., Boston, Mass.
Peter Colefax, chairman, American Potash & Chemical Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.
John T. Connor, president, Merck & Co., Rahway, N.J.
Donald C. Cook, president, American Electric Power Co., New York, N.Y.
Edgar M. Cullman, president, General Cigar Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.
Lewis W. Douglas, Sonoita, Ariz.
Marriner S. Eccles, chairman, Utah Construction & Mining Co., Salt Lake City, Utah.
Ray R. Eppert, president, Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich.
Samuel M. Fleming, president, Third National Bank of Nashville, Nashville, Tenn.
Marion B. Folsom, director, Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N.Y.
Henry Ford II, chairman, Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
William T. Gossett, Bloomfield Hills, Mich.
Walter A. Haas, Jr., president, Levi Strauss & Co., San Francisco, Calif.
Ben W. Heineman, chairman, Chicago & Northwestern Ry. Co., Chicago, Ill.
Harry B. Henshel, president, Bulova Watch Co., New York, N.Y.
William A. Hewitt, president, Deere & Co., Moline, Ill.
Edgar F. Kaiser, chairman, Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., Oakland, Calif.
George Killion, president, American President Lines, Ltd., San Francisco, Calif.
Thomas S. Lamont, New York, N.Y.
Mills B. Lane, Jr., president, Citizens & Southern National Bank, Atlanta, Ga.
Ralph Lazarus, president, Federated Department Stores, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Brian P. Leeb, New York, N.Y.
Robert Lehman, senior partner, Lehman Bros., New York, N.Y.
John L. Loeb, senior partner, Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., New York, N.Y.
Augustus C. Long, chairman, Texaco, Inc., New York, N.Y.
John Mecom, Houston, Tex.
Andre Meyer, senior partner, Lazard Freres & Co., New York, N.Y.
Arjay R. Miller, president, Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
Norton Simon, president, Hunt Foods & Industries, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.
William C. Stolk, chairman, American Can Co., New York, N.Y.
H. Gardiner Symonds, chairman, Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Houston, Tex.
S. Mark Taper, chairman, First Charter Financial Corp., Beverly Hills, Calif.
Charles B. Thornton, chairman, Litton Industries, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.
Sidney J. Weinberg, senior partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co., New York, N.Y.
Charles A. Wellman, president, First Charter Financial Corp., Beverly Hills, Calif.
Frederic B. Whitman, president, Western Pacific Railroad Co., San Francisco, Calif.

The Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. Establishes Creative Teaching Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., of St. Paul, Minn., whose slogan is "Research Is the Key to Progress," has again embarked on a program which establishes a creative teaching library designed to serve as a resource and research center on the use of visual aids in the classroom. The details are highlighted in the following several paragraphs:

Source of the library material, the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. said, will be materials gathered in a massive program to stimulate creative effort among teachers throughout the country. Highlight of this 2-year program is a creative teaching contest this fall which is expected to bring upward of 200,000 entries from throughout the country.

B. Y. Auger, manager, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. visual products, said the new library will be open to all teachers, school administrators and education students. It will contain the definitive works of creative teachers and administrators on the subject of visual teaching techniques.

A nucleus of the library is being built now, Auger said on proposals which won awards for 500 schools across the country in the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.'s 1963–64 assistance grant to education program, plus the 500 semifinalists.

These award-winning proposals consist of illustrated suggestions and already inuse techniques for use of classroom visual aids.

Added to the library early in 1965 will be the winning entries in the company's current "Creative Teaching Competition—Aventura en Mexico."

Auger said the creation of the research library is the latest step in the company's continuing program to give recognition and aid to creative teaching.

"Perhaps the single most important factor in education is the individual teacher's resourcefulness in effectively imparting to her students the vast amount of knowledge which must be transmitted," he said.

"The source of the materials which comprise our library contain some of the finest thinking among educators and teachers in the country.

"In bringing together this body of knowledge of creative teaching through visual techniques and making it accessible to all educators, we hope to serve our Nation's schools effectively," he said.

For ease of use, the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. is permanently cataloging the reference material. The library will be open to educators by appointment with visual products, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., 2501 Hudson Road, St. Paul.

Creation of the library marks the firm's third major effort to aid creative teaching within little more than a year.

Announcement of its $1.5 million assistance grant to education last year brought forth 15,000 proposals from schools vying for the individual grants of $3,000 worth of visual aids and equipment. The proposals represented the combined efforts of individual school faculties on the primary, secondary, and college levels, private, public, and parochial.

Currently underway is the company's "Creative Teaching Competition—Aventura in Mexico" which will award to teachers submitting the top 6 representations summer courses at the University of the Americas in Mexico City and to the runnerup 12 teachers all-expense paid 2-week educational tours of Mexico.

CTC, designed to stimulate creative teachers and promote creative teaching techniques, requires entrants to submit a series of visuals for overhead projectors which demonstrate a teaching idea or concept. These may be entire teaching units or a portion of a teaching unit. Entries will be accompanied by a brief description of how the visuals are used.

ZIP's Slip Showing—170-Mile Trip for 5-Mile Mail Delivery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, the days of 3-cent letters and penny postcards are gone forever and the post office of today is, in every sense of the word, caught up in the whirlwind of big government, which prefers to identify us by number only. Rate increases have become commonplace but, somehow or other, service has not kept pace. Although the present administration has pointed with pride to the great improvements it has made in getting mail to patrons in record time, postal patron complaints, to put it mildly, do not attest to this boast. The following article, which appeared in the Cobleskill (N.Y.) Times-Journal recently, offers ample proof that the ivory tower efficiency experts who devise such monstrosities might be well advised to remember the Department's famous bad-weather pledge before they make their next expensive change for change's sake.

The story is as follows:

ZIP Code Means Some Delay in Area Mail.

Mail service, under the new ZIP code system, is undergoing some changes in this area, effective September 12.

Mail going from Cobleskill to Hyndsville, Dorloo and Seward, will, after that date, be sent to Schenectady, then to Utica, then to Canajoharie where Mr. McDuffy will bring it to Sharon Springs and over to these three towns.

This will mean that mail service will be somewhat slower, perhaps a day later than is now in effect, when mail is sent directly from Cobleskill to Hyndsville, Dorloo or Seward twice a day.

Mrs. Evelyn Wilcox who has had the contract for this route, will no longer be carrying the mail. Mr. McDuffy, who carries the mail from Canajoharie to Sharon Springs, will extend his route to cover as far as Hyndsville.

This change is brought about by order of U.S. Post Office officials under the new ZIP code system. Cobleskill is under the Schenectady ZIP code number and Hyndsville, Dorloo and Seward are under the Utica number.

Mail now will have to travel approximately 170 miles, to go from Cobleskill to Hyndsville, a distance of 5 miles.

To offset this expected delay of the mails to these areas, the Times-Journal staff will personally deliver all issues of the newspaper each Wednesday to each of the post offices in Hyndsville, Dorloo, and Seward, so that all our readers receive their paper at the same time as previously.

Farley Sees Landslide Victory for Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein an article from the Columbus Dispatch, concerning an interview the chief of their Washington bureau, Carl DeBloom, had with the Honorable James A. Farley, of New York, during the recent National Democratic Convention:

Farley Sees Landslide Victory for Johnson, but "Must Run Scared"

(By Carl DeBloom)

Atlantic City.—The man whose reputation for predicting political races puts the pollsters to shame, James A. Farley, still believes President Johnson will have a landslide victory in November.

The former Postmaster General under the late President Roosevelt says he isn't kidding himself about the rough spots that exist for Democrats.

But he believes that Democrats will put an organization together that will solve these problems. And it will be under the "greatest political leader" this country has ever had—President Johnson.

Farley warns that Democrats cannot run on the theory that they will win but "must run scared."

Last February Farley predicted in an interview with the Dispatch in his Madison Avenue office in New York that Johnson would have the same kind of victory Roosevelt had in 1932. Roosevelt carried all but six States.

Here as a New York delegate at the Democratic nominating convention, Farley still believes this will hold true. Actually he now feels that Johnson may do even better and carry Pennsylvania which went in the GOP column in 1932.

Farley sees the possibility of Johnson even carrying the Republican strongholds of Maine and Vermont. He says the voters in those States "fear" Senator Barry Goldwater.

The former national Democratic chairman doesn't see the South going solidly for Goldwater. He points out that "deep down" the southern Democrats want to vote for a southerner for president and will support Johnson.

Such States as Alabama and Mississippi will "want to get on the bandwagon" when they realize that Johnson is a winning candidate, he reasons.

The civil rights issue—barring unforeseen developments—will not be as serious as many believe, Farley says. He feels it is at its peak now and will decline as an issue.

So far as the so-called white backlash, Farley believes that Goldwater will suffer from the reverse of this from Republicans who want strong civil rights laws.

Also hurting Goldwater, according to Farley, will be the fact that a number of Republican leaders such as General Eisenhower, and Governors Nelson Rockefeller

and William Scranton will not give wholehearted support.

GOLDWATER is in so much trouble in Farley's opinion that he questions whether the Senator can carry his own State of Arizona. When it comes to Farley's State of New York, Democrats will have a tremendous victory, Farley says.

The biggest thing going for Johnson, in Farley's estimation, is the economy. He thinks it is the greatest the country has ever experienced and is convinced that big business knows that Johnson is not to be feared.

Big business feels that Johnson is competent and the country rarely changes Presidents when the economy is good, he points out.

Johnson did a great deal to convince big business of his ability with the smooth way he handled the transition of administrations following the assassination, Farley says.

Johnson's firm stand in South Vietnam has aided him, according to Farley.

The party's elder statesman has been in close touch with Johnson and will aid in any way he can, but says he will not take on an assignment "that will tie me to a desk." Many credit Farley with electing Roosevelt President and he is still recognized at the age of 75 as one of the shrewdest political minds in the country.

Farley says Johnson will take a personal charge of his campaign and will be ready to move immediately after the convention here. Farley advises that some political heads will have to be knocked together to smooth out some rough spots and predicts this will be done.

A byproduct of the landslide victory he sees for Johnson will be an increase in the number of Democrats in Congress as candidates ride in on the President's coattails, Farley predicts.

Hon. Clair Engle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege and pleasure of serving in the House for a number of years with the late Senator Clair Engle and shall forever miss his friendship and leadership. I served on a number of conference and committees with the late Senator Engle while he was serving as a Member of the House of Representatives and he was a credit to the State of California and the United States. He could always readily see both sides of every problem confronting the Congress and the Nation. I do not know any Member of Congress that could not admire the late Senator Engle.

It is rather difficult to understand why he would be taken away from us at a time when he was ready to render wonderful service to his fellowman and to his Government. It is easier to understand why a person in their old age is taken away from us even though it seems impossible that his place in life could be filled by another person; however, when a young man such as the late Senator Engle is taken away from us in the prime of his life it makes us think.

Mrs. McMillan joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to the late Senator Engle's wonderful wife. Mrs. Engle has had a heavy load to carry for a number of years and our hearts go out to her during her hours of bereavement.

Congressman William S. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania, and the National Humanities Foundation: Two Editorials From the Goshen, Ind., News and the Criterion, of Indianapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the text of two editorials concerning the leadership which is being given by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, toward the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation.

The first editorial was published in the Goshen, Ind., News, a newspaper in my own congressional district, while the second was published in the August 21, 1964, issue of the Criterion, the publication of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Indianapolis.

The editorials follow:

[From the Goshen (Ind.) News]

HUMANITIES—WORLD'S BEST HOPE

In 1950 Congress created the National Science Foundation to spur the progress of science in this country by supporting research, offering fellowships, improving teaching and school facilities, and in general aiding scholars.

Largely because of the National Science Foundation, high school teaching of science has been revolutionized and U.S. scientific resources are at high strength.

Much has happened in that decade and a half. Always vital to the Nation's defense, with the appearance of Russia's Sputnik I in our skies in 1957, science became, to the popular mind, the magic means whereby the United States would regain the prestige so abruptly snatched from under our noses.

Most of the billions since then have gone to applied technology—rocketry—which may be science to the layman, but is not what the scientist means by the word.

But millions of dollars have gone to basic research, to modernize equipment and facilities, to strengthen the broad base of American science.

In the rush to support science, something called the humanities—the study of history, art, literature, philosophy—got swept aside. A few voices, among them those of scientists, protested aginst this.

In 1963, a Commission on the Humanities was formed by the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Scholars in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

Some weeks ago it issued a 222-page report urging the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, to do for the humanities what the National Science Foundation has done for science with its infusion of money, ideas, and talent.

"Even the most gifted individual," stated the commission, "whether poet or physicist, will not realize his full potential or make his fullest contribution to his times unless his imagination has been kindled by the aspirations and accomplishments of those who have gone before him.

"All men require that a vision be held before them, an ideal toward which they may strive. This vision includes such enduring values as justice, freedom, virtue, beauty, and truth.

"Democracy demands wisdom of the average man * * *. To know the best that has been taught and said in former times can make us wiser than we otherwise might be, and in this respect the humanities are not merely ours, but the world's best hope."

A few days ago, a bill to create a National Humanities Foundation was dropped in the congressional hopper. It is unlikely that much action will be taken on it in these waning days of the 88th Congress. It is certainly not something that should be rushed through in the hectic last hours before adjournment.

The humanities bill is now a matter of record. It should be reintroduced early in the 89th Congress next year to allow it the full and complete hearing it deserves.

[From the Criterion, Aug. 24, 1964]

EGGHEAD BILL

In the liveliest political campaign of the century, a bill introduced this week by Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, is unlikely to cause any hipshooting or 5-gallon-hat tossing.

It is a quiet, nonpartisan proposal with none of the visceral appeal that sets the bands to marching and the press agents to shaping new epithets.

Nonetheless, it is attuned to mankind's noblest visions, and ought to get passed into law.

It concerns itself, simply, with the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation. Its aim is to promote a broad national policy in support of the humanities and the arts. We already have seen how a similar policy swiftly spurred lagging areas of science to fabulous triumphs.

"Well," says a genial practical politician, reading the Moorhead proposal. "Them eggheads what arose in 1952 didn't lose their yolks after all. But, pray tell, what are the humanities? What is this all about anyway?"

Well—as Congressman MOORHEAD sees it—the definition should be broad. It should cover study in depth of literature, languages, religion, philosophy, music, art, law, theories of science, the performing and lively arts.

In fact, the definition should not be tied down concisely in the manner of the specifications for a Ranger spacecraft.

MOORHEAD put it plainly enough when he said the subject is man himself—"that which is most human." Pick up any newspaper any day for confirmation of Arnold Toynbee's observation, quoted by MOORHEAD, that "man is astonishingly good at dealing with the physical world, but he is just as astonishingly bad at dealing with human nature."

To which we add that man tends to be distressingly derelict in his most vital study, God.

"Well," says the practical politician, "but where's the bread and butter in a bill like this?"

Well, there is no bread and butter, in precinct lexicon.

But, then, where is the bread and butter in a sunrise, or a baby's smile, or a bluebird on the wing, or the faith in Eternal Good?

The ultimate purpose of Congressman MOORHEAD's bill is to help create a climate

where men will want more than the very real bread-and-butter needs of life, will know how to fulfill them, and thus will be able to reject materialistic trivia in favor of the more rewarding riches waiting to be mined within their own brains and hearts.

An egghead bill. Yes, it is that, all right.

It stems from a report issued by a commission under the auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

You cannot get much more egghead than that, and MOORHEAD himself is an Andover-Yale-Harvard egghead ably representing an ethnic medley in the Pittsburgh area. Among the distinguished eggheads who drafted the report were Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame; Dr. Herman B. Wells, chancellor of Indiana University, and Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman of International Business Machines.

IBM, by the way, is strong in the field of automated technology. Chairman Watson, however, shares our concern that man remain the boss of his wonderful scientific advance, not become its slave.

Any that's what Congressman MOORHEAD'S bill is all about. It is not going to cost taxpayers a bundle of money; in fact, it foresees support from private grants and endowments. That makes it all the less interesting to some "practical" politicians. No gravy.

But we have a hunch this modest bill may develop more political appeal than currently may be imagined in some quarters.

Mankind, though largely inarticulate, has a remarkably sure sense of balance. It seems right now that scientific progress desperately needs a counterweight of attention to spiritual and cultural pursuits.

And down deep inside almost everybody is the poet's grinding hunger for hyacinths to feed the soul. That, too, is what the Humanities Foundation bill is all about.

Poor Quality the Trademark of Communist Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, from time to time the American citizen—who is often unaware that he is sometimes purchasing imported Communist goods when he goes shopping—gets an insight into the actual situation in the so-called workers' paradise, the Soviet Union, and its puppet satellite states.

People in the free world have been led to believe—by Communist propaganda, and the echoing hurrahs of non-Communist dupes—that everything is going great in the noble Socialist system headed by Nikita Khrushchev. The Communist brush has painted a glowing canvas of progress to perfection in the promised land that is already here. Unfortunately, too many Americans have fallen for this line, including some hard-headed businessmen who want to trade with the Communist countries.

Some Communist-made products have been brought into the United States and in many cases have been bought by Americans who did not know they were purchasing items made under conditions approaching if not actually slave labor.

There has come to my attention a recent story in the Baltimore Sun of July 26, 1964, concerning the shoddy caliber of Communist production in the Soviet Union that provides one of those too rare looks at the true situation in the camp of communism. I urge that Americans take not of this situation, and I hope more of our businessmen who are or would like to do business with the Communists turn their attentions elsewhere in order that they might import items of true quality. Not only would our citizens be provided with opportunity to purchase fine products, but they also would be in less danger of unwittingly putting their hard-earned dollars at the disposal of the Communists who use them in their relentless efforts to destroy our freedoms. The item follows:

SHODDY GOODS ANGER SOVIET—BETTER WORK BY FACTORIES SOUGHT AT HIGH LEVELS

(By Adam Clymer)

Moscow, July 25.—Soviet economic authorities are worried about the poor quality of manufactured goods here and are seeking a way to force factories to do a better job of production.

The Government newspaper, Isvestia, reported tonight that the Budget Commissions of both houses of the Supreme Soviet met today and paid "great attention to elimination of deliveries of spoiled equipment and agricultural materials."

Similar concern was voiced for an increase in variety and quality of consumer goods.

QUALITY STRESSED

Pravada reported this morning on yesterday's meeting of the Presidium of the Council of Ministers under the chairmanship of Premier Khrushchev and cited the "raising of the quality of industrial output" as a main task for the economic plan for 1966 to 1970.

Earlier this week, while boasting of an overfulfillment of the economic plan for the first 6 months, the Central Statistical Administration reported in Izvestia:

"The population requirements for certain commodities are met far from adequately. This refers in particular, to many items of knitwear, refrigerators, and washing machines.

"Many industrial enterprises and economic councils did not pay due attention to improving the quality and expanding the assortment of a number of consumer goods, clothes, footwear, and fabrics in particular.

"The grading organizations often do not use their right to turn down the unmarketable goods and, in a number of cases, take insufficient stock of the market demands in distributing the commodity resources with the result that certain goods remain unsold."

Premier Khrushchev recently laid the blame largely on the factories. In a speech to the Supreme Soviet, he said "a firm system has to be introduced under which the customer could make a claim against the bad quality of the purchased commodity."

Placing the stock of unsalable goods at 2,500 million rubles ($2,778 million) worth, Khrushchev said "the factory which produced the commodities, rather than the trading establishment, should be held responsible for the quality of the goods."

He called on Gosplan, the state planning committee, to work out some system to make the factories more responsive to the stores' needs.

ACCEPTANCE SYSTEM SCORED

One reason trade organizations take shoddy goods was outlined earlier this month by V. Tyukov, Gosplan's section chief for trade turnover.

Writing in Pravda, Tyukov called for stronger financial levers to control production.

He blamed the current acceptance system for poor quality, saying that trade organizations had only 3 days to reject or pay for goods supplied from factories. Moreover, the 3-day period begins from the time the bill gets to the bank, which may be well before the goods get to the trading group.

"It turns out that the trade organization is buying a cat in a bag," he said. "It is compelled to pay bills without knowing the quality and assortment of goods," since such details are not indicated on bills.

CHANGES SUGGESTED

"Such a system of payment, which protects only the interest of the supplier, paves the way for penetration into the stores by goods of bad quality or goods which are not in demand," he concluded.

Some tinkering with the acceptance system and a firmer basis of direct orders from trade organizations as the basis of factory production were suggested in the series of comments on quality and unsold goods.

Supreme Court Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, thoughtful citizens, from both rural and metropolitan sections, appear to be more and more concerned about the effect of the series of Supreme Court decisions, including the decision in the Ohio case, on apportionment of Senate legislatures, handed down on June 15, 1964.

Ohioans are particularly concerned since the Ohio constitutional provision was adopted in a popular election by a vote of more than 29 to 1.

Furthermore, Ohio's constitution has a built-in provision for the citizens' reconsideration of the constitution every 20 years.

Pursuant to the terms of Ohio's constitution, any citizen is authorized to initiate a proposed amendment to Ohio's constitution, and, upon securing the requisite number of signatures to the initiative petition, the proposal comes on for a vote at the next general election. Such provision is workable, too, as Ohio has voted on at least three amendments proposed in such manner within the last 20 years. Two constructive, forward-looking amendments, so proposed, were adopted by overwhelming vote, and one such proposed amendment was overwhelmingly defeated. Proof enough, indeed, that Ohio's constitution is good enough to meet the needs of our changing times and the desires of an intelligent and articulate people.

Finally, any member of the Ohio Senate or the Ohio House, at any time that the legislature is in regular session, may propose amendments to the constitution, and if agreed to by three-fifths of the members elected to each house, the proposed amendment or amendments will be submitted to the voters of Ohio for decision at the next general election. A

majority vote of those voting on the proposal or proposals, submitted to the electorate, either adopts or rejects them, as the case may be. How better can responsible representative government be had and maintained? I dissent from the opinion that a catchy slogan is an adequate substitute for the Ohio plan.

Buckeye Farm News, official magazine of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, in its August 1964 issue, carried a short, understandable editorial on the subject. I recommend its careful reading to both rural and urban residents in each of the 50 States.

The editorial follows:

SUPREME COURT WRONG

(By C. Maurice Wieting)

When the Constitution of the United States was adopted it wisely made provision for representation both on a basis of population and of geography. Most States, including Ohio, followed this precedent.

We believe that the Supreme Court was wrong in its recent ruling that population alone should be the future method of determining political representation. It is for this reason that we are urging Congress to adopt the McCulloch amendment which would allow each State to make its own decision.

There are 88 counties in Ohio and we contend that each of them should have at least one representative in the general assembly as provided under the Hanna amendment. Problems in each county differ from those in other areas, and it is wise that each have a voice in State government.

The Question Remains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is now evident that the social security amendments with the politically motivated socialized medicine package involved remain one of the major stumbling blocks facing this session of Congress.

The Lemonter, a community newspaper serving the village and township of Lemont, Ill., concisely raises a basic question concerning the social security tax structure in its issue of August 27. The editorial follows:

THE QUESTION REMAINS

The intimately related tax and spending problems grow more clouded.

A short time ago the powerful House Ways and Means Committee voted to increase social security payments and to increase social security taxes by 5 percent to meet the bill. There are excellent arguments in favor of this move in view of the slow but steady rises in living costs that have characterized the "creeping inflation" of recent years. But, the pros and cons of that aside, this increased tax will go a long way toward offsetting the reduction in income taxes that went into effect this year.

We are facing an ancient truism—you can't have your cake and eat it too. And the Government, despite the occasional lipservice that is paid to the cause of economy, continues to operate on a "spend more, owe more" basis. The disastrous end result of this kind of policy has been seen the world around in the post-World War I era. So, an old and increasingly important question remains to be answered: Will we learn from the tragic experience of others before our own economic sins catch up with us at home?

The spenders in Congress have just voted a heavy increase in their salaries although they have failed miserably to show any ability to balance national expense with national income.

Republican and Democratic Platforms Compared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Oakland Tribune, Oakland, Calif., August 28, 1964, contained a very interesting column by Richard S. Wheeler comparing the Republican and Democratic platforms of 1964. I commend this column to the Members of the House for serious consideration.

The column is as follows:

PLATFORM MARRED BY LACK OF FAITH

(By Richard S. Wheeler)

The two most striking characteristics of the Democratic Party's domestic platform are its vagueness and its pessimism.

Some of the language is so obscure that it looks as if the Democrats are deliberately obfuscating the meaning. They assert, for example, that "the matter of the length of work periods should be given continuing consideration."

To most of the American public, that assertion means exactly nothing. But to Walter Reuther and his coterie, who have been pushing for longer work breaks in order to create, in effect, a 7-hour day, the plank is loaded with significance. The vagueness of the language permits the Democrats to give Reuther what he wants without alarming the public, which has doubts about the economic virtue of decreasing the length of working days.

JUST WHAT STANDARDS?

The platform asserts that "the unemployment insurance program must be basically revised to meet the standards the Nation's experience dictates." That's all that is said on the subject, and we, the voters, must decide whether the party means to make it easier or tougher for people out of work to live on the public purse, and whether the dole is going to be raised or lowered, lengthened or shortened, through higher or lower taxes on employers.

Even more obscure is the party's assertion that it will "study new low-cost methods and techniques of food distribution for the benefit of our housewives to better feed their families." Is this a proposal to set up Government food distribution centers to eliminate the profit margins of private grocers? It is difficult to say.

Political platforms are necessarily vague, in order to please the most, and antagonize the fewest voters. But the 1964 Democratic platform is more vague than usual. In fact, it is almost impossible to see where the party intends to take the Nation the next 4 years, or how it intends to implement its proposals and still cut back on taxes and spending.

LACK OF FAITH

One thing the vagueness doesn't obscure, however, is the platform's generally pessimistic view of the capacities of the American people. It is one thing to promise governmental support only to those who need it, and quite another thing to proffer handouts, subsidies, and immunities to everybody in sight, regardless of their capacity to help themselves. To help only those in need is charitable, but to offer assistance to those who don't need it is a subtle corruption of the independence and initiative of the American people.

If there is one distinguishing characteristic of the Democratic platform, it is its failure to affirm that the overwhelming majority of Americans are strong and independent; capable of caring for themselves, making wise decisions in the marketplace, and governing their business ethics. One would think from perusing the platform that just the opposite is the case: that Americans are helpless, bumbling wretches who are incapable of survival or enjoyment of life without the crutches, props, and subsidies of a maternal government.

MOTHER-HEN GOVERNMENT

The Democratic platform is "momism" personified. Mother-hen government is going to subsidize artists; protect helpless little consumers from big, bad businessmen; educate everyone for free; provide a "balanced outdoor recreation program"; figure out ways for the Armed Forces to make use of unemployable young men, and generally protect everyone from this mean, old world.

There is nothing in this platform for men who ask only the freedom to stand on their own two feet and meet life squarely. There is nothing there for those who would prefer to pay low taxes and live independently instead of paying high taxes and depending on assorted "benefactions" in return.

The platform sounds like a document out of the great depression instead of a program for an affluent society. It is out of touch not only with the economic and social reality of America in the 1960's, but also the spirit and determination of the American people.

By contrast, the Republican platform affirms time and time again its faith in the capacity of individual Americans to work out their destiny without Federal crutches and controls. Instead of saying, in effect, "You are children and we shall take care of you," it says, "You are adults and we honor you." Thus, plank after plank promises to minimize control, subsidies, and taxes to the lowest possible level consistent with the necessities of compassion and the public weal. Some would say that's not good politics, but I would say that it's extremely good American philosophy.

Tribute to Mrs. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, one of the moving addresses at the Democratic National Convention was made by Hon. Adlai Stevenson in memory of Eleanor Roosevelt. His eloquence rose to the subject and he stirred all who heard him with his tribute to this, one of the greatest ladies and one of the greatest people of our times. I offer this magnificent address for the RECORD and comment it to my colleagues and to my fellow countrymen:

TRIBUTE TO MRS. ROOSEVELT

(Address by Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, at the Democratic National Convention, Atlantic City, N.J., August 27, 1964)

Thank you, my dear friends, for your welcome—and for all your loyalty and comfort to me in years past when our party's fortunes were not as bright as they are tonight.

For what I have done and sought to do for our country and our party, I have been repaid a thousandfold by the kindness of my fellow citizens—and by none more than you, the leaders of the Democratic Party.

I have been proud to march with you in seven presidential campaigns, and to lead two of them. But I have never been prouder than I am tonight—to follow two such brilliant and bold leaders, and old and dear friends, as Lyndon Johnson and HUBERT HUMPHREY. They will, I predict, leave the future of our country and our world in their debt.

But it is of another noble American that I am commissioned to speak to you tonight. She has passed beyond these voices—but our memory and her meaning have not—Eleanor Roosevelt.

She was a lady—a lady for all seasons. And, like her husband, she left "a name to shine on the entablatures of truth—forever."

There is, I believe, a legend in the Talmud which tells us that in any period of man's history the heavens themselves are held in place by the virtue, love, and shining integrity of 12 just men. They are completely unaware of this function. They go about their daily work, their humble chores—doctors, teachers, workers, farmers (never, alas, lawyers, so I understand), just ordinary devoted citizens—and meanwhile the rooftree of creation is supported by them alone.

There are times when nations or movements or great political parties are similarly sustained in their purposes and being by the pervasive, unconscious influence of a few great men and women. Can we doubt that Eleanor Roosevelt had in some measure the keeping of the party's conscience in her special care? That her standards and integrity steadied our own? That her judgment persuaded the doubters and "too-soon despairers"? That her will stiffened the waverers and encouraged the strong?

I do not suggest some unworldly saint dwelling in remote regions of unsullied idealism. On the contrary, as we all know, Eleanor Roosevelt was a bonny fighter, at her best down in the arena, face to face with opponents and ideas she disapproved. Like that other grand old veteran of so many Democratic wars—Herbert Lehman—in ripe old age she took on tasks that might have daunted people half her age. Whether it was Communist bosses in the United Nations or shoddy politicians, whether it was exploiters of the poor or traducers of the faith of freedom—she sailed in, tall, courteous, good tempered, implacable, and thwacked them with the dispassionate energy of a good mother chastizing a bad boy.

She did not carry our conscience by remote control. It was precisely her involvement that gave her such tremendous influence. Long before the civil rights issue moved to the forefront of the Nation's consciousness, she was there, quietly reminding us of the inequalities practiced in our land.

Throughout the depression, her patient journeys brought to the President and dramatized for the Nation the misery and neglect of millions.

During the gray days of national peril she heartened the wounded and the weary.

And during the affluent fifties, when misery ran for cover before the national complacency, she never ceased to remind us of the slums, disease, and deprivation which still make up the dark face of this shining American planet.

And again when we emerged from the war, blinking and surprised, to the role of world leadership, there she was at the center of the effort, reminding her countrymen of their duties as citizens in the greater society of man.

She thought of herself as an "ugly duckling," but she walked in beauty in the ghettos of the world bringing with her the reminder of her beloved St. Francis, "It is in the giving that we receive." And wherever she walked beauty was forever there.

There are always in any society, as there are in ours at this moment, plenty of men and women who would like—despite Abraham Lincoln's warning to "escape history," to evade "the fiery trial," to turn back the clock. Eleanor Roosevelt never would and never did. She trained herself from the beginning of her life to face the realities, however unwelcome they might be, and face them she did, not only in the world around her but in her own family, in her own life. Few human beings are called upon to make decisions as difficult as some of hers. Fewer still—fewer women in any case—have ever been subjected to personal abuse as malicious and persistent. But never did she hide, run, or wince, or lower her head. Falsity withered in her presence. Hypocrisy left the room.

And never did she fail to act. If anything equaled the courage of her confrontation with the facts it was the candor and warmth of her response. She saw the state of our world as well as the most cynical, the most despairing, but she never despaired, she was never cynical, she never gave up. She believed in the human heart because she knew her own, and she proved by love what all the despair of a despairing time will never disprove—that hope is more powerful than fear.

She has left us—our counselor, our friend, our conscience. But there can be no doubt where she would be directing our great party today.

She would bid us add to the equality we guarantee, the extra dimension of opportunity without which even rights can seem so much emptiness.

She would tell us to look at our great cities and ask whether, in the midst of overwhelming affluence, we can afford such misery, such squalor, such hopelessness.

She would tell us to labor on in the vineyards of the world, to succor the needy, to underpin the rule of law, to check aggression, and, with remorseless purpose, to seek peace among the nations.

She would ask us to engage ourselves profoundly in the war on poverty at home and abroad.

She would urge us to build the great society not only for America, but for all God's children.

And she would bid us do all this not from party spirit or partisan prejudice or anger or bitterness or fear or contempt. She would ask only for the positive emotions—love of one's unfortunate neighbor since "there but for the grace of God go I"—love of our party as a mighty engine of social betterment, love for a world community threatened by the same annihilation—and, above all, love for America, which our Founding Fathers first dedicated to the great propositions of freedom, equality, and happiness, and which can never fulfill itself until these magnificent promises can be turned into even more magnificent facts.

This is the spirit in which she would have us go out to join the everlasting battle for something better.

This is her lasting legacy to humankind—and to the party she loved and worked for all her life.

Decision on Apportionment Belongs to the People, Not Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, 1964, there appeared in the Sidney Daily News, an article discussing the decision on apportionment. It is an informative and thoughtful discussion pinpointing many of the points that have been raised by the Honorable WILLIAM MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, who has spearheaded the drive in the House of Representatives to prohibit the complete emasculation of the Constitution and States rights by the present U.S. Supreme Court.

I include this thoughtful discussion in my remarks and urge my colleagues to read it.

The article follows:

DECISION ON APPORTIONMENT BELONGS TO THE PEOPLE, NOT SUPREME COURT

(By William W. Milligan, Shelby County State representative)

The good citizens of our county, of the State of Ohio, and of the United States are face to face with a historic decision—we cannot avoid it. The subject is the basic structure of our State governments and the role of the States in this country.

It is futile to expect the Supreme Court to solve this problem for us by arcane incantations over the equal-protection clause.

The Supreme Court has almost forcibly brought the subject to our attention. For this we may be grateful since the matter demands examination and decision, but Justice Warren and his activist colleagues cannot have the final word. The question is too basic for that.

Constitutional interpreting is the duty of the Court. Constitution-making belongs to the whole people.

The Court may say that this is mere construal of 14th amendment language. Justice Harlan in his brilliant dissent recognized the decision for what it is—an attempt to amend the Constitution itself.

Perhaps the Constitution should be amended. Whether and to what extent it should be is the question now before us all.

We can thank the Congress for the present effort to secure a public examination of the question. The need is for time to consider and answer the ancient question—"Men and brethren what shall we do?" The necessity for a pause is concurred in by such diverse authorities as Ohio House Speaker Cloud, U.S. Representatives McCulloch, Taft, and Smith, Senators Dirksen and Lausche, Life magazine, and Walter Lippmann. The Republican platform endorses further consideration. The Democratic platform at President Johnson's request, does not oppose it.

In the great debate now shaping up, the liberals have the simple position. One man's vote should be equal to another's. How could anyone dispute so elementary and self-evident a principle as that?

The conservative side has a more complex, but perhaps not less compelling argument.

First, to concede the Supreme Court's power to dictate intimate details of State government structure would be a massive departure from the Federal principle toward a unitary system. Do we really want this?

or do we prefer a reasonable maintenance of local power and decision in the face of a growing centralization.

Secondly, within the States themselves, do we really want the majority, on a moment's notice, to be able to override important minority interests and wishes.

The Founding Fathers did not rely on pure majoritarianism. Checks, balances, and divisions of power—familiar to every school boy—were designed to refine the popular will—even though the franchise at that time was generally restricted to male, white landowners.

Assuming that we retain certain local authority in the matter—within the State of Ohio do we wish to abandon historic representation of counties in favor of strict per capita representation? Is the balancing of various interests a desirable governmental principle? And if balancing is good, is the present system the right way to accomplish this?

My personal view is that the Supreme Court was justified in going as far as it did in Baker against Carr—the Tennessee reapportionment case. It was suggested there that a State must provide an effective means whereby the people of the State may amend their State constitution if they wish to do so.

Which Loyalty Comes First?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's television audiences and newspaper readers were recently treated to the spectacle of a demand for loyalty to the Democratic Party's national ticket on the part of delegates to the proceedings in Atlantic City.

The delegates were told, in effect, that they must promise to support whomever was nominated or be ejected from the hall, regardless of the wishes of the voters who had sent them there. It appears that many of those supporting imposing loyalty oaths at the convention have been in the forefront in the hue and cry against loyalty oaths in connection with public service and in the field of education.

This inconsistency was the subject of a perceptive editorial in the August 28 issue of the Alhambra (Calif.) Post-Advocate, under the title of "It's Way You Look at It." Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

LOYALTY OATHS: IT'S WAY YOU LOOK AT IT

What is loyalty?

The Democratic Convention has projected the issue into the national spotlight. Is loyalty to a political party above conscience? Is it above constitutional provisions of political liberty?

Apparently it all depends on whose ideological ox is being gored. The naked politics of cynical men is not pretty to see.

At the convention, party leaders long identified with the radical Americans for Democratic Action demanded loyalty oaths of legally elected delegates and at the same time those who had tried to brand conservatives as extremists were themselves peddling fright to scare voters.

The majority of the members of two southern delegations were denied their seats because of their refusal to sign loyalty pledges required in a compromise worked out under the leadership of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Senator HUMPHREY is one of the stanchest members of the ADA, which has been in the forefront of the fight against loyalty oaths to the Constitution of the United States for public employees and professors and teachers in charge of forming the minds and characters of America's youth.

The oaths were derided as degrading and violations of constitutional rights.

At the Democrat Convention it was insisted that the delegates from Alabama and Mississippi swear on their honor to support the presidential and vice-presidential nominees even before they were nominated.

To Senator HUMPHREY and Walter Reuther, the labor leader who helped in trying to settle the struggle between the northern and southern wings of the Democrat Party, apparently there were nothing incongruous in the demand for loyalty oaths.

But then, history of radical-liberal ideological politics is to place loyalty to labor leaders and party above everything else.

To go back to the Republican Convention, the supporters of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER were by far in the majority.

What if they had demanded that unsympathetic delegates sign pledges on the scene to support the party nominees?

You could imagine the howl that would have gone up from the ADA if the Republican conservatives had tried to demand loyalty oaths of the liberal Senators and Congressmen who have said they could and would not support the national ticket.

We don't pretend to know all the obligations of delegates and the legal ramifications of their status at political conventions.

The only point which became a matter of public policy was the demand to sign up or get out.

What kind of a radical political group is it that can demand special pledges of loyalty, not to the Constitution, but to party and over and above the normal assurances that as delegates they are qualified members of the Democrat Party?

Who is deciding what kind of a Democrat is to be admitted to the party?

This is old world politics. The same attitudes ran through the organizations of the leftist labor leaders who introduced the violent sitdown strikes and that have encouraged civil disobedience.

The same persons who would deny the right of dissent also are warning the American people that our respected military leaders are not to be trusted and that loyalty must be placed with politicians who they contend alone have the capacity to control nuclear power.

Is power to be trusted to these leaders?

A Chat With Frank Wells

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1964

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly fine and moderate men of good will in my Third District of Arizona is Mr. Frank E. Wells, editor and publisher of the Wiliams (Ariz.) News. His featured "Editorial Chat" highlights each issue of that paper.

A face-to-face chat with Frank Wells might well benefit many Americans in this day when extreme positions on serious issues seem the rule rather than the exception. Since this is a manifest impossibility, Mr. Speaker, I commend to you and my colleagues the following "Editorial Chat," by Frank E. Wells, from the Williams News of August 27, 1964, and offer it herewith for insertion in the RECORD.

The item follows:

NOTHING TO BE ASHAMED OF?

One of the regular white delegates to the Democratic Convention from Mississippi said they had nothing to be ashamed of, in the treatment they have given the colored people. That, in the face of testimony presented to the convention by Freedom Democratic delegates. That statement would also cover the killing of three good people who went to Tennessee to investigate the burning of a Negro church, and to teach the colored people how to vote.

The methods used by the governing whites, to prevent the Negroes from voting, included arrests, beatings, firing from jobs, bombings, and killings.

And yet this white delegate said the State of Mississippi had nothing to be ashamed of.

I would say, not only has Mississippi much to be ashamed of, but also the whole Nation for permitting such conditions to exist within our borders.

DID NOT HELP THEIR CAUSE

When the freedom delegates forced their way into the seats vacated by the white delegates from Mississippi, they did not help their cause. Likewise with marches and riots, staged in many cities over the country.

The people of this country have been sympathetic with the Negroes and their asking for a chance to vote at regular elections. There has also been general sympathy with them in seeking a right to the best in schooling for their children, and the opportunity to secure jobs along with their white neighbors.

However, the colored man does not help his cause when he resorts to violence and force. That sort of behavior is proof that he is not fully prepared to have a place alongside the white man when it comes to government.

Orderly conduct on the part of the Negro will advance his cause much more rapidly than resort to force.

Hon. John B. Bennett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the passing of my good friend and colleague the Honorable John B. Bennett. I had the pleasure of knowing Congressman Bennett and working closely with him during the 20 years he had been a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Bennett was a conscientious and hard-working Congressman and he was certainly a credit to his State and the Nation.

We shall always miss him here on Capitol Hill. I do not know of any man that was held in higher esteem and commanded the respect of every Member of the House than John Bennett.

I could not permit this opportunity to get by without expressing my opinion of this statesman.

Democrat Drumfire: Publicists Seek To Tie Barry to Extremists, Show Cool, Busy L.B.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has called my attention to a splendid article by Jerry Landauer in the Wall Street Journal. Since it concerns campaign techniques in this most crucial election year, I believe this article should be reprinted in the RECORD for all Members of Congress to study.

The article follows:

DEMOCRAT DRUMFIRE: PUBLICISTS SEEK TO TIE BARRY TO EXTREMISTS, SHOW COOL, BUSY L.B.J.

(By Jerry Landauer)

ATLANTIC CITY.—On the television screen a telephone jangles. It rings again and again. In a while, a man's hand reaches across the screen. But before it can pluck receiver from cradle, the action suspends. An announcer cuts in, menacingly, to ask: "Who do you want answering the phone when Khrushchev calls?"

This TV scene, striking hard at BARRY GOLDWATER's alleged penchant for jerking the nuclear trigger, was conjured by admen at Doyle Dane Bernbach, Inc., the New York agency hired by the Democratic National Committee to stick barbs into the GOP and grow bouquets for the Johnson administration.

The "call from Khrushchev" may—or may not—become a staple of paid network spots this fall. It and similar advertising assaults upon Republicans are among the costly devices Democrats are cranking up for potential use in the coming political campaign. Sometimes the preparations proceed slowly, in part because President Johnson likes to delve deep into details. And in the end only those salvos which he personally approves will be fired off.

LET US CONTINUE

Mr. Johnson is paying particular attention to the content of ads about him and his Republican challenger, partly because his present intent is to limit personal political appearances mostly to weekends until late in the campaign, and avoid debating encounters with his opponent like the plague. He wants his own image to appear cool and unconcerned, that of a President working calmly at his desk beyond partisan strife. A banner hoisted above the convention hall here suggested the bland theme: "Let Us Continue."

L.B.J. and his aids keep in close touch, too, with activities in an unmarked, four-story building on K Street in Washington, several blocks from national Democratic headquarters. There, party workers operate research and propaganda units.

Practically all publicity material prepared in this unobtrusive building, both for the Atlantic City conclave and the ensuing campaign, has been or will be screened by the President's men. Lyndon personally approved the portrait of a majestic Chief Executive which graces the slick official convention book on sale at $10 a copy; corporations paid up to $20,000 a page for the right to place ads in that book of tributes to the Democrats and their chief.

In contrast to the coolly complimentary role being readied for the President, the imagemakers engaged by the Democrats are out to depict BARRY GOLDWATER as a belligerent hothead. They seek, moreover, to insinuate into public consciousness that the Republican nominee is tied in with extremists and segregationists.

SAMPLE PROPOSALS

Here are three further samples of Doyle Dane Bernbach's creative proposals:

On television, an American voice breaks the somber silence overhanging an atomic test site with a slow countdown; the count ends in a mushroom cloud. Then a Russian voice starts to count; it, too, triggers a mighty blast. The American counts faster and faster yet; so does the Russian. Soon voices and blasts merge into pandemonium. When all's quiet, John F. Kennedy intrudes to discuss the Soviet-American nuclear test ban treaty which his administration negotiated and which Senator GOLDWATER opposed. Messages from Lyndon Johnson follow.

Another vignette, also meant for TV, is titled "Confessions of a Republican." A young, well-scrubbed fellow wearing glasses tells in a conversational tone how his family always has voted for the GOP; so has he. But he's troubled by BARRY. He twists edgily in a chair, weighing his worries. "What's with this guy, anyhow?" he wonders—presumably preparing a bolt to the Democrats.

A billboard poster depicts a huge head masked ominously by a white sheet, except for eye slits. Under the hooded head there's a quote from Robert Creel, Grand Dragon of the Alabama Ku Klux Klan. "I like BARRY GOLDWATER," the klansman says. "I think the same way he thinks."

TWO GUARDED VOLUMES

These and other results of the ad agency's labors have been exposed as yet to hardly anyone outside an inner circle of White House aids and Democratic Party workers. "If we tipped our hand now we'd only give the Republicans a chance to counterattack," explains Lloyd Wright, the party's media coordinator. Suggestions for placing the TV spots and other propaganda material for maximum impact are contained in a two-volume, 328-page set of "media recommendations" which a Doyle Dane Bernbach representative says is "probably the most valuable thing we've got."

To allow their clients a variety of choices, the admen intend to prepare more material than will be used. Some party officials who have seen the ad agency's products think certain scenes, by striking savagely at Senator GOLDWATER, risk generating sympathy for him. The billboard linking BARRY to the Klan (whose endorsement he has repudiated) may be among those vulnerable to presidential veto. It's known that already the White House has rejected one TV script; this played on a 1959 comment by Mr. GOLDWATER to the effect that instead of aiming for the moon he'd rather lob a missile into the men's room at the Kremlin.

The lot of admen working with politicians of both parties has often proved uncomfortable, and this year is no exception. Two weeks ago GOP National Chairman Dean Burch announced the resignation of Leo Burnett Co., a Chicago agency, and its replacement by the New York firm of Erwin, Wasey, Ruthrauff & Ryan; the reason for the switch wasn't disclosed.

One GOP technological advance that could help neutralize the Democrats' attack is a portable TV unit dubbed the "creepy peepy." The nickname derives from the fact that the fellow to whom it's strapped can creep up on a human target and peep right at him. But BARRY GOLDWATER's aids intend to use the "creeper" in a more straightforward way.

They plan to take it aboard the jetplane from which he will campaign. While in flight the candidate can record on video tape excerpts from the speeches he'll make next.

These can be played back immediately to see if they come off well; if not, any fluffed oratory can be done over in improved style. When he lands, aids can hand out copies of the tapes, as if they were press releases, to local stations and the networks. If it works as planned, the "creepy peepy" may win extra—and free—exposure for the GOP.

TELEPHONE TAPE TALKS

The Democrats also have contrived a device to get free air time. In the building on K Street they've installed six machines, manufactured by Broadcast Electronics, Inc., of Silver Spring, Md., which unroll tape-recorded talk by Democratic "bigwigs" whenever a telephone call activates them. By dialing a certain Washington number, radio stations anywhere can thus obtain and broadcast excerpts from oratory at the Democratic National Convention or elsewhere.

Much of the national committee's literary output is directed at big city ethnic groups who, party strategists fear, may be jarred from Democratic moorings by apprehension about competition from Negroes for housing and jobs.

One campaign pamphlet contains 11 photos of Lyndon Johnson (many taken while he was Vice President) meeting, greeting, and conferring with all manner of minority group representatives; he's even shown approaching with outstretched hand a circle of citizens at a crossroad in Finland. Party propagandists are also whipping together publications which explain that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 wasn't intended only to proscribe discrimination against Negroes; the law, it's explained, is also an insurance policy for white minority groups.

Cultivation of the predominantly Democratic Negro vote requires special care, too. Four of one party pamphlet's 10 pages list "Federal posts held by Negro decisionmakers." To fill that much space, researchers dug deep into the bureaucracy. Besides such ranking officials as Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver and Director Carl Rowan, of the U.S. Information Agency, they came up with the names of a special assistant to the Assistant Postmaster General, a Justice Department trial attorney and a collector of customs.

ENLISTING BARBERS

To register Negro voters (the target is 6 million, up from 5 million in 1960) Deputy Democratic Chairman Louis E. Martin has concocted what he thinks will be a particularly effective approach. From national associations of beauticians and from State barber registration boards, volunteer workers compile lists of beauty and barber shop owners in Negro areas. To each goes a prepaid business reply card asking whether the owner will help get customers registered, distribute literature, and join a National Citizens Advisory Committee on Registration and Voting.

The "committee" exists only on paper, of course, but Mr. Martin intends to print and distribute leaflets listing its thousands of "members." He hopes the prestige accompanying membership in the official-sounding National Citizens Committee will help weld barbers and beauticians into a get-out-the-vote political organization. "This is the first national association the barbers have ever had," he says.

Though party leaders in such States as California, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey grumble that campaign plans haven't jelled sufficiently because nobody in Washington except Lyndon Johnson seems able to make

decisions, the Democrats seem well prepared on the technical level.

For the use of Democratic orators, the national committee's research division under former Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton has compiled a 585-page book of provocative Goldwater quotes and a second volume, half as thick, containing key statements by WILLIAM O. MILLER, BARRY'S running mate. The Goldwater book gets updated every 2 weeks. The collected works of L.B.J. occupy three volumes.

COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK

On one floor below in the K Street building, party workers under Wayne Phillips, a former aid to Housing Administrator Weaver, operate a TWX (teletypewriter exchange service) linking headquarters with political "coordinators" in 12 key States; by mid-September the communications net is expected to branch into most smaller States.

By 6:30 every morning a three-man night shift has prepared a digest of political news and intelligence monitored from network newscasts and from 20 newspapers in strategic cities; paid "correspondents" in those cities phone Washington as soon as morning editions of the newspapers become available. The intelligence summary is sent via TWX to the State coordinators. Among other things it indicates the "play" given political developments by news media. Thus guided, Democratic orators and strategists can tailor speeches and actions accordingly.

White House Aid Larry O'Brien is bolstering the Johnson cause by providing Democratic candidates for local office with an elaborately detailed manual on how to run their own campaigns. Some sample hints:

"A touring sound truck should never pass through a residential neighborhood after 7:30 p.m. It is a sure way to lose votes."

"Bumper stickers should be placed on the front and back of the car. If only one sticker is on a car, it should be on the front, because more people will see it there."

"The best method of raising money, bar none, is to ask people for it."

WASH THOSE WINDOWS

"Headquarters windows should be washed regularly. The headquarters should maintain a regular work schedule. Nothing is more deadening than a dull, dreary campaign headquarters, with doors locked and no one around."

"When candidates visit factories, escorts on such tours should be representatives of labor, or labor and management, never management alone."

"There is a point of no return at coffee hours * * * the candidate should shake hands, smile, make his remarks, answer a few questions—and get out while everyone is happy and before he is cornered by an argumentative individual."

"Democratic candidates sometimes have a tendency to ignore the potential support available to them from businessmen. President Johnson has demonstrated great appeal to the business community, and candidates' organizations should be able to develop committees of businessmen. Creation of a businessmen's committee is a newsworthy item and should be given maximum publicity."

"Landslide" Lyndon—Chapter II of "A Texan Looks at Lyndon"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with all the news reports predicting that President Johnson will win in a landslide this fall, I was very interested to read the second chapter of a very excellent book, "A Texan Looks at Lyndon." The chapter is entitled "'Landslide' Lyndon" and is estimated to make approximately 5¾ pages at a cost of $563.50.

Mr. Speaker, the author, J. Evetts Haley, a lifelong Democrat, cowman, and historian, is as adept at the fine art of working wild cattle as he is in writing history, which, as one professor remarked "reads like poetry." He is the author of 12 books of history and biography and the most noted living southwestern historian. Frazier Hunt praised his "Charles Goodnight: Cowman and Plainsman" as "the finest American frontier ever written." The late Dr. E. C. Barker, dean of history at the University of Texas, considered Evetts Haley perhaps his most exceptional student in a lifetime of teaching, and Dr. Herbert E. Bolton, the great California historian, once spoke of him as "America's finest historical writer."

When J. Evetts Haley ran for Governor of Texas in 1956, the Houston Post described him as "a man with a keen, incisive mind, a firm background in history and government and a lively understanding of the problems of his day." The Austin American-Statesman called him the "Salty Texas Rebel" from the Staked Plains:

The region's Thomas Paine, a brilliant historian and a provocative pamphleteer. He argues implacably that Americans stand to lose their individual liberties to big government, and he insists that they should rely on themselves instead of the Government for their welfare.

He is a graduate of West Texas University and the University of Texas, and a former member of the board of the Texas Technological College. With his son he is the active cowboy owner-operator of three southwestern cattle ranches.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the reading of Mr. Haley's entire book to my colleagues and the public. Notwithstanding the length of the manuscript with footnotes, under unanimous consent, I include the aforementioned chapter:

"LANDSLIDE" LYNDON—II

When Senator O'Daniel did not announce for reelection in 1948, Johnson was all set to run. His chief adversary for the Senate seat was a product of the hills of Texas, Gov. Coke R. Stevenson, who had advanced steadily in public life without fanfare in his buildup. He knew the meaning of hard work and had been a freighter, cowboy and country lawyer. From the office of county attorney he was elected to the legislature and became speaker of the Texas House; next Lieutenant Governor, and then succeeded Governor O'Daniel when he resigned to take Sheppard's unexpired term in the Senate.

Stevenson, an inveterate pipe-smoker and a deliberate man, was a close student of the Constitution. His conservatism was evident from the fact that he had never voted for a tax bill. He was a popular figure and knew Texas and politics, but had gathered the enemies and animosities that follow long tenure in office. He was anathema to the ultraliberal New Deal elements and the pseudointellectuals who had swarmed around the University of Texas president, Homer P. Rainey, in his ambitious political battle against the board of regents.

Throughout the war years, however, the influence of Lyndon Johnson "among the people who count"—that is, among the wealthy and influential of Texas—had grown. His ability to "get things done" for prominent people who needed things done had become legendary. His connections with Brown & Root, the Texas contractors who supported his campaigns so generously, and who in turn had prospered so fantastically on wartime Government contracts as to become worldwide operators, was more than a legend—it was a scandal.

But Johnson had stood firm in the face of pressure against the oil industry. He had sped the flow of drastically scarce, wartime newsprint to his favorite publishers. He had kept vast Federal funds flowing freely into Texas. He had mastered the political techniques of "the Hill" in Washington. He had maintained the support without the trust of the ultraliberal fringe, and had, untrammelled by any too rigid regard for honesty and ethics, kept his popular image bright with the voters.

In the mind of the Texas public, with Governor Stevenson and Congressman Johnson as adversaries, the issue between conservatism and liberalism was clearly drawn. Johnson, the restless wheeler-dealer, the plausible advocate of progressive change based on Federal power, the symbol of youthful glamour and ultraliberalism, took to the hustings in a helicopter equipped with loudspeaker and furnished, it was reported, by his extremely wealthy Houston oilman friend, Wesley W. West, in one of those ironic quirks of politics. For the late J. M. West, Sr., Wesley's father, with character and genuine dedication to conservatism, had hated and fought Roosevelt's New Deal, its false nostrums and its political prostitutes with deserving passion.

Again the Washington machine, aided and abetted by a bigger sector of the business community, wealth, and labor and Mexican and Negro blocs marched to the primary polls, July 24, 1948, to register their enthusiastic support of the close friend of "the late great and immortal Democratic President, Franklin D. Roosevelt." [1]

The final count in the primary showed Stevenson with 477,077 to 405,617 votes for Johnson. Since Stevenson's lead of 71,460 votes did not constitute a majority over the entire field, the runoff was set for August 28. Stevenson, apparently overconfident and always deliberate, failed to step up his campaign in keeping with the furious tempo and grandstand tactics of the Johnson elements, diverse, and incongruous as to cohesive qualities, but ardently fused behind their candidate.

Johnson continued to cover the State by air, his force augmented by a 10-star company of "Hollywood entertainers." New Deal politicians everywhere in Texas were tireless, and Johnson gave close personal attention to the controlled Mexican vote section from San Antonio south.

Stevenson, too, had his supporters with political experience, such as fiery, former Congressman Thomas L. Blanton of Albany, Tex. On August 13, Blanton hit Johnson with a devastating open letter charging that he was a close friend of Henry Wallace, the man who had not only "fraternized with Communists," but was still "supported by Communists," and who insisted on giving "Russia our atomic bomb secret."

More than that, Blanton continued, in 1944 Johnson had done all in his power "to have Henry Wallace nominated for Vice President," and, had he succeeded, Wallace would then have been "the President of the United States."

He reviewed Johnson's part in boosting the pay and provision of pensions for Congressmen and Senators. He reminded Johnson of hearings through which "Congress was furnished evidence * * * that the National

Footnotes at end of speech.

Youth Administration, whose affairs you later handled in Texas, was under domination by Russia and was a disloyal, subversive organization." Most scathing of all was his attack on Johnson's war record in which he charged:

"Being a Congressman enabled you to procure a high commission in the U.S. Navy, but when President Roosevelt held that Congressmen could not hold two positions, you thought more of your $15,000 job in Washington than you did of war service to the Nation, and you took off your gold-braided uniform, and gave up your commission in the Navy.

"Have you any right to brag continually about being a veteran of World War II [he continued], when you fail to tell the GI's that at the time you got the Navy to issue you a high commission, you then thought that you could be a Congressman at the same time, and when early in the war you learned that you could not hold both positions, you became convinced that our brave GI's and Gobs could win the war without your help, and you quit the Service and hurried back to your marble-florred, plush-lined congressional foxhole there to sweat out the war while GI's and Gobs did the fighting?" [3]

Congressman Blanton's blast, put in the form of interrogatories, failed of answer. Johnson simply blazed on with his helicopter, his retinue of movie stars, and his emphasis on hoopla and sex appeal.

Shortly thereafter the Dallas News showered down on Johnson, charging that his platform was "all things to all men." The News editorially reminded Texans of the polyglot political backing of this "New Deal-ingest New Dealer" who was being supported by Drew Pearson, University of Texas radical professors, and a "variety of business tycoons, leftwing laborites, corporation lawyers, New Dealers, anti-New Dealers, et cetera." The News, which admitted it was deeply puzzled as to "what Mr. Johnson stands for," had "offered its editorial conference room, rent free" to this queer combination, "so they might discuss among themselves just why they are riding the same bandwagon."

It too reminded its readers that Johnson had "gone right down the line with the Henry Wallace wing of the party," and that in 1941 Wallace had sent his own "political mentor, Harold Young, to Texas to head Johnson rallies and pay for Johnson advertising." It marveled at Johnson's ability to reverse himself so quickly from his rabidly prolabor stance in the past, invariably carrying CIO boxes, to become a supporter of Taft-Hartley, now. Johnson was contending that Stevenson was prolabor and was soft on subversion while he, Johnson, was promising more in REA, roads, water, wages, pensions, and farm income from the Federal Treasury and at the same time "a more economical Federal Government." [3]

In ordinary times it would have been an incredible political phenomenon. But these were not ordinary times. They were times showing the effect of 16 years of steady erosion of American character through sordid appeal to the most selfish traits in human nature. They were times showing the results of 16 years of contrived ideological confusion, economic fraud and bribery, and dangerous appeal to class warfare and hatred. They were times in which our national unity was being destroyed, and our social structure shattered through the cynical undermining of pride and principle by the man whom Johnson still calls his "spiritual leader," Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Johnson support was understandable in the light of history. Like the terrible excesses of the French Revolution, it was a product of the lusts and passions of the times. The response to his synthetic glamor and glib demagoguery was the direct result of lack of moral leadership in high places. It was the seed of corrupt Federal policy designed for lifelong tenure of ambitious men in office, instead of the perpetuity of the Republic on the basis of high national policy and moral principle. It only seemed strange. It was natural, and it is still terrible.

Big money was thrown into south Texas by the Johnson forces, reportedly $35,000 into Bexar County (San Antonio) alone. Johnson personally guided the San Antonio setup under his politically potent leaders, Sheriff Owen Kilday and Street Commissioner Jimmy Knight, where they performed the political miracle of converting a 12,000 Stevenson lead into a 2,000-vote favorable margin for Johnson in the runoff.

Initial returns on the 28th confirmed the "spot checks by trained political writers" that the controlled vote, particularly in the Latin-American sections of southwest Texas, was firmly in the hands of the New Deal machine and that Governor Stevenson was in trouble.

Johnson had moved in to take the George Parr, southwest Texas section,[4] which had formerly supported Stevenson, and where, with Kleberg's backing, the Governor, despite the concern of his supporters, had felt he need not worry. Herein was a fatal tactical error. For George Parr had been in trouble, and with the easy duplicity of his kind, and the flexible conscience and the undoubted power of the Johnson forces to deliver, Parr had decided that if he did not exactly love Lyndon, his personal interests now lay on Lyndon's side.

The switch that Parr engineered in his area of influence and control was absolutely fantastic. His immediate tricounty returns gave Johnson a 30-to-1 lead—10,547 to 368, with heavy majorities in many other counties adjacent to them and along the Rio Grande.

For days the outcome was in doubt. With 254 Texas counties, many with independent and leisurely ways, even the honest returns are often deliberate and slow. After 5 days with returns all in but unofficially tabulated, Stevenson was in the lead with 113 votes out of nearly a million counted. Despite this Johnson hit the air with a broadcast on Thursday, September 2, with a "victory speech," interlaced with the continual refrain that "we have won." As Clyde Wantland has written:

"This broadcast alerted and disturbed the Stevenson forces. Johnson's enthusiastic assurance was unreal in the face of all the known facts.

"Their fears were validated the following day, Friday, September 3, when a source friendly to Stevenson reported from Jim Wells County that precinct 13 had been recanvassed and a 'correction' made favoring Johnson with 202 more votes.

"Johnson's radio forecast on Thursday, thus became a reality on Saturday. Precinct No. 13 had been corrected from Johnson 765 to 60 to Johnson 967 to 61. This gave him a lead of 87 votes, with returns now complete and semiofficial."

Thereupon began the historic struggle to validate the steal which gained for Johnson the frivolous nickname of "Landslide Lyndon," and which established his illegitimate seat in the Senate, where his aptitude for compromise and chicanery put him into the crucial position from which a diabolical fate catapulted him into the Presidency. The nature of the men involved and the ways in which his "election" was sealed and delivered, are of more than passing significance.

The key figure in this drama, which may finally assume the proportions of a historic Greek tragedy, was an affable, blue-eyed, multimillionaire criminal by the name of George Parr. He was a native product of that unusual combination of corrupt political patronage and warm paternal concern; of ruthless power at the top and friendly protection at the bottom; and of confidence of the leader in the support of those willing to be led, that flourishes along the Texan-Mexican border as nowhere else. At the apex of this political phenomenon are the hard, tough, and practical political bosses. At its base is the preponderant Mexican or Latin American mass leavened with a few subservient Anglo-Saxons, while in between are the lesser lackeys, leaders, jefe politicos, and wardheelers of the hierarchy. The pattern of political control in the border area goes back almost to the beginnings of Texas.

In 1948 George Parr, Duke of Duval County and undoubted boss of his domain, was in his late forties and immensely rich by virtue of his own talents and the inherited political power of his father, the late Texas Senator Archie Parr. Archie had gone to the Texas Senate in 1914, and had stayed for 20 years. He so dominated Duval County that he rarely allowed the name of more than one candidate on the ticket for local office. During this time and after his son came to control, the Texas election bureau had grown used to near-unanimous returns on all offices of importance, sometimes "complete" before the closing of the polls. Why should Texas be concerned? After all there were plenty of decent counties, and Duval seemed of little moment.

But on the local level, Senator Parr had his enemies, among them one taxpayer who strangely but persistently believed, especially in view of Parr's prosperity, that the county's financial records should be subject to audit. Parr insisted that since they never had been, this was clearly unnecessary to Duval's progress. The local reactionary hired his own accountants and carried his contentions to the Duval courthouse. Understandably rebuffed, he appealed to the State Supreme Court and was sustained. Before the audit could be made, the courthouse caught fire and burned to the ground. Unfortunately, the records went with it.

When the friendly, light blue-eyed, Spanish-speaking George Parr, after service as a Senate page, and a round in university law, returned home, Archie saw to it that he was elected county judge. It was not hard. He was the only candidate on the ticket. George thus became the head of the local political hierarchy at 25.

While Texas officialdom merely winked at Parr's corruption, it turned out that the Federal attorney of the San Antonio district, William Robert Smith, with a high regard for his oath of office and his duty, did not. In 1932 he secured indictments against George Parr for criminal evasion of income taxes. But the proof of the ways in which Parr got his money was more significant than his evasion of taxes.

Smith proved that in 1928 George Parr had an income of more than $45,000, only $2,700 of which was "from a legitimate source." Some $17,000 had come in payoffs for protection of illegal liquor and gambling operations and houses of prostitution. And Parr's protection was ample. He was "the political dictator of Duval County," and "controlled the action of practically every other officeholder in the county."

The remaining $25,000 of his 1928 income—he was quite young and just getting started—came in the form of a kickback on a county road contract, a Duval operation that had been relatively easy. As county judge, Parr presided over the meetings of the commissioners court, which let substantial road-building contracts to W. L. Pierson & Co., of Houston. U.S. Attorney Bob Smith found that on May 14, 1928, the county of Duval, pursuant to one of these contracts, issued a warrant for $85,000 to Pierson Construction Co., signed by the county treasurer and by Parr as county judge.

Upon its receipt the company deposited the warrant in its Houston bank, drew $25,000 in

Footnotes at end of speech.

cash, "which was placed in a little black bag and was taken by A. A. Sangster," a company official, to San Diego, Tex., the county seat of Duval, and "on May 24, 1928, delivered said black bag" to the county judge, George Parr. Such a picayunish matter would never have caused a public ripple in tolerant Texas except that Parr failed to cut the Federal Government in for its share.

Federal Attorney Smith was a determined prosecutor. For defense Parr employed one-time Attorney General of Texas, Tom Pollard. At the last minute Parr threw in the legal sponge and pleaded guilty, rather than have his methods and means further explored and exposed. But Parr's influence already reached far beyond Duval. Federal Judge Robert J. McMillan was lenient. Pressed with the word of prominent people that Parr would recant and reform, the judge imposed a $5,000 fine and an 18-month probated sentence to the Federal Reformatory at El Reno, Okla.

Nothing derelict when it came to chicanery and crime, however, Parr went right on making the most of his golden opportunity and his less than sterling character. He levied on the county school fund to buy himself the famous Dobie ranch; he assaulted J. C. Canales, a Brownsville attorney, in the Duval courthouse for political speeches that Canales had made against his father; he financed a local whoesale liquor business before repeal of prohibition; he was a party to a $600 monthly payoff by a local gambling hall, and then had the operator raided and indicted when he became delinquent; and he really went to town in the oil business that was spreading over Duval.

As an extensive landowner through the generous use of county funds and other progressive educational procedures, Parr was prepared to hit it rich. On June 11, 1934, he leased some lands to J. T. Graham and the Texon Royalty Co. for a period of 1 year, with the usual provision that in case of production the lease should run for "as long thereafter" as oil or gas was produced in commercial quantities. The lessees drilled and were rewarded with production. At the end of the year, however, they were appalled upon being hailed into court by Parr for recovery of the wells due to the expiration of the lease. They rushed to the county courthouse and found that Parr had scratched out "as long thereafter" on "oil and gas"—ironically leaving them only the "sulfur," of which he had none—before the original lease had gone on record.

Thus their expensive wells in the flush of production belonged to Parr. All of which was highly improper in the trade, and even fraudulent under Texas law.

Armed with this fresh evidence of Parr's fraud and open violation of Texas law during his probationary period, Federal Attorney Bob Smith returned to Judge McMillan's court and in the light of the evidence petitioned the judge to vacate Parr's probation.

In a frank statement sadly delivered, Judge McMillan did so. While harboring his doubts as to the widsdom of a suspended sentence at the time of the trial, the judge admitted he had made a mistake, primarily because of the "strong representations" by people of prominance that Parr "was a man who might be rehabilitated." And Parr did have his points, now proving his outspoken honesty by blithely admitting he had changed the Texan deed, but "did not call the grantee's attention" to it.

Judge McMillan was unmoved by his frankness. As Parr waited transfer from jail in San Antonio, the judge was presented with a petition signed by practically every high officeholder at Austin—by Governor James V. Allred, the attorney general, every member of the Texas senate and all justices of the court of criminal appeals—praying for Parr's release. Parr was sent on for reformation at El Reno, from where he continued to run his district. Shortly he was back on his old stomping grounds at San Diego, still the Duke, still the unquestioned dictator of Duval.

As the years passed, with his ready aptitude for oil, racketeering, and even legitimate business—for which he really had no aversion when profitable, the vast wealth, power, and influence of George Parr flourished and grew. He moved with confidence, often flanked by a couple of Mexican pistoleros for a bodyguard. He owned the bank in San Diego and another in Alice, county seat of adjoining Jim Wells. He acquired land holdings of some 70,000 acres and built a mansion, where he lived and entertained, somewhat in feudal splendor, with a swimming pool, his own racetrack and a string of horses. But politics—which his friend Lyndon Johnson has so neatly termed "the art of the possible," was the basis of his money and power.

Through the bloc Mexican vote he took and held control of the 79th judicial district made up of Jim Wells, Brooks, Starr, and Duval Counties. His influence weighed heavily in Nueces (Corpus Christi), as well as in many other counties that lapped leisurely west and south to include the tier abutting on the Rio Grande.[5] He is reported to have fallen out with his powerful friend, Congressman Kleberg and retaliated by defeating him. Thus, when Johnson called on Parr for support in 1948 and got it, Kleberg was in Stevenson's corner.

At the time of the Johnson-Stevenson campaign, Parr was reported to have had a brother in trouble and in need of added influence. Johnson and his political ally from nearby Floresville, John Connally, had that highly negotiable commodity. When the count from the run-off election was in, Parr had delivered for Lyndon. But though he had dallied in sending his returns while Lyndon kept in close touch by telephone, it finally turned out that they had closed their own count prematurely. Stevenson was ahead by 113 votes.

Johnson made another frantic telephone call to Parr, who indicated that he might pick up what they needed in precinct 13 at Alice. Thereupon his henchmen "recanvassed the returns," reporting on September 3 the corrected total of 202 additional votes for Johnson and one for Stevenson. Thus, Lyndon went into the lead by 87 votes out of nearly a million actually cast.

By Texas procedure the next step was the meeting of the State Democratic executive committee, which was to convene at Fort Worth on September 13, in advance of the party convention, officially to canvas the returns and certify the nominees. In the meantime, however, its subcommittee met in Austin to tabulate the vote and immediately announced its acceptance of the corrected returns from box 13.

When he had challenged in vain acceptance of the report by the subcommittee, Governor Stevenson sent two of his best campaign workers, Kellis Dibrell and Jim Gardner, ex-FBI agents and young Texas lawyers, posthaste to Parr's county to investigate. They went by Laredo to pick up a guide who knew the land and its ropes, and were joined at San Diego on Monday by Governor Stevenson. But when they called on Parr at his office, they found that Johnson's campaign manager, John Connally, who is now Governor of Texas, had beat them to it. As Wantland wrote, "He had arrived the preceding day and was busily cementing the theft," though Parr publicly stated that the run-off in his district "was as clean an election as had ever been held." Possibly so, in his district.

Stevenson demanded that Parr show them the Duval poll lists and the returns of the election judges, which reported a vote of 4,622 to 38 in favor of Johnson. Parr feigned astonishment. Why should they ask him? He was not an election judge; he knew nothing about the returns.

From Parr's office the Governor and his party hurried into adjacent Jim Wells County, and at Alice found that "Harry Adams and H. L. Poole, newly elected chairman and secretary, respectively, of the Jim Wells County Democratic executive committee, were already trying to upset the 'correction' from precinct 13, that had been made and reported by the old committee officials."

These two, who had seen the corrected list on the previous Friday, and had sat in on the meeting of the committee for the recount, told Stevenson that the 202 new names had been added alphabetically in blue ink, whereas the original list was in black. The old secretary, Tom Donald, an employee in Parr's Texas State bank, carefully kept the list despite the protests of the new officials.

Donald locked the list in the vault of the bank and continued to refuse to turn it over for public scrutiny. Thereupon Governor Stevenson and his party made plans to get possession of this public record when the bank opened next morning.

South Texas, in keeping with its history, traditions, and the mercurial temper of its people, was still an explosive and dangerous country. When Dibrell and Gardner sent out "an urgent call for help to check the entire voting lists, and recruits began arriving hourly," wild rumor spread that the Governor's party were all well-armed FBI men. The newspapers reported that an emergency call for Texas Rangers had been relayed to Austin. Stevenson did call the noted ranger, Capt. Frank Hamer, to come down and keep the peace.

Next morning before the bank opened, Parr's forces commandeered the entrance with Winchesters. The Historian Clyde Wantland has told the story of what happened and told it well:

"Governor Stevenson wisely ordered his forces to appear in public in only their shirt sleeves [to prove they were unarmed].

"As the hour approached for the bank doors to open, armed men sauntered onto the scene and took positions with an ominous silence.

"Governor Stevenson and his coatless investigators arrived, escorted by Ranger Capt. Frank Hamer. Not a word was spoken as the ranger captain took position directly before the bank door. The veteran captain was well known to every man there. He was known as a stern, inflexible officer who exacted, one way or another, prompt and stern obedience to his orders.

"He waved the armed men to fall back from the bank door, and they did. Very promptly. The doors opened and Governor Stevenson and his men entered. Captain Hamer forbid any other to follow. None tried. Witnesses said later the captain never lifted his pistol, nor even touched it, but Johnson charged him with force, threats, and intimidation.[6]"

Inside the bank Tom Donald produced the list for the Stevenson party to see. Dibrell and Gardner concentrated upon the added names, having determined in advance to memorize as many as possible. Donald conferred with the county attorney who, after a few moments, gave the opinion that Stevenson should be allowed only to look at the record, not to copy or make notes therefrom. Donald repossessed the record and again locked it in the bank vault.[7]

Stevenson left to confer in private with Adams and Poole. Gardner and Dibrell, hurriedly scribbling down their remembered names, left on investigations of their own—the identity and whereabouts of the added "voters." They found grave difficulty in locating the addresses they had jotted down except three, "whose last known address was

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

the cemetery," one of whom, according to the church records, had been there for 4 years. At least two of those they did locate swore they had not voted, while others shrugged off their questions with the frank admission that people in Parr's province who did not talk prospered better and lived longer than those who did.

On the local level the battle now revolved around the efforts of newly elected Democratic Chairman Adams and Secretary Poole to take over the Jim Wells poll lists and recertify the returns. In the light of the irregularities, they hoped to get the county committee to eliminate returns from box 13 completely, which would have thrown the election to Governor Stevenson. At a private meeting on the night of September 9, they decided they had the commitments necessary to do so. They issued a call for the full committee to meet at 11 on the following morning, Friday, the 10th, to sanction the proposal and to report their official action to the State committee, which was to convene 3 days later.

But John Connally had virtually assumed command of the Parr and Johnson forces, for which the prevailing county chairman and secretary, Clarence Martens and Tom Donald, were the local front. They relayed the news of the proposed meeting to Johnson and his lawyers, who sped into a friendly jurisdiction to stop it.

Shortly after 10 o'clock on Friday all members of the Jim Wells executive committee, Governor Stevenson, Frank Hamer, and Kellis Dibrell were served with notices of an injunction issued by Judge Roy Archer in Austin. It forbade the county committee to meet. It brought the Stevenson counterattack to a standstill.

Johnson's petition and Judge Archer's restraining order are exceptional documents even in Texas jurisprudence. Obviously Johnson was desperate. He contended that he had received a majority of the votes "in the recent election." He charged that Stevenson, Hamer, and the committee had "entered into a conspiracy" to have box 13 "thrown out on the grounds of fraud and irregularity" which would take from him enough votes to change the election.

He charged that Adams and Poole were "acting under threats and intimidation" of Captain Hamer. His petition argued that the county committee lacked authority to take any action in the premises. He admitted that it had met once for the purpose of correcting the returns, but that it had no legal right to meet again and reconsider, "to hear and pass judgment on charges of illegality or irregularity of any nature."

He pleaded that the "resident judge of Jim Wells County * * * cannot be reached in sufficient time," and that therefore "a restraining order without notice" to the defendants—that is, to Governor Stevenson and the county committee, should be granted. All this he contended, in effect, was urgent and necessary to keep his rightful "seat in the U.S. Senate" from being stolen from him. Judge Archer forthwith signed the order.

This obvious perversion of the law, distortion of the truth, brazen action and political perfidy, were characteristic of Johnson. But even for Texas it was a high point in low and dirty dealing. It set something of a record.

"For the first and only time in Texas history a Texas Ranger was forbidden to preserve the peace and maintain order and discharge his lawful duty," on the specious and wholly dishonest claim that Hamer had used "threats, force and intimidation" to further the alleged conspiracy. The historical record shows that "Captain Hamer had conducted himself with impartial restraint, and that he was on hand to prevent violence and bloodshed. This he had done. Nothing more."

The record further reveals that Judge L. Broeter, of Alice, was in his resident district on Friday morning and readily available had Johnson desired him. In view of the obvious chicanery, Mr. Wantland raises the pertinent question that has burned in the minds of Texans ever since.

"Just why Johnson and Connally presented the petition to Judge Roy Archer in Austin, 200 miles distant from Jim Wells County, raised a serious question, not alone of honesty and fair play, but also the more serious fact of swearing to a falsehood when Johnson knew it was a lie.

"Just why Judge Archer was beguiled into signing this order in chambers, without notice, thus perverting the vast powers of a district court to handcuff a victim while ruthless political hijackers mauled and stripped him clean, is a question still unanswered. Maybe it was the legendary Johnson charm and personality. Maybe the decision stemmed from the law of heteronomy rather than the law of Texas. Judge Archer alone has the answer." [8]

Time was of the essence. Had the action in Judge Archer's chambers been delayed more than an hour, it is highly likely that the Jim Wells Democratic committee would have met, thrown out box 13, and restored the electoral decision in Stevenson's favor. But with the State Democratic executive committee meeting in Fort Worth within 3 days to canvass the returns and certify the candidates to the secretary of state for printing of the ballots for the November election, the blow to the hopes of the Stevenson forces seemed fatal.

They girded for a forceful and factual presentation of the Governor's case, and left for the momentous meeting of the State committee, set to open at noon at the Blackstone Hotel in Fort Worth, on Monday, September 13. The decisive issue in the battle before the committee was to be the acceptance or rejection of the subcommittee's report. If rejected it would open the way for the submission of evidence of fraud by Governor Stevenson. If accepted it would automatically mean that Johnson was the party's nominee, certain of election in November since the Republican chances were nil.

Delegates, gathering for the convention, crowded the committee meeting, where tempers were high; the battle long and hot. The sophisticated lawyer, Charles I. Frances, of the most powerful political firm in Texas, eloquently and emotionally argued the Congressman's case as the New Deal idol sat smoking his cigarette with an affected air of ennui, while Stevenson puffed on his pipe in obvious concern. The battle raged throughout the afternoon; the Stevenson forces encouraged when the first test showed the committee split down the middle, 28 on either side. But this was broken by the dramatic appearance of C. C. Gibson, the Amarillo committeeman who flew in to break the tie in favor of the subcommittee report, and hence of Lyndon Johnson.

The chairman gaveled the session to a close and before night the jubilant Johnson attorneys had the official results on the way to the secretary of state at Austin for certification of Johnson's name as the nominee. The stunned Stevenson leaders were decimated by the action. A few faithful gathered in their Blackstone rooms that night in utter dejection. Among them were veteran conservative political leaders who would not quit as long as Stevenson refused to surrender. They pondered their course.[9]

"This race is not a matter of life or death for me," Stevenson said. "If I lost by one vote in an honest count the heavens wouldn't fall in. But some half million good solid Texans voted for me as their Senator and they have been defrauded and robbed. We can do no less than appeal to the Federal courts."

Thus again a precedent was set in Texas. During the next 2 days his attorneys worked on an appeal to the Federal court "raising for the first time in a major case the issue of civil rights." Their petition alleged that through fraud and corruption the Governor and those who had voted for him, had been denied the right of an honest count. They drafted a petition for a temporary order restraining the secretary of state from printing the name of Johnson on the ballot until their evidence could be heard and headed for Judge T. Whitfield Davidson's court to present their petition.

It turned out that Judge Davidson was not in Dallas but at his ancestral farm home in deep east Texas. Despite the late hour C. C. Renfro and Kellis Dibrell decided to drive to the judge's retreat and present the petition upon arrival. About 4 o'clock on the morning of September 15, Connie Renfro cajoled his way past the judge's truculent dog and roused the sharp and genial southern constitutionalist from his bed. The judge brewed a pot of coffee, read the petition and listened to their brief presentation. He then signed the sweeping order and set Federal court for a full hearing Tuesday, September 21.

His court convened in Fort Worth as scheduled, and in calling it to order Judge Davidson clearly stated that it was for the purpose of hearing an election contest. Lawyer-Gov. Coke Stevenson rose to say that he had not subpenaed witnesses, but that he had plenty of testimony and evidence at hand to support his contentions of irregularity and fraud. His leading counsel, the outstanding lawyer, ex-Gov. Dan Moody, was flanked by State Senator Clint Small, C. C. Renfro, and five others, all of whom had "volunteered their services," while "at least 100 lawyers" from over Texas and likewise volunteered theirs. Not a member of his array of counsel, Stevenson quietly observed, "had been hired," but had joined the case "because they were interested from the standpoint of the people of Texas." [10]

Standing by were Gardner and Dibrell with the evidence that they had been digging up, ready to testify as to their examination of the poll list for box 13, with its final 202 names of alleged voters mysteriously added alphabetically in blue ink, in the same hand, whereas the rest of the list was in black, and in a number of hands.

Besides these, a number of Mexicans on the list were present and ready to take the stand to say they had not voted. One was a girl named Enriqueta Acero, from the State of Yucatan, who was in Mexico at the time of voting, but who had been found and who willingly agreed to come out and testify. Stevenson was ready with affidavits from a number of others, together with the factual proof that only 600 ballots had been officially issued for Precinct 13, while the "corrected returns" claimed 1,025 votes had been cast. In addition the Stevenson forces had the deadwood on a number of other "voters" on the list who, at the time of the election, were resting easy in local cemeteries. All this had been adduced from only the relatively few names that Dibrell, Gardner, and Adams had been able to memorize hurriedly from fleeting examination of the list—a "public record" still secure from public scrutiny—still safely locked in Parr's bank in Alice.[11]

Their evidence was devastating; their contentions went unchallenged. Yet an air of superlative self-confidence if not of boredom permeated the Johnson camp as Lawyer John D. Cofer and Charles Frances, a prominent figure in Johnson's career, asked that the petition be denied, while they sneered at Governor Stevenson as a bad sport, "a poor loser."

They contended that he had lost in a party contest in which the party managers were the sole authority. These leaders, they argued, had declared him the loser and Judge Davidson's court was without jurisdiction. "As for his alleged civil rights—they couldn't have been violated because he had none. This is strictly a party matter." Which, ex-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

cept for the charges of fraud, Judge Davidson had recognized at the outset. They offered no evidence in rebuttal. The reason was obvious. They had none.

Judge Davidson, in his inimitable courtroom way, observed off the record that the citizens of Texas "were entitled to a Senator without any cloud of suspicion hanging over him," and suggested a compromise; adding, however, that its reception would have no bearing upon his decision. Why not, as a party matter, he asked, let the names of both go on the general ballot in November, leaving the choice to the court of public opinion?

Governor Moody responded that "Stevenson is ready to dispose of the entire controversy in the manner your Honor suggested."

John D. Cofer, for Johnson, rose to refuse, with what seems a strangely illogical statement: "Voluntarily to waive that right [did he mean Johnson's 'right' to the 'corrected' returns?] would stultify the right of the people."

Moody retorted that the plaintiff was ready to prove that box 13 "was stuffed," and prove as well the fraudulent shift of votes in four precincts in Zavalla County, from down on the Rio Grande. But the strategy of the Johnson attorneys simply seemed to be to make the best of the court as a forum and to continue to berate the Governor.[12] Thereupon Judge Davidson "Arose and angrily cut short the tirade in a manner seldom witnessed in a sedate Federal court.

" 'There has not been one word of evidence submitted,' he blazed 'to disprove this plaintiff's claim that he has been robbed of a seat in the U.S. Senate.

" 'If there was not a single law on the books, this man would be entitled to and would get a hearing in this court.

" 'This hearing shall be held over until September 27; and this court will appoint a commissioner to go into Jim Wells County, procure evidence and report back to this court when the hearing opens again.' "

The court's blistering denunciation and decision to adduce the evidence itself "all but blew the Johnson ship out of the water." Judge Davidson[13] thereupon named Wm. Robert Smith, late Federal attorney and a man familiar with Parr's record and power, to go into the Parr district as master in chancery for the Federal court, to summon and swear witnesses, to adduce evidence, and to determine the truth about the doings in Duval. He likewise sent James McCollum Burnett as commissioner, since exidence was to be taken in Duval and Jim Wells simultaneously.

At once the Texas newspapers carried stories that apparently the fight would be resolved by a write-in campaign between Stevenson and Johnson, who was then triumphantly crossing the State as an honor guest on President Harry Truman's campaign train.

This sudden turn threw his camp into panic and completely dispelled the assumed air of ennui—all appearances of boredom. Johnson rushed back into the fray while Truman, well aware of the possibly disastrous effects on his own cause, especially with the southern rebellion of Fielding Wright and Strom Thurmond drawing off scores of Democratic Texas leaders and thousands of voters, repeatedly dropped word to the party faithful as he crossed Texas that it must be Johnson "at any price."

With the resolute Bob Smith, armed with the authority of the Federal court, moving to dig out the voting records and take the sworn testimony of those involved, Johnson was in serious trouble. He frantically called George Parr, who was at his office with Duval County Democratic Chairman T. C. King, pleading: "George don't burn those ballots. It'll be a reflection on me."

But Parr, who like Harry Truman, knew the psychology of his henchmen and the code of loyalty in their protection, shouted back:

"To hell with you. I'm going to protect my friends."

Commissioner Burnett opened his investigation in the Duval Courthouse, with the prominent and veteran Texas courtroom attorneys Joe Montague, Oliver Fannin, Jr., and C. C. Renfro, with plenty of local help from Jacob Floyd and others, examining the unwilling witnesses summoned into court. Most were election judges or otherwise officially connected with Duval County, carefully coached in advance by Judge George Parr. Hours of penetrating examination revealed little more than the appalling ignorance of the witnesses; proving the eternal apteness of the Spanish phrase in answer to embarrassing questions—"quien sabe?"—"who knows?"

But as a matter of official record the commissioners did establish certain historic facts about Duval County elections that everybody in south Texas, from Mexican sheepherders to State senators, already knew. They brought out the fact that despite the Texas election laws there had never been an official return by a precinct chairman to the county chairman, and that the keeping of actual poll lists was unknown. Attorney Montague eased County Tax Collector Clemente Garcia into admitting, in his broken English, that poll taxes had been bought in bales in Duval County, "yes, many several thousands." But when George Parr, who sat directly behind Montague, vigorously shook his head, Clemente forgot completely "who had paid for them." Commissioner Smith sent him to his office for his legal authorizations. Clemente returned sadly to report that he could not find them.[14]

What of the all-important lists kept at the polls at the time of the recent election? They too "showed up missing." It developed later that County Chairman T. C. King, a Parr enterprise employee, had grown nervous over the vast disparity between the election returns and the poll taxes issued—about 2 to 1—and had taken the lists home for safekeeping. There his wife, in her commendable zeal of housecleaning, had apparently consigned them to the fire. Thus the attempt to get at the actual voting in Duval ended in futility, in complete frustration.

Over in precinct 13 at Alice, in Jim Wells County, the investigations went little better. Commissioner Bob Smith issued a subpena for Tom Donald, the Parr bank employee who was Democratic county secretary at the time of the election, but he was in Mexico "on business." He issued another for Luis Salas, presiding judge in the election. He had been called to Mexico "on business."

The poll list, too, failed of subpena. Commissioner Smith impounded the county's ballot boxes and found them empty. "Why?" Obviously, it was suggested, the industrious Mexican janitor, ignorant in the premises, must have emptied the boxes and burned the ballots. Thus the same pattern of evasion and frustration prevailed as in Duval. "Nobody knew nothing."[15]

The interest over the State had grown to a fever pitch. Sam Rayburn had called a caucus of New and Fair Deal leaders at his Bonham home, determined to meet Truman's demand that it be Johnson "at any price." Johnson and his attorney had flown to New Orleans to petition the dismissal of Judge Davidson's order by the Fifth Court of Appeals, where Judge J. C. Hutcheson, Jr., held that their case must be heard by the entire court and set an early date.

With time so urgent, and aware, as no one else, that the ultimate power lay with friendly forces in Washington, Johnson bypassed the Court of Civil Appeals, while his attorneys made only a perfunctory defense at Judge Davidson's hearing, which reopened on September 28. Johnson flew his case directly to that ex-Klu Klux Klansman and noted police judge on the Supreme Bench, Mr. Justice Hugo Black.[16]

Justice Black belonged to the club. At once, on September 29, 1948, he issued a sweeping order on behalf of Johnson, staying Judge Davidson's temporary injunction and ending the Fort Worth hearing, where the iron curtain tactics of south Texas were about to be proved in Federal court.

In adjourning court, Judge Davidson observed that the Supreme Court was without jurisdiction; that this was not a dispute in a general election, but in a State primary over a party nominee, where even the Senate was without power to act; and that Stevenson's only "recourse was in my court." As a part of the Nation's responsible judiciary, he had no choice except to suspend the hearings and adjourn court in view of Black's ruling. But with characteristically outspoken courage he added:

"The U.S. Supreme Court has altered my opinion, but it hasn't changed my mind."[17] He was also heard to remark that Black's order was unduly hasty "and probably unlawful."

The Black order, hurriedly issued in chambers, evidently without clerical or stenographic help, since it was dated in his own hand, has been likened to that of a judicial bulldozer. It overrode one of America's foremost constitutionalists and judges, who had in the light of fraud, simply stayed the election contest long enough to give each side time to present its case in evidence. It overrode a distinguished circuit Federal judge who had held that the full court of appeals should hear Johnson's petition, and had set an immediate date to do so. It preemptorily denied justice to Governor Stevenson and nearly half a million Texans who had voted for him. It brazenly abridged the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, especially in their guarantees of States rights and the limitations on jurisdiction. But perhaps most terrible of all, it sanctioned corruption as public policy. There is nothing in American history like it.

Lyndon Johnson went on to the Senate and his truly meteoric rise to power. But the trouble in south Texas continued as local leaders rose to challenge the domination of the powerful and much-indicted George Parr, still the duke of Duval. His oil holdings grew with scores of new wells and he entertained his prominent friends, such as Tom Clark, now a Justice of the Supreme Court, on the Dobie Ranch.

The many charges against him never seemed to hinder his influence or operations, and somehow his rare convictions in court seemed certain of reversals, especially by the Federal bench, where Johnson's friends had become judges as often as vacancies occurred. Only recently the last of many true bills against him was dismissed on motion of the present Federal Attorney Ernest Morgan, who had publicly admitted that he got his appointment through the close friendship of Vice President Lyndon Johnson.

For years the veteran Jim Wells attorney, Jacob Floyd, fought to break the Parr control. He had some effective help. When a young courageous, crusading newcomer, W. H. Mason, joined the Alice station KBKI as a news commentator, he immediately discovered and began to expose, the local corruption, especially as it pertained to Parr's Jim Wells County Sheriff H. T. Sain and his deputies. Anonymous threats stirred Mason's ardor instead of deterring him.

Among his exposures was the ownership of what was deliciously known as "Rancho Alegre"—"The Ranch of Joy," a hall for drinking, dancing and prostitution stocked with quite young and pretty Mexican girls, located on the edge of the town of Alice and owned by the sheriff's deputy, a giant half-breed Mexican by the name of Sam Smithwick.

Bill Mason repeatedly exposed the operation and when threats did not stop him, two

Footnotes at end of speech.

of Sain's deputies waylaid and beat him, two stripped him of his trousers and left him half naked in the street. Mason retrieved his pants and flew them from the radio station flagstaff as an indication that he had not surrendered. Shortly thereafter, July 29, 1949, Smithwick met him on the street, removed his great hat as in token of Latin grace, whipped out his .45 behind it and shot Mason to the ground.

After some delay the Smithwick trial was thrown on change of venue into central Texas, where a young and fearless prosecutor by the name of Jim Evetts had never failed, in a case originating in his native county of Bell, to get an indictment. Smithwick came to trial in January 1950, confident that the pervasive Parr influence would still prevail. But Jim Evetts rounded up an array of witnesses, among them a number of seductive figures from the late Rancho Alegre. He exposed the official corruption and connections of the Jim Wells-Duval machine, and in a sweeping and devasting attack had Smithwick apprehensively looking down the corridor to the electric chair. Something had to be done to cause a mistrial, and that something was the ultimate, age-old resort of illegitimacy in desperation—assassination.

When District Attorney Evetts drove home the night of January 23, 1950, and stepped out of his car, a man rose from hiding in a hedge beside the garage and opened up on him in the darkness with an automatic Colt's .45. But illegitimacy lives in fear and the gunman, obviously nervous, missed two shots and fled when his gun jammed. Evading apprehension, like his confederates in time of trouble, he too crossed the river, on business in Mexico.[19]

Jim Evetts failed of the death penalty but did send Smithwick to the penitentiary for life. His appeal was denied and at Huntsville he languished in solitude, with a growing resentment against the south Texas powers, that he had faithfully served, for not getting him out. He wrote a letter to former Governor Stevenson, urging Stevenson to come and see him, saying he was ready to tell the true story of what had happened in Jim Wells and Duval. Within a few days, before Stevenson could make the trip, the prison guard, while making his morning round on April 16, 1952, found Smithwick dead in his cell, an apparent suicide, though many in Texas still refuse to believe it.[19]

Shortly thereafter the long battle to recover that fair and fascinating land from Parr's control took an even more tragic turn for the embattled Alice attorney, "Jake" Floyd, who had proven so persistent and effective that the machine decided upon his assassination. But at the last minute, on the night of September 9, 1952, a Mexican by the name of Nego Alaniz, one of the co-conspirators, weakened and frantically phoned Floyd to call a taxi and come to the edge of town, as he had vitally important news for him. Floyd agreed to come. Again Alaniz warned: "Take a taxi. Don't go for your car. They are waiting there to kill you."

Floyd called for and left in a cab. Almost immediately his youthful son, Jacob, Jr., reached home, and upon hearing of his father's hurried departure, and apprehensive of his safety, rushed for the family car to follow him. In the darkness the assassin mistook him for the father and shot him down.

Sometime later "El Turco" Mario Sapet, the Mexican murderer, was quietly hustled from deep in Mexico by a Texas Ranger—without benefit of extradition, in the sometimes mysterious but effective ways of the Texas border, and delivered for trial in Brown County. He was sent to pentitentiary for life. Nego Alaniz, who had warned the father, was tried on change of venue in Waco Tex., as accessory to the murder of the Floyd boy. His defense attorney was the noted Houston criminal lawyer, Percy Foreman, at a "$25,000 fee" reportedly paid by Parr.

In the years since, violence and corruption have so spread to the national stage as to relegate Parr and Duval to a relatively minor role. In a last futile effort Stevenson did appeal the fraud to the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. But the battle was over, the deal was done. Judge Davidson's views were confirmed. Stevenson's "contest complaint was not considered since it was not presented to the Senate" at the time. And for two very good reasons: "the Senate was not in session," and in a State primary, Washington had no jurisdiction.[20]

More than once in public addresses thereafter Governor Moody boldly charged, in the proper jurisdiction, that "if the district attorney here had done his duty, Lyndon Johnson would now be in the penitentiary instead of the U.S. Senate." And there was no action for a libel.[21]

The profound significance of this remark was, first, that the lawless underworld was in league with the highest echelons of the Federal Government, and second, that fraud and corruption had come to be tolerated if not admired by authority on the State level. In such a climate and environment, the adept Lyndon B. Johnson systematically and securely enhanced his power.

Unresolved, however, were the bitter and ineradicable effects of the steal—albeit validated by Black's nefarious order—upon the minds of Texans. Unsettled yet is the sense of betrayal, the smoldering resentment, and righteous indignation of moral people, which 16 years later still burns with passion in the hearts of thousands of Texans who think that the duty and province of the judiciary is to mete out justice, after full and impartial hearings, rather than, in star chamber proceedings, to serve as a mantle for criminality.

Given a healthy society, the perversion of character in individuals can be contained. But the perversion of justice, with its reaction upon all a country's institutions, has historically placed nations and even civilizations beyond recall.

Times change, but not the motivations of human nature; not the moral and spiritual principles upon which civilized society depends. The celestial spheres sail on in their sure and certain orbits, suggesting something eternal, while America sports and plays on, engrossed with "social progress," and the dirty Duval deal is "past history."

Coke Stevenson, a forgotten man, lives sadly in seclusion on his remote ranch in the hills of Texas. George Parr, citizenship restored by President Truman, flourishes and prospers—still a tremendous political power in south Texas, while the prominent figures who fought him hardest are gone, some having paid with fortune, blood, and life. Justice Black still sits on the Supreme Bench, a leading figure in its steady and unspeakable usurpation of power, while John Connally, Lyndon's righthand man in the Duval steal, is Governor of "the great State of Texas."

And Lyndon Baines Johnson, the master devotee of power and politics as "the art of the possible," is President of the United States at the most critical period in history.

In its incipiency, public sanction of immorality, assassination, and illegitimacy may seem a local if not a minor matter. But the malignancy spreads. What a strange coincidence that Lee Harvey Oswald, on his return from Mexico shortly before the Kennedy assassination, detoured from Laredo to stop and spend the night in "search of a job" at Alice, in Jim Wells County, Tex., before proceeding to Dallas and his worldshocking deed.

All thoughtful men who have read the record of mankind can but stop, ponder, and probably shudder. The judgments now will not be rendered by an impartial judiciary, which is apparently gone. They will be found in the distant verdicts of history, most likely written in red.

---

[1] Dr. S. S. McKay, "Texas and the Fair Deal," 1945–52, give a step-by-step account of this campaign.

[2] Thomas L. Blanton to Lyndon Johnson, Aug. 13, 1948. Johnson declined to answer but since explains, in his authorized biographies, that the President "felt the country could not give all its men to the front-line," and "called all Members of Congress serving in the military to return to Washington." See Leslie Carpenter, "Profile of a President," 1964, p. 27.

[3] See Dallas News, Aug. 22, and the final week of the month, 1948.

[4] The veteran newspaperman and Texas historian, Clyde Wantland, has traced this phase of the campaign in sweeping and devastating detail. I am much indebted to him for his researches. For his fine account, see the Texas Argus, April 1962, San Antonio.

[5] Dr. McKay, "Texas and the Fair Deal," as cited, 240, speaks of Parr as "the ruling power of the 18-county 27th senatorial district.

[6] Wantland, as cited.

[7] James Gardner, Affidavit to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the U.S. Senate, Nov. 12, 1948.

[8] Clyde Wantland, "The Story of George Parr's Ballot Box No. 13," as cited; Josh Groce, ms., 7 pages; Kellis Dibrell and Jas. Gardner to J.E.H., Jan. 6, 9, 1964; Gordon Schendel, "Something is Rotton in the State of Texas," pp. 13–14, Colliers, June 9, 1951.

[9] The author was a delegate to the Democratic Party Convention and a witness of the committee's proceedings. For further details see Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Sept. 14, 1948.

[10] Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Sept. 21, 28, 1948.

[11] Star-Telegram, as cited; *Coke R. Stevenson* v. *Tom L. Tyson*, case 1640, Federal Court records, Northern District of Texas; Wantland, as cited; Dibrell and Gardner to J.E.H., Jan. 9, 1964; C. C. Renfro to J.E.H., Jan. 18, 1964; Coke R. Stevenson to J.E.H., Jan. 5, 1964; McKay, as cited, pp. 238–242.

[12] Star-Telegram, Sept. 21, 1948.

[13] The sturdy and venerable Judge Davidson is still on the Federal bench at Dallas. This incident is taken from Wantland, as cited, and confirmed by others.

[14] William Robert Smith to J.E.H., Jan. 10, 1964; Joseph Montague to J.E.H., Jan. 18, 1964.

[15] W. R. Smith to J.E.H., Jan. 9, 1964; Wantland, as cited.

[16] The high-placed New Deal attorneys, Abe Fortas and Thurman Arnold, along with Charles I. Frances, represented Johnson in Washington. Alvin J. Wirtz was designated his leading attorney in Texas, though John Cofer, who was to represent Johnson in all sorts of business from defending a friend charged with murder to the defense of another named Billy Sol Estes, took the lead in the hearings before Judge Davidson. See Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Sept. 16, 18, and 21, 1948.

[17] Fort Worth Star-Telegram, September 28 and 30, 1948.

[18] Juan Barrera Canate is suspected as the would-be assassin. Capt. Alfred Y. Allee to J.E.H., Feb. 2, 1964.

[19] Judge James K. Evetts to J.E.H., Jan. 14, 1964; Capt. Alfred Y. Alee to J.E.H., Jan. 8, 1964; district court records, Bell County, Sam Smithwick case; Dallas News, Jan. 24, 1950; Gordon Schendel, in Colliers, June 9, 1951, as cited; Coke R. Stevenson to J.E.H., Jan. 5, 1964, Kellis Dibrell, as cited.

[20] Recently, however, the Supreme Court, in its Georgia, Tennessee, Texas, and related cases on congressional redistricting, has swept these constitutional guarantees completely away.

[21] Star-Telegram, Sept. 28, 1948, for the Stevenson remark. The author himself heard Moody repeat this statement.

Appendix

Labor Day Speech by the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on yesterday, Labor Day, the President of United States made an outstanding address in Cadillac Square, Detroit, Mich. I believe the address should be read in full and I ask unanimous consent that the literal transcript of the speech, as given, be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, CADILLAC SQUARE, DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. Barber, Governor and Mrs. Romney, Mayor Cavanaugh, Senator Hart, Senator McNamara, Congressman Staebler, Walter Reuther, Governor Swainson, Secretary Williams, my good friends in the Michigan congressional delegation, my fellow countrymen, this is a great day in a historic place. Here, and today, we begin to move toward new years of achievement for America. Sixteen years ago an American President came here and he promised then that America would "enter a new period of hope." That President was Harry S. Truman.

You gave him support and he gave you that hope. Four years ago another great American stood where I stand today and he said, "Give my your hand * * * and this country can move again." That man was John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

You reached out your hand and America began to move. I have come here today to pledge that if all Americans will stand united we will keep moving. This country is not going to turn its back on the future. This country is not going to turn away from the upward course of prosperity or from the urgent hopes of peace. This country is not going to turn away from the needs of the jobless and the hungry, the poor and the oppressed. This country is not going to turn from unity to hostility, from understanding to hate.

So today I have come here in Cadillac Square to call for national unity. I plead for brotherhood among men and understanding among nations. This is not just a slogan. It is not based on empty hopes or upon remote dreams. It flows from the facts of life in 1964.

I have traveled to every section of this country, I have talked to people in every walk of life. And I have found that most of the American people are united. There are, of course, issues which stir passion and conflicting interests. But most Americans have the same hopes for themselves and their children. They have the same desires for themselves and their country. They know that, for the most part, we no longer struggle among ourselves for a larger share of limited abundance. We labor, instead, to increase the total abundance of us all. Responsible business knows that fair wages are essential to its prosperity. Responsible labor knows that fair profits are essential to rising employment. Farmers and city dwellers, bankers and laborers know that by strengthening each group we strengthen the Nation—by pursuing the growth of all, we advance the welfare of each.

And all of us know that we have a mortal stake in the peace of this world. And that the only real test, the only test that really counts, is what is good for America. And what is good for America is good for all of us.

I want to talk briefly today about three of the goals which are good for America, which reflect the common purpose of most Americans, which are the basis of unity in our country. These are the goal of prosperity, the goal of justice, and the goal of peace.

First, the goal of prosperity. This is the 43d month of the greatest peacetime prosperity in the history of all the United States. The last 4 years, in Michigan alone, unemployment dropped from 10.2 percent to 5.3 percent. The average weekly earnings for manufacturing workers went up 23 percent. A new tax cut will raise personal income by $1½ billion and create 90,000 new jobs. And what is true for Michigan is true for other parts of America. As long as I am President I will lead this country toward increased prosperity. We will continue until every man has a job, and until every family has a decent income. And this is what most Americans want.

The second part of our common purpose is justice. Justice is a country where every man has an equal chance to use his talents, to pursue his desires, and to provide for his family. We seek to give every American, of every race and color, and without regard to how he spells his name, his full constitutional rights under our Constitution and under the laws of the land. We seek to conquer the conditions which condemn millions to hopeless poverty.

We seek to find a job for every man who wants to work. We seek to care for the old through medical care under social security. The jobless with increased unemployment compensation; the oppressed with minimum wage protection. And this is what we think most Americans want.

Third among our common goals is peace. Peace is more than the absence of aggression. It is the creation of a world community in which every nation can follow its own course without fear of its neighbors. In that pursuit we have developed a threefold policy. First, we have built a military strength greater than the world has ever known before. Second, in Cuba and in the waters around Vietnam we proved that we would stand firm in the defense of freedom. And everywhere we have worked to extend the domain of liberty. Third, we patiently labored to open new avenues to peace. The result of these efforts since 1961 is our world of 1964. In this world in which we live today, no nation, new or old, has gone Communist since Cuba went in 1959. In this world the solid unity of communism has begun to crack. We have worked to help the nations of Eastern Europe move toward independence. This is their people's goal and this is our people's continuing resolve.

In this world the influence and the prestige of freedom is on the rise. Hands of friendship have replaced the clenched fists of angry mobs. In this world the strength of freedom is greater and the prospects for peace are brighter.

It is not enough, I think, just to want peace or to talk peace, or to hope for peace. We must constantly work for peace. And I want you to know that today your Government is working for peace. And that is why I, as a Congressman, worked to help pass the Marshall plan. That is why, as a Senator during the Eisenhower administration, I went to the United Nations, at President Eisenhower's request, to urge and to invite all nations of the world to join the United States in the peaceful exploration of outer space.

And that is why, as Vice President of the United States, I worked long and hard for the treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere. We slowed down the deadly poisoning of the air we breathe, and the milk that our children drink. We do not want every mother to live in fear that her baby may be born crippled or deformed. And we, too, must remember that we organized the Peace Corps which started the spirit of America and carried it to remote villages on every continent of the world. And also that is why, as President, I ordered a cutback of unnecessary nuclear production. And that is why I will continue to support every realistic measure that will bring the world closer to peace without increasing the danger to freedom.

Yes, it is men that make peace. Modern weapons are not like any other. In the first nuclear exchange, 100 million Americans and more than 100,000 Russians would all be dead. And when it was over, our great cities would be in ashes, our fields would be barren, our industry would be destroyed, and our American dreams would have vanished.

As long as I am President I will bend every effort to make sure that that day never comes. I am not the first President to speak here in Cadillac Square, and I do not intend to be the last.

Make no mistake. There is no such thing as conventional nuclear weapons. For 19 peril filled years no nation has loosed the atom against another. To do so now is a political decision of the highest order. And it would lead us down an uncertain path of blows and counterblows whose outcome none may know. No President of the United States of America can divest himself of the responsibility for such a decision. Any man who shares control of such enormous power must remember that "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit is better than he that taketh a city."

These common purposes, prosperity, justice and peace, are the foundation of American unity. Our future is almost upon us. Man has never lived in a more exciting time. The world is changing before our eyes. Either we will move to meet these changes or they will overwhelm us. On the one hand is opportunity of shining promise; on the other is a power to destroy the world. Those nations or individuals who seek today to divide us, who preach strife and dissension, and hate and fear, and smear, strike at our hopes and strike at the hopes of all the people of the world.

When I was young, I often walked out after supper and looked up at the scattered Texas sky. As a boy, on those still nights, I wondered what those heavens had seen, what they would see, and what they might bring

to me. The world has turned many times since then, but still in the evening I sometimes walk out and look across the great Capital City where I live, and I dream the same dreams, and I ask the same questions. Just as you do, I sit and think of today's events and tomorrow's problems. I feel glad in my family and concern for my children.

It is then that I remember the men who captured my native soil from the wilderness. They endured much so that others might have much. Their dream was for the children; mine, too, is for the child, even now struggling toward birth.

What will the observing skies say of the world that we have built for him? I want all the ages of man to yield him their promise, the child will find all knowledge open to him; the growing boy will shape his spirit in a house of God and his ways in the house of his family. The young man will find reward for his work and feel pride in the product of his skills. The man will find leisure and occasion for the closeness of family, and an opportunity for the enrichment of life. The citizen will enrich the Nation, sharing its rule, walking its streets, adding his views to its counsel, secure always from the unjust and the arbitrary power of his fellows. The least among us will find contentment, and the best among us will find greatness, and all of us will respect the dignity of the one and admire the achievements of the other.

At the end of the journey, he will look back and say, "I have done all that a man could do, built all, shared all, experienced all." And then people shall say to people, group to group, man to man, "There on this earth as in the eyes of God walks my brother."

Well, this is my dream. It is not the grand vision of a powerful and feared nation. It concerns the simple wants of people. But this is what America is really all about. All the rest, the power and the wealth, the life of freedom and the hopes for peace, the treasured past and the uncertain future—all of this will stand or fall on this. Reality rarely matches dream, but only dreams give nobility to purpose.

This is the star that I hope to follow. This is the star which I know that most of you at some time have seen, and which I first glimpsed many, many years ago, one night out in the West.

United we stand; divided we fall. So today I say to these thousands assembled here, whose only concern is what is best for their country, let us bring the capitalist, the manager, the worker, and the Government to one table to share in the fruits of all of our dreams and all of our work, and let's leave for our children, as we enjoy for ourselves, the greatest country that any man has ever known.

Report of the Committee on Use and Treatment of Saline Waters of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1964

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege earlier this year to be appointed chairman of the Committee on Use and Treatment of Saline Waters of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and to preside at the organizational meeting of this new committee on June 3, 1964. With the water problems of this Nation becoming ever more serious and with more and more conflicts developing in the use of our limited supplies I believe that there is a need for this committee in connection with the activities of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I hope that the committee can make a real contribution in carrying out the purposes and objectives of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

I am including as a part of the remarks the report on the organizational meeting of this new committee:

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON USE AND TREATMENT OF SALINE WATERS

The Committee on Use and Treatment of Saline Waters held its organizational meeting on June 3, 1964, at the Mayflower Hotel. Chairman WAYNE N. ASPINALL called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

First order of business was the rollcall of members. Present at the meeting were the following members of the committee: Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman of the committee and chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, House of Representatives; Mr. W. B. Camp, vice chairman of the committee and president of the W. B. Camp, Inc., Bakersfield, Calif.; Mr. Frank C. DiLuzio, Denver, Colo.; Mr. H. S. Noble, New Caanan, Conn.; Mr. Robert T. Chuck, Honolulu, Hawaii; Mr. Robert M. Williams, Wilmington, N.C.; Mr. Joe D. Carter, Austin, Tex.; Mr. Sidney L. McFarland, Silver Spring, Md. In addition to the members, there were 23 visitors at the meeting from Alabama, California, Florida, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Nebraska, Ohio, Pennsylvania Texas, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Also, Mr. Pat O'Meara, from the Office of Saline Water, Department of the Interior, and Mr. Floyd Reed from the Department of Agriculture were present.

Chairman ASPINALL made an opening statement in which he related the need for this committee to the growing national salinity problem and to the Nation's dwindling water supplies as compared to our estimated future needs for an exploding population and expanding industry and agriculture. He presented a brief history of the saline water conversion program of the Federal Government and gave his ideas of the activities and studies which would be appropriate for the new Committee on Use and Treatment of Saline Waters. He indicated that several subcommittees would be appointed at a later date to look into various aspects of the committee's jurisdiction.

Vice Chairman Camp presented a statement to the committee in which he expressed his view as to the importance to the Nation of finding economical means to treat and use saline water, stating that the Nation eventually would have to depend upon saline water conversion and treatment to meet its needs.

The election of a secretary was held and Mr. Sidney L. McFarland, of Silver Spring, Md., was elected secretary to the committee. Mr. McFarland is staff director of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and consultant to that committee on water matters.

The motion was made and adopted that the committee follow regular rules of procedure and order of business. The chairman stated that business during the year necessarily would have to be conducted, for the most part, by correspondence.

Members of the committee and visitors were recognized for any statements or comments they wished to present to the committee. Several members and visitors spoke on various aspects of the salinity problem and the committee's activities, and out of this discussion came several meritorious suggestions for this committee's consideration.

Mr. Pat O'Meara presented a brief statement on the activities of the Office of Saline Water.

Chairman ASPINALL appointed Vice Chairman Camp, Mr. McFarland, and Mr. Chuck, of Hawaii, to prepare the committee's report for presentation to the present convention and received committee approval of the report with the understanding that it would go only to the committee's organizational meeting and would include no committee recommendations at this time.

The committee adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Dee Summers, National Junior Vice Commander In Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1964

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the people of Idaho were proud to learn that the recent convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars elected Mr. Dee Summers as national junior vice commander in chief.

Mr. Summers is a well-known wheat farmer and cattle rancher at Ririe, Idaho, and has long been active in veteran's and civic activities.

If the usual succession is followed, Mr. Summers will be national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in 1966. I ask unanimous consent that a biographical sketch of this outstanding citizen of Idaho be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

DEE SUMMERS BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Dee Summers was born in Ririe, Idaho, July 30, 1924. His wife is the former Rita Hunter. His three sons are Craig, age 15, Jeff, age 11, and Kirk, age 7.

He completed elementary schools in Ririe, attended Ricks College, Rexburg, Idaho, and Utah State University with a business administration major.

He was a Marine Corp. NCO tank commander and gunner with the 22d Marine Regiment and 6th U.S. Marine Division with combat service throughout the South Pacific. He was awarded two Presidential Unit Citations, the Navy Unit Commendation, and two battle stars for his Asiatic Pacific campaigns. Combat wounds caused 6 months hospitalization and honorable discharge with a Purple Heart Award.

Dee Summers joined VFW Post 1004, Rigby, Idaho, in 1946 and began an illustrous career. His unprecedented enthusiasm for post programs made him a draft choice for post office, which placed him in all of the chair offices where he served full terms. He was elected district commander by acclamation and became the popular candidate for all chair offices in the department. He served with distinction as department commander in 1955–56 and was awarded the highly coveted "Mr. VFW" plague the following year. Summers has a conspicuous record of exceeding all previous membership records during his respective years in respective offices.

He was elected a national council member for District 16 (Washington, Montana,

Idaho) for 1950–60. Following his election to vice chairman of the western conference, he was appointed to the national legislative committee. He was subsequently elected chairman of the western conference. In 1962 he completed a term on the national loyalty day committee and immediately accepted an invitation to become national chief of staff to commander in chief, Byron B. Gentry. He was a member of the board of directors for the National VFW Convention Corp. for the 1963 convention in Seattle, Wash. He currently functions as vice chairman of the national security committee.

Summers is serving in his 8th year as a member of the exclusive 5-man State of Idaho, Veterans Affairs Commission, where he distinguished himself with his leadership in obtaining State legislation which provided funds for a new State veterans home.

In his community, he is a prominent civic figure, serving as an active member of the school board and an aggressive participant on the independent committee for better schools, as well as being a school trustee.

Summers has spent the greater part of his life as a salesman, which includes several years as a sales manager for a large retail chain store and as an insurance agent.

At home Dee is engaged in wheat farming and raising purebred cattle. His operation extends into two counties in southeastern Idaho. Other of his organization memberships include, the M.O.C., American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, parent teachers' association, Pacific Producers Co-op, Ririe Grain Growers, American Hereford Association, Farm Bureau, and a past presidency of Club 548 Toastmasters International.

Convention Arrangements Inefficient "Nightmare"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Betty Beale, a Washington Star staff writer, wrote the following column, which was published in the Sunday Star of September 6, which is a very interesting analysis of the Democratic Convention.

CONVENTION ARRANGEMENTS INEFFICIENT "NIGHTMARE"

(By Betty Beale)

Following the greatest reportage of soft news in the history of mankind—i.e., the coverage of the Democratic National Convention of 1964—most of the Washington press corps and the people they write about have virtually lain inert for the past week.

Those who could summon the strength after the ghastly experience of that hideous week in Atlantic City have called at a friend's house or sat by a pool in a motionless state of utter exhaustion. They have remained in that state, that is, until some blithe, unknowing friend sailed in and exclaimed, "Do tell me all, my dear. Was it fun at the convention?" Thereupon has burst forth the pent-up protests against the greatest outrages ever perpetrated on the politically active.

Politically, the convention was a masterpiece of masterminding by Lyndon Johnson that produced the greatest harmony of any Democratic Convention in a quarter of a century. Socially, it offered the most crowded calendar of diverse get-togethers listed at any political conclave. But, logistically, it was a mountain of inefficiency.

Unless Mr. Johnson can rid his organization of the inefficiency that made the convention an arrangements nightmare, he may well lose in November.

Who was it who hung the movie screen in the convention hall in a deeply recessed niche instead of flush with the wall so that ssome 50 percent of the people present, including occupants of the President's box, the Cabinet, and "honored guests" never saw a single film?

Who was it who told people to get their credentials Monday morning at a desk just inside the front entrance to the hall, then told New Jersey police not to let anyone through the front entrance who didn't have credentials?

Who was it who told New Jersey police to arbitrarily close the door to the convention hall ballroom on invited guests the night of the President's birthday ball, then stand inside the closed door so the guests had no one to appeal to? Two specially invited guests, Minnesota Gov. Karl Rolvaag, a close friend of the vice presidential nominee, and teenager David Betz, a boyfriend of Luci Johnson's, plus uniformed Ladies for Lyndon who were supposed to be working inside, were among the crowd crushed against the door banging on it in vain for 40 minutes. The Governor finally left in disgust and when the rest were eventually permitted in they found a mere handful of people left. There is no explainable reason why one or two experienced members of the National Committee couldn't have been posted at the door to at least identify VIP's.

Who ordered every entrance closed Wednesday evening so that neither delegates, nor press nor honored guests—all wearing their proper credentials—could get into the hall? Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island, who was chairman of a committee caucusing at the moment, pleaded with the policemen in vain. Some of the press walked blocks that night trying every entrance in frustrated fatigue until someone on the National Committee finally came to the rescue.

We who complained at the GOP convention about the stupidity of building the typewriter tables in the press section too high for typewriters; about the failure of the public relations section to supply the latest information; about the rudeness of most of the assistant sergeant at arms or ushers; about the strong arm protection around Peggy Goldwater—little knew what was in store for us. The list of obstacles to convenience in Atlantic City goes on and on without even touching on the horror of some accommodations. The best true tale in this department concerns that ill-housed California delegate who called the hotel desk to complain about the plaster falling from the ceiling onto his bed, only to get the unsympathetic reply: "Why don't you move your bed?"

The one improvement of the Democratic over the Republican convention was maneuvered by Elizabeth Carpenter, Mrs. Johnson's press secretary. For the first time in this correspondent's experience, the 10 or so newswomen covering the No. 1 lady's every move were provided with seats adjacent to her box. And when her husband's name was placed in nomination and the hall broke into a demonstration, Mrs. Carpenter made it possible for all of them to enter Mrs. Johnson's box and get her reaction, without, as heretofore, having to push, or trample over bodies like feminine Tarzans.

It is perfectly obvious that John Kennedy had never been to Atlantic City when he chose it. The announced reason for going there was the city's offer of $625,00 to the party's coffers. The unannounced reason was that there was no danger of race trouble there because Negroes get treated the same way as whites. Whatever the deciding reason, it was too late to change the site when Lyndon Johnson became President.

To my way of thinking, the ideal convention city for political parties is Chicago. Even if it wouldn't offer a sum to entice them there, both parties ought to beg Chicago for the privilege. In addition to A–1 hotel accommodations, it has the marvelous new convention hall, McCormick Place, right on the lake front and boasting the last word in equipment for television, graceful dining, comfortable seating, etc. It is President Johnson's favorite convention place, so maybe the next Democratic Convention will once again be fun.

Lady Bird Johnson was more upset on her father's account than her own by the cover article in Time. The late Thomas J. Taylor II was represented as a scrooge in it, whereas Mrs. Johnson said he was a kind and generous man who lent money to down-and-out neighbors knowing they couldn't pay him back. Said Liz Carpenter, "I am constantly taking people of all races through the White House who tell me they were given their education by Mr. Taylor."

When HUBERT HUMPHREY was selected as the running mate for Lyndon Johnson, the Democrats were assured leadership by the best dancing pair in party history. The President's love of dancing is now legend, and Muriel Humphrey says that when she married HUBERT in 1936 he was the best dancer in town.

HUBERT, the liberal, is also less conservative on the ballroom floor than his chief, who is a quietier, smoother foxtrotter. The Minnesota Senator's effervescent spirits may even be expressed in the jitterbug if the rhythm calls for it.

Having danced with both gentlemen, this writer can truthfully say that rarely has she encountered two men who were so nimble both in the head and the feet.

Elliott Roosevelt's wife Patty recounted later midst chuckles the night at the Democratic Convention when a secret serviceman pulled a gun on her. She was standing in the VIP lounge when she suddenly saw Mrs. Johnson and the two girls whip by the door. The bubbling Patty was dashing forward as fast as a bullet with a big, "Hello, Mrs. Johnson," when suddenly she was looking at the nozzle of a pistol.

A new fad turned up in Atlantic City—an "inoculated orange." That's a whole orange liberally injected with hypodermics of vodka.

Economic Expansion: Arkansas' Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1964

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there recently came to my attention an address delivered by Frank Whitbeck, the president of American Foundation Life Insurance Co. of Little Rock, Ark., entitled "Economic Expansion: Arkansas' Challenge."

Mr. Whitbeck, who is a member of the Arkansas Economic Expansion Study Commission, a leading businessman in my State, and an old friend of mine, has quite succinctly stated the challenges which face the people of my State in building our economy. In a larger sense it is a dissertation on the problems which confront all of the areas of America that are working to achieve balanced and sound economies. I commend it to my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent

that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

ECONOMIC EXPANSION: ARKANSAS' CHALLENGE

(By Frank Whitbeck)

(NOTE.—These remarks constitute the personal observations and opinions of the author only, and as such do not directly or indirectly reflect or infer the opinions or possible final conclusions of the Arkansas Economic Expansion Study Commission.)

Much has been said about the dramatic industrial growth in Arkansas during the past decade—new industries, new jobs, new businesses, new farming and forestry techniques—but very little has been published which relates the overall economic advancement in our State to national growth.

While in retrospect we seem to have made tremendous gains in terms of pure economic growth, still we are falling behind national levels, and economists predict that unless we do something about it, we will continue to fall behind for some time to come.

As an example, consider our situation on the very yardstick we use to measure economic growth—changes in per capita incomes. Over the past 15 years our per capita incomes in Arkansas have increased faster than that of the Nation as a whole—about 5.3 percent for Arkansas, and 4.4 percent for the United States. This pleasant statistic loses its luster, however, when we look at what it means in cold, hard dollars. Each Arkansan had $845 less income last year than his national counterpart, and even with the favorable 5.3 percent rate of increase, the gap between per capita incomes in Arkansas and the Nation as a whole will grow larger until in 1992 there will be a $1,324 income difference per person—man, woman, and child. After that the difference will get smaller, and finally catch up in the year 2032—68 years hence.

If this outlook is too unpleasant, we can look at a shorter, though less reliable, period of time. We have done much better since 1960, comparatively, and if we could keep up this fierce pace, we will be able to catch up by 1980, 15 years from now.

We have billed our State as "The Land of Opportunity," yet, unfortunately, we have not been able to create a climate of opportunity for everyone. For example, it would appear that we have exported great segments of our future—our trained and energetic youth. About 50 percent of all our college graduates for the last 10 years migrated to other States. Even with some replacement by in-migrants we netted out losing over 40 percent of the total. And many of the most expensive ones left Arkansas—the engineers, the mathematicians, the graduate students.

Be that as it may, those of us who have established businesses know better than anyone else that we cannot build a solid future solely on the offspring of an affluent or propertied class, whose children stay at home by reason of prestige or inheritance. Civilization, as well as business, is advanced on the bellies of the hungry—by men who want to achieve bad enough. Call it desire, call it economic or social or political hunger, call it an ambitious, energetic middle class, call it what you will. Fortunately for society, some individuals seem to make their own opportunities and, in turn, create opportunities for the many others.

With the idea that more could be done to develop Arkansas, the last legislature set up an Economic Expansion Study Commission, and charged it with the responsibility to investigate all facets of our economic life, in all areas of the State, and to report its findings plus recommendations to the Governor and the legislature by October 1, 1964.

It has been my pleasure to serve on this 11-man commission with your fellow townsman, Mr. Lee Roy Beasley. Ours has been an exciting, interesting, informative assignment. We are grateful to many of you who have contributed your time and ideas to the work of the commission, but we would hope that every businessman, every laborer, every individual who loves his State would also have an opportunity to see Arkansas as we have seen it.

Our potential for economic growth in Arkansas is theoretically unlimited, but also we must recognize that we have been limited and are limited by the literal interpretations we give to many of our corporate needs.

Particularly, we find ourselves with many desires, many needs, but with few definite goals, and no time schedule to reach them. It can be very dangerous to measure progress only ex-post, because every little increase is positive. We strive for goals, and privately we measure ourselves by our approach toward them. I would submit that we need identifiable, attainable goals if we are to succeed in developing this State.

Consider some of the problems and challenges we share here in Arkansas:

Education: Time and again we have all said that Arkansas' most important resource is its people. We do have some of the finest people in America living in Arkansas and these fine people live in every section of every county of our State. It was interesting to note last spring that the roster of Phi Beta Kappa nominees at the University of Arkansas included scholars from hamlets so small that their counties had to be identified. Big city school systems have no monopoly on candidates for Phi Beta Kappa; talent is everywhere. So, obviously, the greatest challenge we face today is to tap that talent and use it for the development of our State.

It is admitted that education is both a cost and a burden to the public, but education is also an investment which pays handsome dividends to both the individual and to the State. How do we upgrade education in Arkansas and how do we hang on to the dropouts?

One thing we should consider is the reorganization of inferior school districts. There are 90 senior high schools in Arkansas operating in districts which enroll fewer than 150 pupils from grades 1 through 12. In these same schools there are only 3,500 pupils in grades 10, 11, and 12.

There is a school district adjoining El Dorado which, I daresay, could buy all its seniors individual new automobiles this year and send them to El Dorado High School cheaper than their present facility can be run. And yet, for some reason, we have instilled in our minds that the sacred symbol of democracy is the little red schoolhouse, still training our children in almost 19th century methods, but turning them out to face 20th century responsibilities.

Reasonable standards have been developed to determine the necessary changes needed for an adequate school system. We should get on with it—and set a target date for its completion. And we must coordinate, cooperate, and consolidate to save unnecessary waste—because good education is an expensive business. As of last year, at the State level alone, it would have taken another $19 million to have raised us to the national level of per capita expenditures for education.

In the area of satisfactory salaries for teachers, we have made some progress but we haven't made enough. It isn't for me to outline to you what the salary goal should be, but I do believe the salary should be high enough not only to reward those qualified teachers now in our system, but to set such high standards and minimum incomes that we retain our new teachers for the future. The difficulty today is that our young, new teachers are going outside the State for employment where the salaries are higher and the working conditions generally superior.

This year there are 515 senior high schools in Arkansas, but only 144 of these are accredited by the North Central Association. This means that 72 percent of all our senior high schools are accredited only at the State level. We are today spending $150 per child below the national average, but it will be up to you and the people you can influence to say how fast we should attempt to achieve the national average.

Why are we weak and what is the problem? One thing that is quite evident is that it is not because we are poor.

We may as well face it. Some of our communities just don't want to assess their property up to the 20-percent minimum program which was launched in 1955. We have land being offered for sale at $55,000 an acre that is assessed at comparatively peanuts. We have plantations that are quite valuable that are assessed at $25 an acre or less. Our urban areas have unplatted pieces of land that are being treated as county farm property which do not bear their true tax burden in comparison with other adjoining properties. While we are required by law to assess all stocks, bonds, cash, jewelry, and other valuable items, we collectively ignore this statute as not even being a part of the law.

In spite of these inequities, however, I am not one who wants to raise sums for education just for the sake of raising sums. I think in many instances, especially in higher education, we have built better campuses than we have faculties. We have better student unions that we have teachers in our classrooms. We have better libraries than we have professors who have contributed lasting works to those libraries. And we have fallen short in creating a climate of academic freedom; in fact, in many instances we have seen almost deliberate intimidation, putting some of our brightest minds out to pasture if they don't agree with us.

If we really want our people better educated, what price will we pay for that education? And in which generation? The one we live in? Or the one our children will live in, or our grandchildren?

County and city government: Urbanization is on the move in Arkansas just as it is in every other State, but in Arkansas our cities are hamstrung for growth and are as poverty stricken as Appalachia. Little Rock is a prime example: largest city in the State; a city government that literally has to beg for enough revenue to provide minimum services; a city growing larger by the year, a county responsibility growing smaller, with turnback funds from the State that are smaller to the city, larger to the county. These inequities in civil administration must be looked at realistically if we are to expand our economy.

We must also look realistically at our county government and see what that unit of government can best do for the people. The county unit is a small state because it performs many of the functions of the State, affecting elections, roads, penal institutions, courts, and so on, all prescribed by the constitution. But the county has additional functions—administrative, libraries, public health, to name a few. It has been suggested that we need to consolidate counties. I don't know that that is the real answer, but it seems to me that there are certain functions among counties that can be consolidated.

Under our present system, we have 50,000 miles of local highways in this State, administered by 75 separate county highway departments, not including municipal units. Many of these departments do not have enough funds to function 12 months a year, but all of them have all sorts of expensive equipment they cannot put to full use. Can we envision one local highway maintenance region incorporating Union, Ouachita, and Columbia Counties, utilizing one central purchasing agency, utilizing one resi-

dent engineer, and only that equipment which is absolutely needed and can be used?

Can we envision that our county judge or our county president or county major (or whatever we call him) should be bonded just as you are bonded in your business? Today the county judge has taxing power, disbursing power, judicial power. Because of his judicial power he cannot be bonded. In our advanced system of business, no one man should be forced to handle all these functions. Thus, in the name of good administration, the functions need to be separated and separately administered.

The judicial function belongs in the constituted courts. The absurdity of bastardy proceedings before a county judge has probably reached its height of judicial mockery in my own county, where parentage is now determined by comparison of ears. And I think this exaggerated course of judgment has been deliberately taken to attempt to awaken the the public that this judicial function is not properly a function of our county executive. His is an administrative function, not judicial.

It is possible also that our cities can pool resources, that our counties can pool resources on roads, prison systems, police, libraries, public health, fire protection, water sewage, parks. This, of course, does not mean that cities and counties would lose their historical territorial jurisdiction. You have seen cities within cities, even counties within cities in many highly urbanized areas in which certain public services are pooled for better administration, less expensive operation.

Agriculture and forestry: It is estimated that the minimum investment needed to farm today is $125,000. And for the average man to secure a crop loan, he must farm a basic 100 acres of cotton. There are many fields in this State where the crop is raised and no human hand has ever touched it. Where is the small farmer in our economy of tomorrow?

What we can do about land utilization in Arkansas is a challenge of the future. The challenge of what we're going to do with the farming family versus big farming, the types of crops that will be needed in the future and where they will be raised. Perhaps we've done more research in farming than any other branch of our economy, but more research is needed to be done, because farming in Arkansas today is in the midst of a mechanical revolution. Many large but efficient operators rent land and don't own a piece of it—only equipment—just as you and I rent space in an office building. These men are skilled operators, they know their business, and they're greatly in demand, as they would be in any other enterprise. A great source of farm wealth rests with these professional farm operators. The State is logically their research and development agency.

Also, we observe that the groundhog sawmill is gone, that the challenge today is to utilize all of the log, the slab lumber, the trimmings, the sawdust, for mechanization has moved in. Some shops are now operating on what used to be burned up, but one of the great challenges we face is that we are now producing more timber than we can consume. An even greater challenge is for us to keep the small lumber manufacturer from becoming, as one keen observer put it, "a sharecropper of the very large manufacturer and the labor unions."

In one county of our State there were 25,000 residents in 1950. It was then half delta and half hills. Today there are only 15,000 populating that county and 51 percent of the land is now in pine timber. A man comes to us and says, "I am a merchant and what is it that is happening to me?"

Is it a problem that big ownership of land is in the hands of a few people? Who controls our destiny?

The picture changes also in Union County. Once there were seven cotton gins, now only one. It used to take 20 to 25 men to run a sawmill, now it takes 3 to 6. We jumped in and bought up marginal land; we reforested it and we overproduced. At the World's Fair in New York you will see a home made almost entirely of plastic, no wood. Do we get caught with wood as we did with cotton and wool when the synthetic fibers took over?

Our challenge here is research and development as we have never had it before. Not how to plant more trees or grow more forests, but what to do with the wood once we have produced it. * * * as finding new uses for building materials and in areas of marketing where we are weak.

Capital formation: In all of the hearings before our Commission we have not found a shortage of investment capital at some price. The price varies. There's more competition today in Arkansas in first mortgage lending, for example, than ever before in my experience. Few communities have turned down the assistance granted under acts 404, 9, and amendment 49. The first Arkansas Development Corp., which was organized to help push business in risk areas, has had such good business it has had little or no loss; and the success of its loan portfolio would be flattering to most financial institutions.

But we have been accused here in Arkansas of helping competitors to tax-free plants, who in turn buy their own tax-exempt bonds, and that we have ignored the people who stay and pay, the plants, and businesses who pay taxes, who support the schools, who run the communities.

A plea is heard—"What are you doing to help local business to gain more stature?" This is a field that's very dear to my heart because I, too, organized a business in Arkansas and I assumed the risk, alone at one time, spread it to others later, but still had the responsibility of making the business click and to run fast enough to gain strength and profits, so that the personnel so desperately needed to give the business full life could be adequately compensated and retained. No subsidy, no tax-free building, no support from the community; yet the locus of that business is Arkansas, the headquarters is Arkansas, the first thoughts of that business is Arkansas.

I will walk the extra mile with you to get business and new industry from without this State; but I am reminded that what finally builds El Dorado are the businesses that are domiciled here, and not those who have their headquarters beyond our borders.

So the question comes up—"What can we do to assist the business that is already established, how can we help it to greater growth and profit?" I don't know the full answer to that question, but I do feel, in fairness, that home-grown industries are due every consideration, equal to if not more than our brethren from outside the State who want to move here and compete with us for the same markets.

When our Arkansas communities authorize millions of tax-free bonds for the building of a new industry, our school districts suffer. Under the tax-free status, it is questionable that there will be any return to the local school system. Those who have been interested in schools have questioned this method of economic and industrial expansion, because indirectly it is affecting our schools. This is obviously a big problem, for on the one hand we want the industry, and on the other hand we want to protect things that are dear to us that give us the continuous ability to expand economically.

Is there some way, somehow, that we could set up an insurance fund to underwrite the risky business? I doubt that any public institution is big enough to underwrite all failures. In our capitalistic free enterprise system, the weak in business perish. This has always been so. But if an industry that needed expansion capital were screened by some well-staffed superagency, an agency which impartially determined that the applicant industry had a chance for survival, then an insurance fund could be set up. We're doing the same thing today on mortgage loans through the FHA. And we're doing the same thing through our banks with the FDIC, and in our savings and loan associations. Yes, there is a basis on which this could be determined, and we hope one day to have it off the drawing boards and in your hands.

State debt: We have all been reared on the admonition that debt is an evil. We have survived in our personal lives because of this. We have made our businesses successful because of this. But we have also attempted to apply the same rule to elements of government and we have faced a dilemma. We have faced a dilemma because on the one hand we have a taxing power in government and we also have a spending power. In government we usually consider everything we gain from taxes and everything we spend to balance each other and dissolve into nothing, which means that we usually do not give ourselves credit for having produced additional wealth or new capital with our taxing and spending powers. We do not run our businesses this way, for we capitalize every asset in preparing our balance sheet.

What price have we put on our public roads, on our public institutions, on the public plants that we have built in which to perform services? What capitalization have we put on our taxing power? Have you ever considered the value of the total wealth in property alone that is owned by your State government—in roads, buildings, parks, etc.? I imagine that $2 billion would be a small estimate. An additional asset is the taxing power, the income power that we have generated, and an even greater asset is the population of our State, 2 million strong. These are our assets.

What are our liabilities? On paper, our only State liabilities are about $50 million of highway bonds. Do you know how much money we have in the bank? On May 22, Deputy Treasurer Robert L. Mack wrote me that there was over $52,612,541.16 on deposit. Now, naturally, we have running accounts and we have obligations that are coming up every day that need to be paid, but we also have income, and about $15 million more of that than was anticipated thus far in 1964.

Another interesting item in Mr. Mack's letter indicates that if we had gotten a reasonable return on the State's dormant bank accounts during the past 10 years, assuming the same level of deposit, we would have an additional $5 to $8 million in our State treasury today. Our challenge as businessmen is to face up to our needs and to look at our assets and liabilities realistically.

If we were completely debt free, would we be any better off? We might be worse off, because we would not be hungry any more. So your challenge may be to reach out for more public debt and with this debt to create capital improvements which generate wealth and jobs. This is our challenge to advance Arkansas a whole generation, for by reaching out we would accelerate tax income, thereby repaying principal and interest * * * thereafter, the turnover would multiply. The Federal Government used this same technique in the tax cut this year.

If we can overcome waste, each dollar saved means $1 less of State debt. But it is also obvious that we cannot do the full job in research and development, and at the same time create new jobs solely through increments in present State revenues. Therefore, we must reach out for additional capital which means additional public debt.

The question is, what do you want? What is your objective? What should be our State objective? How can we define it?

Our challenge today is to define our goal, for if we can define a burning, longed-for goal, the means to attain that goal will be found. And, once defined, then a time schedule to reach it must be established.

Are we imaginative enough to think ahead a decade, a generation? If we are, Arkansas' future can be much brighter. If we are not, we must content ourselves to fall behind in the economic expansion race.

The final question is, Do we really have the luxury of a choice?

Peter Steenhusen Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I take leave to include a letter to me from the Honorable Peter Steenhusen, a former member of the Iowa House of Representatives, and a Democrat who puts country before party, and who shoots straight from the shoulder, that thousands may read and ponder.

The full text of his letter follows:

IRWIN, IOWA,
September 3, 1964.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: I thank you for the two books containing hearings conducted by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I also asked you in my first letter to give me the name and address of the man who is in charge of the committee in case I want to continue my correspondence on subsidizing these magazines. You failed to do this; please give me the information at your earliest convenience. Thanks.

I also want the names and addresses of those to whom I should write, in regards to the labor unions, who certainly have gotten clear out of hand, and have the people of the United States feeling that the unions are running our Government, and will wreck our economy if something isn't done at once to put them in their place. I have been a hardware dealer all my life, and during the past 10 or 15 years, there has been a price rise on practically everything I sell, usually once a year and on some items a price rise has happened twice a year. There is no legitimate reason for this unfair practice at all, and it is all because of the unions. The unions always use the old alibi, cost of living has gone up, so we need to strike and get more money for our workers. The people are not so dumb and would not believe such a thing. The reason and only reason if the cost of living had gone up would be because the unions have struck for higher wages and less hours. I am going to give you one example of the experience I have daily and have had for the past 10 years and it is very discouraging and makes one feel he wants to get out of business.

Example—Customer came in and wanted a pair of 12-inch hinges, the cost to customer is $4 a pair. Customer about hits the ceiling, does a lot of cussing and snorting, of which I hear nearly every day, because the prices are too high. All I can say to customer is that I agree with him and also tell him that as long as the big labor unions are in the driver's seat, prices rise on everything the farmer needs to buy and will continue to go up. Now the 12-inch hinge happens to be a slow turnover item, so I tell my customer that I have had these larger hinges in stock for probably 2 years or possibly 3, and he is getting them for at least $1 less than what today's price should be, well he finally takes the hinges. So I reorder the hinges for stock, and the hinges hadn't gone up $1 per pair, but $1.50 a pair, or an advance or 10 to 15 percent a year.

Another thing, big business is getting bigger, and the small getting smaller and finally extinct. This is bad for our country, and why isn't something being done about it?

Why does General Motors need to make the outrageous profits, why don't the Government make them pay more taxes and they would be satisfied with less profits and sell their cars for a lot less and in turn would help the people.

The G.M. surely are smart enough to realize that when they make these enormous profits, that this is the thing that causes the labor unions to continue their demands for higher wages, as they want some more of this easy money the General Motors are squeezing out of the general public. All big businesses are as guilty of this as General Motors. To me it looks like the United States is full of Communist inspired people who are working tooth and toe nail to soften us up to the extent where Communists can take over easily.

Yours truly,

PETER STEENHUSEN.

Conservation Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, when the 88th Congress adjourns, it will have established an amazing record of accomplishment in many fields; but we can take special pride in what has been accomplished by this Congress in the interests of the conservation of natural resources. Several new national parks have been established, the land and water conservation fund has been established, and a wilderness preservation system has been established. This record of accomplishment was noted by the Washington Post in an editorial of September 4, 1964, which stated:

The present session has earned the title of "Conservation Congress."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

CONSERVATION CONGRESS

President Johnson's compliments to Congress as he signed the wilderness and land and water conservation bills yesterday were well merited. The present session has earned the title of "Conservation Congress." Both of the bills that the President signed yesterday mark important milestones in the struggle to save what is best in our natural environment. The wilderness bill will afford additional protection to 9.2 million acres of unspoiled wilds and open the door to extension of this system. The other bill is designed to create a $2 billion fund over a 10-year period for the acquisition and protection of lands that are needed for the anticipated great expansion of outdoor recreation.

In addition, the President noted, the 83th Congress has approved the Ozark Rivers National Riverway bill, the Fire Island National Seashore bill, and the Canyon Lands National Park bill. This is an impressive record. If every Congress would do as well, the country would have less cause for concern about its national heritage.

Conservation will inevitably become more essential with each passing decade. During the last two centuries nearly all of our energy has gone into the exploitation of a rich continent, with relatively little thought of the future. Now some precious resources have been exhausted and others gravely depleted. Some of the natural beauty of the land has been defaced or destroyed. With our population now building up toward the 200-million mark and with prospects of doubling by the turn of the century, conservation of what is left becomes a first imperative.

The continent itself cannot be expanded, but no end is in sight to the expanding demands upon it. Men cannot continue to poison and despoil their environment without repeating disaster. At some period soon the efforts that go into conservation should match those that are devoted to exploitation. The record of the present Congress should become not just another spurt of conscience but rather the beginning of a consistent and permanent policy of national stewardship.

Lyndon Johnson on Rights, Law and Order, and Beer Bottles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article from the February 11, 1959, issue of the Washington Post, by Aubrey Graves, where it describes the methods Lyndon Johnson would use, as the headline indicates, to defend certain "rights." Perhaps during the course of the campaign, President Johnson will give the Nation a lecture on law and order and the use of beer bottles in the manly art of self-defense.

The article follows:

DEFEND ELECTRIC RIGHTS, JOHNSON URGES FARMERS

(By Aubrey Graves)

Pledging full support to their cause, Senator Lyndon Johnson, Democrat, of Texas, urged members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association yesterday to "fight with beer bottles," if necessary, to keep advantages they now enjoy under the law.

These advantages include the right to borrow Federal money on long-term loans at 2-percent interest—less than the Government has to pay for money it borrows.

An administration spokesman on Monday told 7,000 NRECA delegates in convention at the armory here that, after 24 years of Government aid, and with 95 percent of the Nation's farms electrified, the rural power movement should now stand on its own feet.

The President, scheduled to explain his views in person at the convention today, wants Congress to boost the interest rate to

more than 4 percent. He also believes the cooperatives should go to private sources for some of their money.

"This is a battle for your very existence," Johnson said yesterday. He predicted, however, that Congress would defeat the administration proposals.

"We are not going to raise the interest rate," Johnson declared. "We are not going to require you to go to Wall Street for your money, and we are going to pass a bill by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, that will give back to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration the authority to pass on loans."

The Secretary of Agriculture now has veto power over loans.

Mr. Speaker, what are some of those "advantages" Lyndon Johnson talked about? Under unanimous consent, I include excerpts from recent speeches of Norman Clapp, Administrator of the REA, which clarify the meaning of Johnson's remarks.

The excerpts follow:

REMARKS OF NORMAN M. CLAPP, ADMINISTRATOR, REA, AT THE 14TH ANNUAL REA GENERATING CONFERENCE, HOT SPRINGS, ARK., MAY 20, 1963

In organizing their own rural service rural people recognized that they were facing tough problems and they found in the REA program special equalizers to offset these higher costs.

One of these equalizers is the authorization in the Rural Electrification Act under which REA can make loans for generation and transmission purposes. This authorization has proven its value from its earliest applications, both as a bargaining tool in negotiating realistic power rates from the commercial companies, and where necessary, to actually finance new generation and transmission facilities.

When we talk of 2-percent loans, let us not overlook the fact that another of these equalizers has been supplied by the rural people themselves in the non-profit operation of the cooperative systems they have built. By organizing into cooperatives they have voluntarily waived the normal claim to a return from their investment, except in terms of lower cost service. The capital they contribute to the growing financial equity in their systems does not draw interest at 6 percent, nor even at 2 percent; it pays zero percent.

REMARKS OF NORMAN M. CLAPP, ADMINISTRATOR, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION, AT GROUND BREAKING CEREMONIES, BASIN ELECTRIC POWER COOPERATIVE, STANTON, N. DAK., JUNE 22, 1963

Under such conditions, rural electric cooperatives have to use such available "equalizers" as long-term, 2-percent REA loans if they are to provide any possible approach to parity of electric service in rural areas.

Two-percent loans are not the only "equalizers" necessary for rural electrification. One of the greatest equalizers arises from the willingness of co-op members to participate in enterprises which operate on a nonprofit basis. By forming themselves into cooperatives, member-owners have waived all rights to the normal claims to profits of ordinary electric corporations.

Another equalizer is found in the technical assistance provided by REA. Perhaps the most dramatic result from this assistance has been demonstrated by the standardization of design and construction, pioneered by REA, in the electric industry.

The final major equalizer designed to help overcome the high cost of rural electric service is the REA-financed generating and transmission program.

STATEMENT OF NORMAN M. CLAPP, ADMINISTRATOR, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE DAIRYLAND POWER COOPERATIVE ANNUAL MEETING, LA CROSSE, WIS., JUNE 3, 1964

To help overcome these handicaps, a number of equalizers were written into the REA program, including long-term, low-cost loans; encouragement of nonprofit modes of operation; and technical assistance from REA.

Mr. Speaker, you can also add the special postal rates for statewide NRECA associations. I might mention a number of Members of the House and Senate on both sides of the aisle have introduced bills as "equalizers" to offset some of these "advantages"; so, I suppose, after reviewing the words of Lyndon Johnson, we can expect some NRECA member to come raging into our offices with a broken beer bottle to "defend" himself.

Creed Black Resignation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting and objective report by Ben H. Bagdikian in the summer 1964 issue of the Columbia Journalism Review details the experiences which led Creed Black to resign as vice president and executive editor of the Morning News and the Evening Journal in Wilmington, Del. The report is an excellent example of the problems faced by many highly principled working newsmen.

Following is the article:

CASE HISTORY: WILMINGTON'S "INDEPENDENT" NEWSPAPERS

(By Ben H. Bagdikian)

The Wilmington, Del., newspaper, the Morning News and the Evening Journal, are, according to a standing editorial masthead, "independent" newspapers. A formal resolution issued by their owners on April 13, 1936, and presumably still in force, instructs the editors that the policy of the paper is, among other things, to "avoid blind partisanship * * * never to misrepresent the facts either in their news or editorial columns; never to resort to suppression except for the public good * * * always to give all sides a fair hearing on all public questions."

In this the two papers are no different from hundreds of others across the United States that also call themselves "independent" and solemnly declare that their owners insist on editorial freedom and want no fiddling with the news. As in Wilmington, their owners don't really mean it, or else the words mean one thing to editors and something else to owners.

Creed Black is an intense Kentuckian, 39 years old, with reportorial and editorial experence on Stars and Stripes, the Chicago Sun, the Chicago Herald-American, the Nashville Tennessean, and the Savannah News-Press. He seldom turns his back on a controversy ("I don't mind a fight") and until June 1 of this year was vice president and executive editor of the two Wilmington papers.

Black's departure from Wilmington is not unusual in the tribulations of the trade—it was an enactment of a ritual that goes on through American newspaperdom with all the unhappy regularity of Aztec sacrifices; and if some way is not found to end this combat the free-enterprise press could go the way of the Aztecs. For what Creed Black did overtly goes on silently and secretly in editorial offices and board rooms all over the country, in election years more than ever.

The owner of the two Wilmington papers is the Du Pont Co., which is to Delaware what God is to Heaven. More precisely, the owner is the Christiana Securities Co., a holding company that is to Du Pont what the church is to God. Christiana was formed in pre-World War I days to buy out a faction of Du Ponts during one of the bitter family feuds. It now owns 27 percent of the Du Pont Co. and all the stock of the News-Journal Co., which, with the exception of a paper of 13,600 circulation in Dover, publishes the only dailies in Delaware.

The Du Pont Co. is run by an executive committee of nine men, called the ExComm. The Du Pont family interest in the company and other concerns is exercised through Christiana, whose ruling group has some seats in ExComm. There is a single room on the ninth floor of the Du Pont Building in Wilmington where the secretary of Christiana can cast one ballot to constitute a "stockholders' meeting" of the News-Journal Co.

The News-Journal Co. has a board of directors of 10 men. Four of them are working executives of the paper, including, until recently, Creed Black. They also include the papers' president and editor, Charles L. Reese, Jr., son of the Du Pont chemist who led the company's research to international stature in World War I. There are two "outside men," that is, non-Du Pont. They are Ralph K. Gottshall, president of Atlas Chemicals, once a Du Pont firm, spun off after antitrust action but still in friendly symbiosis with its parent. The other is J. J. B. Fulenwider, vice president of Hercules Powder, another former Du Pont firm separated by antitrust order, with 300,000 of its shares now owned by Christiana. A seventh member of the board is Robert H. Richards, Jr., counsel for the paper, a director of the Du Pont bank, the Wilmington Trust, until recently Republican national committeeman from Delaware, and son of the legal genius who created Delaware's friendly corporation laws and guided the formation of Christiana.

The three ownership directors are Henry Silliman, son-in-law of Irénée du Pont; Robert R. M. Carpenter, Jr., known as Bobby, nephew of the president of Christiana, himself on the board of Christiana and owner of the Philadelphia Phillies baseball team; and Henry B. du Pont, president and patriarch of Christiana and until recently vice president of ExComm. H. B. du Pont is the ruling man in the ownership, with Carpenter increasingly influential.

The Du Ponts and the press have had a long joint history. The family first appeared in the Delaware press on January 1, 1806, when one of the papers in town (Wilmington then had a population of 3,500 and two newspapers; it now has a population of 100,000 and two newspapers) carried a grocery store ad for smoked herring, Old Peach Brandy, and "Dupont & Co.'s gunpowder." Since that time their printed presence has been more dramatic. Like any normal family, they have no love for adverse publicity, but their wealth and power have given them more than their share of it. It is a huge family, with about 1,600 contemporary members, 250 of them important in the empire and a handful of them potent leaders. It is a large but close-knit group.

For the last 75 years the news has often been intolerable for the Du Ponts, since their prominence made their most embarrassing

private moments terribly public. These moments were plentiful, with family scandals and fights, suicides, bordello shootings, spectacular intrafamily marriages and divorces ("He Married a Barmaid," a Chicago Daily News headline said of a Du Pont on November 12, 1889) and senatorial investigations of the "munitions lobby" in the 1930's. All of this gave the family good reason to fear the press.

Alfred I. du Pont saved the company for the family, and helped plunge it into the newspaper business. After most of the clan had voted to sell out to their closest competitor, Alfred formed a troika of leadership in 1902 with his cousins, T. Coleman du Pont and Pierre S. du Pont (with the help of Pierre's ingenious assistant, John Jacob Raskob). The three cousins took over the $24 million enterprise with a total cash outlay of $2,100—the incorporation fees.

The newspaper appendix to the Du Pont anatomy was acquired after the family declared war on Alfred, not so much because of his spectacular divorce and remarriage to his divorced cousin but because when he did this he inserted a flamboyant announcement of it in the Wilmington Morning News. When he got back from his honeymoon, Coleman told him, "Al, now you've done it," and said he should get out of the company. Alfred refused and the fight was on, Alfred on one side with about one-fifth of the clan, and Coleman and Pierre on the other, with the bulk of the family. The feud involved politics; Coleman had ambitions to be a Senator or even President. Alfred started a new bank and deliberately made his building 2 stories higher than the 12-story Du Pont Building 1 block away.

Henry A. du Pont, on Coleman's side, bought the Wilmington Evening Journal. In response, Alfred bought the Wilmington Morning News and six downstate papers and there followed a journalistic firefight that shredded State politics, the company, and the family. When Coleman's political drive collapsed, Alfred ran a headline in his paper:

BANG! T. C. DU PONT'S BOOM BLOWS UP!

The explosive figure of speech was considered unforgiveable bad taste in a family that lived (and sometimes died) by gunpowder.

When Alfred got his second divorce in 1906, nothing appeared in any Wilmington paper, but there was a full account in the Philadelphia papers, an enduring pattern that continues to this day on sensitive Du Pont family or Du Pont Co. news.

World War I made the company what it is today, but the postwar depression caught Alfred personally $10 million in debt. He sold out his share of the company and the News to his family enemy, Pierre. The same faction of the family then took control of the company and of every daily paper in the State.

Over the years the family shaped itself by shrewd decision and careful selection of in-laws to govern the company in a more orderly fashion, ruthlessly weeding out incompetent members from company leadership in the most discriminating nepotism in the country. The Wilmington newspapers were only afterthoughts in this process and they settled down to conventionality and drab dignity.

In 1960, the executive editor, Fendall Yerxa, left to return to the New York Herald Tribune and a management consultant firm combed the country for an acceptable professional to take his place. They came across Black, who was ready to leave Savannah. The Morning News and Journal-Every Evening (as it was then called) were not very different from most papers: the owners insisted that within broad principles agreed upon beforehand, the editors were free to put out the best product they could.

Two other prominent American newspaper editors took a look and decided not to take a chance. One of them asked what would happen if he decided to endorse a Democrat. When he was told that this would be a decision for the board of directors he said good-by and went to the nearest hotel and "got stiff." On the other hand, previous editors had not found the job intolerable and Reese, the president and editor, is a respected man in the trade. Black took the job.

The technical history thereafter was comforting. Their names were simplified to News and Journal. The typography was reformed; one paper had looked like the prewar Herald Tribune and the other like the postwar Baltimore Sun. Some of the old content (sandwiches/on menu and masonic club/aid to speak) disappeared to make room for harder news from new bureaus. An inbred staff was leavened with younger talent selected from other papers and from universities. In 4 years the combined morning and evening circulation went from 106,000 to 125,000. The 1963 revenue and profit were up 25 percent to the highest level in the papers' history. What was more significant, the old picture of the Wilmington papers as Du Pont Co. house organs began to fade. Youngster editors even asked if the Du Ponts still owned the paper.

Despite professional appearances, inside troubles had begun in 1961. The starting point was "Operation Abolition," the House Un-American Activities Committee film that was used as a set propaganda piece for right-wing causes. The Delaware State police were showing the film under official auspices to school children, churches, and civic clubs. The paper editorialized against the official showings as dangerous precedent for political indoctrination by the police, using a factually dubious piece of work.

This stand brought severe pressures from the owners. An Un-American Activities Committee staff member and the narrator of the film, Fulton Lewis III, was a guest at the home of H. B. du Pont, where the papers were severely criticized by a group made up largely of right-wing Delawareans. The film later was shown at a program sponsored by Mrs. H. B. du Pont and Carpenter.

H. B. du Pont ordered the papers not to comment editorially on the film. Instead, for 2 months the news columns carried attacks against the paper by the State police chief. The letters columns carried attacks on the papers and on the patriotism of the staff. The editors themselves were ordered to remain silent. The owners' old resolutions—never to resort to suppression and always to give all sides a fair hearing—were invoked, in vain.

At about this time the papers provoked the disapproval of the president of the University of Delaware, an institution close to the Du Ponts, who served on its board of trustees. The dispute seemed to be over the reporting of campus controversies, which the university regarded as bias on the part of the dailies. H. B. du Pont ordered the papers to suppress a number of items involving the university.

It was at this point that Bobby Carpenter, nehpew of H. B. du Pont, was placed on the board of the papers. It was plain that the papers were being enlisted in a passionate political crusade. From this time on there was growing acrimony between the editors and the owners.

In 1962, the editors proposed that they interview major candidates for State office from both parties to help them editorialize during the campaign. This was approved. But when the editors decided to back the Democratic candidate for Congress as "the lesser of two evils," there was a special meeting of the board of Christiana Securities. Christiana is probably the richest investment trust in the world, with assets of more than $3 billion, but that day its attention was directed to the cosmic subject of an editorial that compared the demerits of two candidates for Congress and came up with a begrudging net in favor of the Democrat. Christiana had the editorial rewritten outside the newspaper office. It finally appeared, watered down from the original. The papers did endorse one Democrat openly—the candidate for State auditor.

Other clashes came quickly. When Shell Oil wanted to build a refinery in Delaware, the owners ordered the papers to stop comment on the issue. When Congress was considering legislation for relief of the Du Ponts in selling their General Motors stock under Court order, the papers were told not to criticize Senator BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. During the same period, the Du Pont Co. public relations department asked the paper not to run on page one a statement on the matter by HARRIS MCDOWELL, Democratic Member of Congress from Delaware, for fear it would anger a friendly Senator.

H. B. du Pont also told the paper to put the damper on stories of public charges of mismanagement at the Wilmington Airport, whose chief activity is handling the business of a private aviation corporation in which H. B. du Pont has an interest.

Some idea of the clash between owner ideologies and professional practices can be seen in the complaints of board members. The significance of these conflicts is not so much in the views of the owners (who, of course, have views, as do all interested citizens) as it is a revelation of what happens when an owner fails to understand the role of the monopoly newspaper and the discipline of news.

Henry Silliman and Robert Richards, both members of the paper's board, formally requested through Richards that the paper give a prominent play to a family wedding. "I do not know if this is in accordance with your policy or would require a deviation from your rules. If the latter is true, there should be exceptions to every rule."

At a time when Richards was on the paper's board and also Republican national comitteeman from Delaware, Richards complained bitterly to the editors that the paper's reporter had written a conventional news account of a Democratic rally when he should have turned it into a pro-Republican essay. Richards even wrote his own anti-Democratic story as an example of how the paper should have carried it, though presumably Richards was not at the rally himself. "This was a matter which, if properly handled, could, in my opinion, have been very useful to the Republican Party and their success at the polls in November," he wrote.

When Wilmington began having racial troubles, H. B. du Pont told his editors, "A continual overplaying of integration in our papers certainly plays right into the hands of the radical element of our population * * * many of the writers on your staff seem to have a degree of dedication to certain causes which would make them appear to be quite far to the left."

Most revealing is the collection of complaints issued by Carpenter to the executive editor:

On an editorial praising President Kennedy's Supreme Court appointments: "Why should we devote space to one who is an enemy of private enterprise and the capitalistic system?"

When editors asked him if his complaints about their comments on a bill by Representative MCDOWELL meant the paper should oppose everything MCDOWELL was for, the answer was, "I would say, 'Yes.'"

When an editorial criticized some Republican choices of candidates: "Are we endorsing the Democratic Party by criticizing the Republican Conventions? * * * Could we

not become a house organ for the conservative cause?"

When he objected to running a letter to the editor signed by 64 University of Delaware students favoring integration, the editors asked if they should close the column to all letters from students. His answer was "Yes."

On an editorial noting that French Socialists had outmaneuvered French Communists: "Should the News-Journal take the position of favoring actions of any Socialist Party? I believe it is a grave error for a subsidiary of Du Pont to follow the philosophy of the ultraliberal whose objectives are destruction of capitalistic systems."

It is apparent in retrospect that two conflicting developments had occurred. The Wilmington papers, as with most metropolitan dailies in this country, were in fact broadening their professional and social scope. This was in line with the growing sophistication of the overwhelmingly Democratic or moderate Republican urban audience. At the same time, the owners seemed increasingly rigid in their demands for ultraconservative orthodoxy and family convenience, both in the news columns and editorials.

With the 1964 election campaign approaching, and with Senator BARRY GOLDWATER involved, it was obvious to the editors that something had to be done to resolve these conflicts. The editors pressed the owners for a statement of what they expected of the papers, some mandate that could be followed. When the editors suggested that the papers be committed to the Republican cause with editorials to "focus on an objective appraisal of the chances of the various candidates," H. B. du Pont objected that this idea would "leave editorial writers free to snipe at candidates for the Republican nomination for President."

Black asked mostly for consistency. In a memo noting that he had received orders from four or five separate owners plus the public relations department of the Du Pont Co., he asked, "How many bosses are we expected to please and take orders from?" (He had, for example, run the names of large holders of General Motors stock, as released to the national press by the Du Pont Co. public relations office and had received bitter castigation from two members of the Du Pont family.)

On May 19, 1964, the owners of the Wilmington News-Journal gave their answer. They said that Charles M. Hackett, executive assistant in the public relations department of the Du Pont Co., would be the boss of news and editorial operations of the papers, with Black serving under him. Black quit. The day before, the announcement was made that the Wilmington papers had won 5 of 15 possible first prizes in a publishers' association judging of papers in Pennsylvania and Delaware.

The ending followed tradition. Black wanted to publish his letter of resignation, which said, in part: "I, for one, need no further evidence that the ownership wants the Morning News and the Evening Journal operated as house organs instead of as newspapers." H. B. du Pont vetoed the idea. After the first edition of May 19, carrying simply the news of his resignation, Black posted his letter on the newsroom bulletin board and the Philadelphia papers printed it before Wilmington did.

H. B. du Pont, at the time, denied Black's assertion and said the newspapers "have never been and never will be operated as a house organ for any organization. Christiana Securities Corp. reaffirms their determination that the News-Journal newspapers be operated independently with the objective of being a constructive influence in the community, in the State, and in the Nation."

Efforts to obtain further comment from the papers' management during the preparation of this article were unsuccessful. H. B. du Pont was unavailable for comment. Robert Carpenter, when asked about his role in requesting changes in the newspapers' content, said, "I wouldn't want to comment on the subject." Charles L. Reese, Jr., president and editor of the newspapers, also declined to discuss it.

The depressing quality of the Wilmington episode is that it is not unusual. Few families are so powerful, organized, or dominant in their State as are the Du Ponts, but newspaperdom is filled with owners whose assumptions of their responsibilities are based on their nonnewspaper businesses and whose journalistic enterprises are peripheral both to their personal experience and their daily attention. Unlike the McCormicks and the Ochses, such owners do not have to live with the day-to-day consequences of their decisions, nor face constituents whose information and opinions they oversee.

Decisionmaking in newspapers has a fundamental difference from that of most enterprises. Success in conventional business has a simple measure: survival and profitmaking. Both are essential to newspapers, but a paper that only survives and only shows a profit can be a failure as a newspaper. The newspaper is a community educational institution run for profit. The owner's relationship to the news he prints is something like a university trustee's relationship to reading material selected for archeology courses.

There are hundreds of dailies in which editorials on certain subjects are as predictable as a catechism, whose news departments are designed to overreact or underreact to certain kinds of news, notably financial and political, not because of incompetence or sensationalism but because of the impulse to create a picture closer to the dreams of the ownership. Nor is it unusual for owners to believe that their paper's staff is filled with radicals dangerous to the point of doubtful patriotism. Owners, typically, are conservative Republicans, and staffs—in journalism, as in most fields—tend to be Democrats.

If there were a tradition within newspapering to contain this distrust and tension between owners and staff, as there is in universities, it could result in a pluralism with the advantage of a checks-and-balances system. But there is no such tradition. Too many owners have been alienated too long from the social realities their staffs must perceive and report (and amid which the staff lives and owners generally do not). The Boston Transcript was perhaps the last metropolitan daily that lived within a closed elite. The power of both the Transcript and its elite were changed with the depression. Millions of words in thousands of editorials will not bring back the midtwenties.

There are continual legislative and vigilante attacks on freedom of the press. It will be an uncomfortable time when the owners of newspapers have to depend for preservation of this freedom on the understanding of constituents with whom the owners have been out of sympathy and, worse, out of touch, for 30 years.

When Creed Black resigned he got the unexpected sympathy of some prominent citizens of Delaware, partly because not many hired hands publicly dispute the Du Ponts. Some publishers wrote him that owners will never learn. Editors sympathized with him. And one bright university student who had planned a newspaper career wrote:

"I have always had a few doubts about the newspaper business * * * if this is at all typical of the behind-the-scenes actions in the fourth estate, I'll have no part of it."

Why We Endorse Mr. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in today's editions, the Chicago Sun-Times has editorially endorsed President Lyndon B. Johnson for reelection.

The Chicago Sun-Times endorsement is extremely significant since this newspaper, published by Marshall Field, today represents one of the most influential voices in the entire Midwest.

It should be particularly gratifying to President Johnson to receive the Chicago Sun-Times endorsement in view of the fact that both in 1952 and in 1956 the Chicago Sun-Times endorsed Dwight D. Eisenhower for President and in 1960, this powerful voice of the Midwest endorsed Richard M. Nixon for President.

Mr. Speaker, this excellent editorial follows:

WHY WE ENDORSE MR. JOHNSON

On June 10—a month before the Republican National Convention at San Francisco—The Sun-Times declared it would support President Johnson's candidacy if Senator BARRY GOLDWATER became the GOP presidential nominee.

That which has happened since has strengthened our conviction that the well-being of America and the peace of the world will be better served by keeping Mr. Johnson in the White House.

The Nation faces a choice between two opposing philosophies of government, a choice that will affect American lives for years to come. We cannot accept the Goldwater philosophy. Neither do we believe the Arizona Senator has the capacity to serve as the Chief Executive of this Nation.

The Sun-Times in 1952 and in 1956 endorsed Dwight D. Eisenhower for President. In 1960 our choice was Richard M. Nixon. This year we are for the Democratic candidates, Mr. Johnson and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, not because our views have changed but because the Republican Party changed—temporarily, we hope—when it chose GOLDWATER. That change would not have occurred if the GOP had nominated Gov. William W. Scranton, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, or Gov. George Romney.

The election of President Johnson would mean a continuation of fundamental foreign policies that have guided the United States under both Democratic and Republican administrations since World War II.

GOLDWATER has a long record of opposition to those policies. His record and statements justify the fear that if he were elected, international tensions would increase. What he would do is uncertain since he has been erratic and inconsistent in his discussions of world affairs. He stresses the military rather than the diplomatic approach in solving international problems.

The bipartisan policies followed by Washington in the last few years have not brought total peace but they have avoided total war. Communist aggression has been held in check with force where necessary and with diplomacy where possible. Despite the loss of Cuba to the Communists the free world has been strengthened. Every President in this nuclear age—Mr. Truman, Mr. Eisen-

hower, Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Johnson—has been aware of his responsibility to act both with courage and restraint in situations that could bring war.

GOLDWATER alone of the leaders of either party in this country has shown a dangerous casualness toward the use of atomic weapons. He would delegate to military commanders in the field the authority to initiate the use of small tactical nuclear weapons. The authority to push the nuclear button by law belongs only to the President. Considering GOLDWATER's reckless and jingoistic attitude toward the use of nuclear weapons we could not vote for him even if his vague and sometimes conflicting domestic policies were susceptible to rationalization.

We have often disagreed with the Democrats on domestic matters and we expect to disagree from time to time with President Johnson. For example, we believe Mr. Johnson was wrong in pressing Congress to graft a hospitalization plan for the aged on the social security system. But we would rather have a President who is wrong about medicare than one who is wrong about nuclear warfare.

While we disagree and will continue to disagree with some Democratic domestic policies we concede and applaud the fact that Mr. Johnson has proposed a positive program. He has definite ideas about what he believes is necessary to make this country a better place in which to live.

GOLDWATER's program is a negative one. He stresses what he would undo in Government rather than what he would do. His aim, he says, is not to pass laws but to repeal them. Which laws would he abolish? The GOP platform is no help in guessing what Government might be like with GOLDWATER in the White House. The platform promises a continuation of some Federal efforts that GOLDWATER has said should be abolished; for example, in 1960, in "Conscience of a Conservative," GOLDWATER said there should be prompt and final termination of the farm subsidy program. He has now accepted a platform that pledges to continue price supports. GOLDWATER last week said he realizes many changes in Government cannot be made overnight.

We must believe that GOLDWATER would follow his own bent in the White House rather than his party platform. Last January he said that "at best, political platforms are a packet of misinformation and lies." If he is true to his own earlier beliefs, he will make serious overtures to sell TVA and withdraw the Government from some social welfare programs, public power, housing and urban renewal.

President Johnson has shown appreciation of the need for prudence in spending. He has helped develop the climate of confidence in which the economy is booming and has attracted support from important elements in the business community. He has come to grips with the problem of poverty that still exists in this most affluent of all societies.

Personality, experience, ability, and knowledge are all factors to be considered in the election of a President.

President Johnson has shown an ability to get things done. He knows the art of politics and that of getting men and women to work with him to bring his programs to realization. He has proved himself to be a masterful leader.

GOLDWATER gives every evidence of the military approach in the handling of his fellow men. He is neither a compromiser nor a persuader. In his victory at San Francisco he permitted no deviation from his extremist line and it was not until the meeting at Hershey, weeks later, that he made a gesture toward party unity by consulting with the elements he had defeated.

GOLDWATER differed with the 1960 Republican platform and voted contrary to the majority of his Republican colleagues in the Senate on at least 23 occasions. At the San Francisco convention, the American public saw the difference between GOLDWATER and his own party clearly when speaker after speaker praised the Civil Rights Act and took credit for helping pass it. GOLDWATER, their candidate, had voted against it.

GOLDWATER has been the spokesman for an element in America that has been unhappy at the speed and complication of the 20th century; one that distrusts Federal Government even in areas where local government has failed. He attracts groups that resent Negro demands for equal rights.

In their hearts, most Americans, we believe, know that GOLDWATER's election would complicate the race problem, not ease it. Those who would vote for him because they resent Negro civil rights militancy, would neither end the militancy nor help bring about the understanding and harmony that will make it unnecessary. Mr. Johnson, we believe, is better fitted to try to bring about that understanding.

In BARRY GOLDWATER's world the United States is a fearful place in which to live, plagued by centralized planning, redtape, regimentation, and public officials who are leading the Nation into socialism.

He would turn back the clock to a halcyon day. He would return to a day that in reality never existed and cannot exist. Technology, science, our expanding population, the increased mobility of our people, the rising standards of living and education, the demands of Negroes for their constitutional rights, the shrinking of the world in time and space, the changes abroad that have matched the changes here—all have, indeed, made life today more complicated and swifter. We may not like it, but 20th century government must play a role in the lives of everyone.

Since this is so, we would feel more secure, more optimistic and confident of America's future with Mr. Johnson or HUMPHREY in the White House than GOLDWATER or his running mate, WILLIAM E. MILLER. Mr. Johnson is aware of the challenges and problems of our times. We cannot believe GOLDWATER truly understands them.

Humphrey for Giving U.S. A-Bomb to U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, a founder of the ultraliberal Americans for Democratic Action, has taken some of the most far-out positions of any American politician. But typical of the Democratic vice-presidential nominee's politically extreme positions is his suggestion in 1950 that the United States turn its stockpile of atomic weapons over to the United Nations. Writing in the Progressive magazine, HUMPHREY said:

The United States should stand ready to turn over its stockpile of destruction to the U.N. as part of an international agreement for a police force to maintain world peace.

Mr. Speaker, how would you like to have U Thant's finger on the atomic button?

Under unanimous consent, I include an article from the St. Louis Post Dispatch dated March 27, 1950, concerning the aforementioned:

HUMPHREY FOR GIVING U.S. A-BOMB TO U.N.—SENATOR PROPOSES MODIFYING BARUCH PLAN TO SHOW SINCERITY IN PEACE HUNT

WASHINGTON, March 27.—Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, has proposed that the United States turn its stockpile of atomic weapons over to the United Nations to build an international police force capable of maintaining world peace.

Writing in the Progressive magazine, he said the time has come for the United States "to rekindle the hope of peoples of the world by taking the leadership in the quest for honorable settlement (of the cold war) and universal disarmament."

To do this, he said, U.S. officials should demonstrate the sincerity of their peace intentions by modifying the Baruch plan for world atomic controls which Russia has rejected.

"The United States should stand ready to turn over its stockpile of destruction to the U.N. as part of an international agreement for a police force to maintain world peace," HUMPHREY said. "The U.N. must be transformed into an organization capable of enforcing peace under law."

HUMPHREY suggested also that the State Department invite Russia to join this Nation in urging the U.N. to call a world conference to outlaw war, all types of arms, and peacetime conscription.

The Establishment and Operation of a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress Is Imperative to the National Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1964

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly hope that legislation, H.R. 11611, which I vigorously supported and which passed in the House, will be promptly approved in the Senate and thereafter signed by the President into law.

A brief review of the purposes of this measure obviously reveal its paramount importance to our sustained economic progress and necessity to begin, now, to deal with the complex effects, including serious unemployment, of this otherwise blessed automatic age.

Briefly the bill proposes to identify and assess the past effects and the increasing pace of technological change, identify and describe the impact of technological and economic change on production and employment, including new job requirements and the major types of worker displacement, both technological and economic, which are likely to occur during the next 10 years, the specific industries, occupations, and geographic areas which are most likely to be involved, and the social and economic effects of these developments on the Nation's economy, manpower, communities, families, social structure, and human values; to define

those areas of unmet community and human needs toward which application of new technologies might most effectively be directed, including those resulting from the Federal Government's research and development programs; to assess the most effective means for channeling new technologies into promising directions; to recommend specific administrative and legislative steps which should be taken by the Federal, State, and local governments in meeting their responsibilities in this area; to develop and adopt measures which will facilitate occupational adjustment and geographic mobility; and to share the costs and help prevent and alleviate the adverse impact of change, of any type, on displaced workers.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of providing employment, encouraging retraining programs, making adjustments to the shift in the employment structure, including the displacement of workers through defense cutbacks and so many others arising out of the automatic age present one of the greatest challenges of our time. This challenge will require the fullest cooperation of all levels of government and demand the utmost concentration of all our intellectual resources to the planning of wise, constructive uses of the benefits of automation.

It is only too apparent the impact of automation and mechanization on our economy must inspire new economic thinking and the most comprehensive planning in protecting and projecting our general progress and continuing welfare. As an imperative step toward this patriotic objective I most earnestly hope that the provisions of H.R. 11611 will soon become the law of our land.

Hon. L. D. "Red" Webster and Hon. Hubert Gregg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most interesting article about two fine east Texas citizens. I have a high regard for both men.

A BAG FULL OF LOVE

During the many years we have been in the newspaper business, no news story has appealed to us more than the one in this publication Tuesday in which our good friend L. D. "Red" Webster bared his oversized heart in relating a vignette that dealt with himself and another beloved east Texan.

The article had to do with the speech Red, as he is affectionately known to his legion of friends, made in Longview before the East Texas Treatment Center in which he recounted the several crossings of his and Hubert Gregg's paths at widely separated times.

It was a heart-warming, soul-stirring occasion, as all who heard the Lone Star Steel Co. vice president would quickly and eagerly testify.

The eloquence of the speech was heightened by the sincerity of the man. It was a masterpiece of human feeling woven into a beautiful fabric of meaningful words.

It was a double mirror, in which the hearts of two men were reflected for all to see.

Entitled "The Story of a Little Brown Bag," the speech reviewed the long friendship of the speaker and Hubert Gregg, the blind musician and peanut vendor. As a 10-year-old boy in El Dorado, Ark., Red was given his first job in 1920 as Hubert's assistant in the operation of a soft drink stand. Later both men left El Dorado, Red moving to Dallas and Hubert to Longview, but they kept in touch with each other through the years. Their most recent meeting was a week ago in Hubert's home.

Here in Red's own words is what took place:

"Seated in the neat little breakfast nook, Gregg and I rehashed our friendship and finally he asked me what I was doing in Longview. I told him about the East Texas Oil Men's Golf Association barbecue, and mentioned that I would return to Longview to speak at the annual meeting of the East Texas Treatment Center.

"Without a word, my blind friend pushed his chair back from the table, walked over to the cupboard, and brought back a paper sack.

" 'Red,' he said, 'I make it a rule never to say anything about my gifts; I think too many people talk too much about their giving, and give too little. I know about the treatment center and the fine work it does for those who are afflicted. I want you to take this money and give it to the center.'

"My friend pushed toward me the little sack, worn and crumpled by the many handlings required to open and close it when pennies and nickels, dimes and quarters were dropped in during the day's work.

"I'm glad Gregg didn't see the tear in my eye as I picked up the sack, and bade him farewell. As I started out I saw his Bible. It didn't look like mine or yours. You see, it was in braille. It was in a dozen or more thick, oversized volumes, whose characters were raised letters which, to be read, had to be touched, each one, by a blind person's fingertips. As my glance lingered on those books, I knew at once that, somewhere on some page, Gregg's fingertips had spelled out a theme about it being more blessed to give than to receive.

"Suddenly there was an aura of greatness that filled the bright little room with sunshine that dried away the tear that I would have been ashamed for Gregg to see. In its place came a swelling, surging sense of appreciation for this blind man, his guardian-at-work (his seeing-eye dog) and for Mrs. Gregg, the homemaker.

"As I walked back to my car, the grass was a little greener, the air a little sweeter, and I was proud to be a friend of Hubert Gregg.

"When I got back to Dallas, I spilled the contents of the sack on the table and began counting. As the coins flicked into my palm, I couldn't help thinking about the untold thousands of steps taken by a man led by a seeing-eye dog as he traveled his routes. I had to think about the number of bags of peanuts that had to be sold before Gregg would have something left over for his own little piggy bank which lay crumpled before me on the table.

"I counted the money, and it came to $17.29, but to me it represented a great deal more than just a pile of coins.

"It was the heart of east Texas. It was a symbol of those who work hard and save, of those who have faith and are willing to sacrifice of those who ask no favors or special privileges, who want only to live their own lives and to be of service to mankind.

"In my book, this sack was a bag full of love."

While endeavoring to manifest his appreciation of Hubert Gregg, Red Webster also projected his own philosophy of life and revealed the brilliance of his mind and the depth of his understanding.

Tall, rugged, forceful, and typically Texan, he is well known and admired throughout the entire Southwest and midcontinent oil and gas regions as well as in newspaper and public relations circles.

Since 1950 when he became public relations director, we have watched with interest his work in behalf of Lone Star Steel Co., a great industrial concern owned and operated by Texas people as the result of the efforts many years ago of the publisher of this newspaper and W. W. Lynch, president of the Texas Power & Light Co. "Red" has done a marvelous job not only for his company but the entire northeast Texas area and Dallas, his home city. He is a member of American Iron & Steel Institute and its national public relations committee; American Petroleum Institute; Sigma Delta Chi; Public Relations Society of America; International Council of Industrial Editors; Dallas Athletic Club; Dallas Press Club; Nomads; Masonic lodge and Hella Temple Shrine; and the Methodist Church. He is in great demand as a speaker, and has written a book on Russia following a visit to that country in 1958.

A native of Texas, "Red" was born in Lubbock, June 10, 1910. He attended Dallas elementary and high schools and Southern Methodist University, and in 1933 began a career with the Dallas Dispatch as a cub reporter, later serving as sports editor, aviation editor, special events editor, promotions and public relations director. From 1941 to 1944 he was general manager of the U.S. Air Force contract flight school at Cuero, and was executive vice president of Red Arrow Freight Lines, of Houston, from 1944 to 1948. During the next 2 years he was in advertising and public relations work in the Bayou City, joining Lone Star Steel in 1950 as public relations director. Three years later he was named vice president, employee-public relations, and in 1955 was advanced to vice president in charge af public relations and advertising.

"Red" is a man's man and a very capable business executive and administrator. Firm in his convictions, resolute and positive in his approach to problems be they large or small, this compassionate and dynamic leader is a loyal and devoted friend of east Texas and an outstanding citizen of Texas.

We salute you, "Red," for being the grand person you are.

—S. A. PARKER.

Address of Samuel Rose at Encampment of United Spanish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the stirring address of Samuel Rose of the Veterans' Administration before the 66th National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans on August 31, 1964, at the Hotel Sheraton in Louisville, Ky.:

I have a special spot in my heart for the United Spanish War Veterans, and I am not

alone. Mr. John S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of Veterans Affairs, also has a particularly warm regard for all of you. He has asked me to extend his greetings to your fine commander in chief, Archie House, and your adjutant general, James H. McElroy, and also to express his regrets that he wasn't able to attend your national encampment. The entire Veterans' Administration has a certain special feeling for you. And I can tell you that this entire Nation holds you in great esteem.

And no wonder. You served well; you earned your place in the annals of American bravery.

You are what might be called the "elder statesmen" of America's veterans—but knowing of your activities and your vigor, I prefer to call you our younger elder statesmen.

With your own eyes you have seen some of the most breathtaking developments in all of American history. You have seen this world not only roll forward but jet forward.

Sometimes I suppose you get the feeling that all you can do is hold on to your hat and hang on—things move so fast.

More has happened within the span of your own lives than in all the previous days of American history. Think back for a minute.

When you were fighting the war at the turn of the century and before, there was no such thing as airpower. There was no such thing as the airplane. It hadn't been invented yet. Man was anchored to the ground. But now we fly into Louisville for this 66th national encampment at 600 miles an hour. And, as you know, they're now developing an airplane that will fly 2,000 miles an hour. It should be operational in the next couple of years. I figured out that because of the change in time between Washington and Louisville, with one of those supersonic planes I would be able to arrive here a full hour before I started out.

When you were fighting the Spanish-American War, the biggest weapons you had were some crude cannons * * * crude by modern standards of weaponry, of course. War was then almost a personalized thing. You could see the enemy. You could come to grips with him. And today? Today, we have weapons that could destroy the whole world. And today, electronic data processing is what puts us in touch with the enemy position, not our own scouts. War has always been hell. But today, war would be a particular kind of hell, so brutal that it could wipe us all off the face of the earth.

There have been tremendous changes in all aspects of life. Newspapers have changed. How about our highly organized radio and TV industry? Men and monkeys have orbited the earth since you went to war. Ours is a strangely changed world, compared with the world when you were in uniform, ready to shed your blood for your country. And yet, the more you think about it, the more convinced you are that these fantastic developments, these magical changes, are only surface deep. The outside of life has changed. I do not think the inside of life has changed.

However, the American Nation still shows the same warm consideration toward her former fighting men as she always did * * * ever since the beginning. Did you know that the first law passed by the First Congress of the United States, 'way back when our Nation was just formed, was a law pertaining to veterans and to their welfare? And did you know that even before the United States came into being, back in the days of the colonies, away back in the 1500's, the Massachusetts Colony passed a law pertaining to the welfare of veterans?

That same tradition has carried forth throughout history, from that time to this.

It's that long tradition of regard that makes working at the Veterans' Administration such a pleasure. When we help veterans, when we help care for their needs, certainly we are tending to our fellow human beings, but we are doing something more than that, too. We are carrying out one of the oldest traditions in America—the tradition of consideration for those who served.

That's why the Veterans' Administration makes such a great effort to maintain the individual touch to all it does. After all, we do deal in huge numbers—numbers that would make you dizzy: 22 million veterans; a $5½ billion budget; a compensation and pension program that serves 3 million disabled veterans and 2 million dependents of deceased veterans; the world's largest medical program—168 hospitals, 93 clinics, 5,100 doctors, 15,000 nurses. And yet despite these big numbers, we never do lose sight of the most important number of all. The No. 1, the individual. The veteran himself. Or his widow or his orphan.

The No. 1, the individual, is more important to us than all the dazzling big numbers in the world. By showing him human consideration, by considering his interests as an individual rather than as just one more face in a million, we are doing our best to carry out America's warmhearted tradition to her veterans. This is the way America wants it.

All of which comes down to this point. You United Spanish War veterans, your wives, your children, and your families, should consider the Veterans' Administration not just as an agency of the U.S. Government, but as a friend. The VA is your friend. The VA stands ready to help you when you need help. The VA is interested in you and in your welfare. Your nearest VA regional office is your point of contact with this agency with a heart. And don't ever forget; the VA does have a heart, and does handle its affairs with a heart. That's the way America wants it.

The next point I am going to make you have heard many times before. And I predict you are going to hear it many times again. It is the fact that one reason America loves and respects you is the vital part you played in the course of American history.

Your war was a sort of link between the past and the future. Your war marked the end of one era and the beginning of another era * * * the era we now live in. Let me give y ou a few examples.

Your war freed Cuba from Spanish rule. It's true that some people are wondering whether it was worth the effort, with a man like Castro at its head; but sure, it was worth the effort. Castro will go, someday. And democracy will return to our brave little neighbor in the Southeast. And Cuba will be free—as you intended it to be.

Your war removed Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippine Islands from Spanish rule. How much better off those lands are, with the independence to make their own destinies.

Your war brought Hawaii under the flag of the United States * * * our newest State, an important State.

Your war did all that, and a lot more. Your efforts made America see that she couldn't go forever with blinders on her eyes; that she couldn't be an isolationist country in a world growing smaller and smaller; that she had to be part of the world, not apart from it.

Your war made America wake up to the fact that she had to build her defenses in the Pacific * * * and it's fortunate she did, when you consider what happened in that part of the world in World War II.

Your war made America grow up in a hurry—and realize she had a leading part to play in the development of this globe. Your war unlocked the doors that led to America becoming the leading power on the fact of this earth.

There you have something of the true meaning of your noble service in the Spanish-American War of better than 3-score years ago. Now you can see why I say that you have played a much larger part in writing American history than you may realize.

No wonder the population of the United States of America salutes you. No wonder we love and esteem you. No wonder we honor you. No wonder we consider you very special veterans.

And what do we hope for you, our younger elder statesmen? We hope that your days will be filled with contentment; that your memories of the past will be happy; that your bodies retain their vigor and your minds their alertness. We hope that all the days of your lives will be full ones; that your activities will be useful. We hope that all the best will come to the best.

We hope you continue to show your neighbors and all the world that life is worth while; that life can be good at any age and as Robert Browning said:

"Grow old along with me!
The best is yet to be,
The last of life, for which the
first was made."

Labor Day Reflections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include some thoughts with respect to Labor Day, 1964, which we should all contemplate:

Mr. Speaker, "To Labor Is To Pray." This, as you probably know, was the motto of Benedict, who, of course, was the founder of the Benedictine Order. It therefore was not surprising, when in reviewing previous Labor Day comments of world leaders, to find this philosophy carried through in the radio broadcast on September 1, 1944, of Pope Pius XII—just over 20 years ago this Labor Day.

The Pope stated:

Private property is a natural fruit of labor, a product of intense activity of man, acquired through his energetic determination to insure and develop with his own strength his own existence and that of his family, and to create for himself and his own an existence of just freedom, not only economic, but also political, cultural, and religious. If a worker is deprived of hope to acquire some personal property, what other natural stimulus can be offered him that will inspire him to hard work, labor, saving, and sobriety today, when so many nations and men have lost everything and all they have left is their capacity for work?

Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt but what, in the latter instance, the Pope was referring to those nations whose workers have been enslaved in Marxist-Leninist chains. Joseph Stalin had previously admitted this in 1936 when he said:

In the U.S.S.R. the principle of socialism is realized.

To prove his point he quoted article 12 of the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

From each according to his ability, to each according to his work.

Scholars tell us that this article in the Soviet Constitution was taken from Karl Marx's critique of the Gotha program in 1875 when he summed it all up by saying:

From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want you to listen closely to just one more quote:

We are going to try to take all of the money that we think is unnecessarily being spent and take it from the "haves" and give it to the "have nots" that need it so much.

I am sure that statement has sent shivers down the spine of the laboring man for it denies an individual the right to private property and the fruits of his labor. This statement was not made in an Iron Curtain country, it was said by President Lyndon Baines Johnson in his White House speech of January 15, 1964. Now think about that for a while.

The Law and the Bombers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, television station WBBM–TV, a Columbia Broadcasting Co. affiliate in Chicago, has been conducting a very strong editorial campaign in recent weeks to strengthen our Federal antibombing law.

I should like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which WBBM–TV voiced on September 2 and 3 on this subject. I am particularly gratified to see WMMB–TV support my efforts to strengthen the antibombing law.

The Justice Department has opposed this legislation on the theory it needs greater freedom and latitude to carry on its work. It is regrettable that the full forces of the FBI cannot be used in Illinois and other parts of the country where, it appears, there exists a gigantic plot to destroy legitimate, successful restaurants.

It is my hope the WBBM–TV editorial will jar the Justice Department into action.

The editorial follows:

STANDPOINT: THE LAW AND THE BOMBERS

The bombers are getting bolder. The outcry for a halt to their terror is getting louder. The task of putting an end to the outrageous depredations doesn't seem to be getting any easier.

Seventy-four times in 2½ years the bombers and burners have struck in the Chicago area. Thirty-nine of the acts of terror have been perpetrated against restaurants or cocktail lounges.

The most recent incident was directed against a restaurant owner who had three times before been the target of arson or bomb attacks. It was the first bombing in the grim, long list, that was ignited against a restaurant during business hours. Some 80 to 100 people fled the place when the bomb tore into the restaurant roof during the peak dinner hour.

Joseph Wilkos, the restaurant owner and four times a victim, now says he wants the Federal Bureau of Investigation to move into the picture. Standpoint has favored Federal intervention in bombing and arson cases through support of legislation already introduced in Congress by Representative ROMAN PUCINSKI and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS.

Their companion measures would make it mandatory for the FBI to enter a bombing or arson case which remained unsolved after 24 hours. Now such FBI action is discretionary with the Department of Justice, which orders FBI investigations only when it appears an existing Federal law has been broken.

We believe that any law which would throw the full power of the Federal Government into an investigation of the Chicago area's reign of terror would be a useful weapon.

Legislative wheels grind slowly, however, and at the moment, the bombing and arson outrages remain the concern of local law enforcement agencies. These agencies, together and separately, have looked into all 74 cases committed in the past 30 months. Not one arrest has been made. Not one case has been solved.

Now a special Cook County Grand Jury has been convened by State's Attorney Daniel Ward. Its first chore, apparently, will be to listen to a recital of explanations by half a dozen law enforcement agencies as to why the bombers and burners still are free, after two and a half years of terror.

After that, presumably, some of the victims like Joseph Wilkos will be called to testify. This probably will be the most fruitful testimony since it is fairly hard to stomach the notion that every one of the victims of 74 cases of bombing and arson would be totally ignorant of why anyone would want to terrorize him.

There is only a faint pattern to the outrages, but it appears to be sufficient to discount the theory that a crackpot "mad bomber" has been terrorizing the community for two and a half years just for kicks.

Whether the terror is the work of the crime syndicate, the result of labor disputes, or the adventures of predator racketeers, we believe some painstaking police work can bring it to an end.

It is high time that it be brought to an end.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind.*
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.* — 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.* — Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J.*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H.*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo.*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*
Eastland, James O., *Miss.* — 5101 Macomb St.
Edmondson, J. Howard, *Okla.*
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C.*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark.*
Goldwater, Barry, *Ariz.*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y.*
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C.*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C.*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Keating, Kenneth B., *N.Y.* — 2809 Dumbarton Ave.
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo.*
Long, Russell B., *La.*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak.*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*
Mechem, Edwin L., *N. Mex.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.* — 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa.* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis.*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I.*
Pearson, James B., *Kans.*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I.* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*
Salinger, Pierre, *Calif.*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala.* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C.*
Tower, John G., *Tex.*
Walters, Herbert S., *Tenn.*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del.*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex.*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Edmondson, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case, Hickenlooper, Curtis, and Keating.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McGovern, Edmondson, Walters, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Cooper, Boggs, and Mechem.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Humphrey, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Beall, Goldwater, and Case.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Bennett, Tower, Javits, Simpson, and Dominick.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, and Beall.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Hartke, McIntyre, Beall, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Smathers, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, and Mundt.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Pell, Ribicoff, Brewster, Salinger, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, Miller, and Pearson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Walters, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, Mechem, and Dominick.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy, Bayh, Burdick, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, Fong, and Scott.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy, Metcalf, Goldwater, Javits, Prouty, Tower, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Carlson, Fong, and Boggs.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Nelson, Salinger, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Miller, and Pearson.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED	TERRITORY EMBRACED
District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren.	District of Columbia.
First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg.	Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.
Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan.	Connecticut, New York, Vermont.
Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan.	Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.
Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren.	Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.
Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black.	Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.
Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart.	Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.
Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark.	Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.
Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White.	Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.
Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas.	Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.
Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White.	Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Statement of C. E. Goldberg, Chairman of the Executive Committee of Bowling Proprietors' Association of America, Inc., Before the Committee on Ways and Means, During Its Excise Tax Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, few sports in the United States have achieved nationwide popularity as fast as has the sport of bowling. It is a great game, good for all ages and sexes. It can be a wonderful family outing and can also do much for office morale. It works well in both country and in the city. It is a healthy sport and can even be handled by persons who in some way or other are handicapped. It is a highly competitive sport and therefore good for American sense of competition.

Recently Mr. C. E. Goldberg, chairman of the executive committee of Bowling Proprietors' Association of America, Inc., and its affiliated organizations, the New York State Bowling Proprietors and the New York City Bowling Proprietors Conference, testified before the Ways and Means Committee at its excise tax hearings, urging repeal of the bowling excise tax.

I think Mr. Goldberg made an excellent statement, and because of my enthusiasm for this American sport I am including Mr. Goldberg's testimony in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF C. E. GOLDBERG, WASHINGTON, D.C., CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF BOWLING PROPRIETORS' ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC., BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DURING ITS EXCISE TAX HEARINGS, JULY 30, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity of appearing before you on behalf of the Bowling Proprietors' Association of America, Inc., of which I am chairman of the executive committee. Our association, which is more familiarly known as BPAA, includes in its membership the proprietors of 6,242 bowling establishments operating 116,632 bowling lanes located in every State of the United States. Our membership covers all aspects of bowling—tenpins, duckpins, rubberband duckpins, and candlepins.

The American Bowling Congress and the National Duckpin Bowling Congress have certified for the current year 11,336 bowling establishments with an aggregate of 164,300 bowling lanes in the United States, so that we represent more than half of the bowling establishments and almost three-fourths of the bowling lanes in the United States. I am sure, however, that every bowling proprietor in the country is in accord with the views which I shall express today.

The tax whose repeal I urge upon you today is embodied in section 4471 of the Internal Revenue Code, which provides:

"There shall be imposed a special tax to be paid by every person who operates a bowling alley, billiardroom, or poolroom at the rate of $20 a year for each bowling alley, billiard table, or pool table."

There are exempted from this tax such of the facilities as are located in a hospital, or are maintained exclusively for the use of members of the Armed Forces, or are maintained by nonprofit organizations or by an agency of the United States.

With a total of 164,300 bowling lanes in the United States, it produces revenues for the Government of only $3,286,000 a year. Yet to an industry which is economically distressed, with many suffering bankruptcies, going out of business, and generally facing financial chaos, this is a sum which means a great deal.

This tax was initially imposed during the First World War as a temporary wartime excise tax at the rate of $10 a year for each bowling lane. It continued on such a temporary basis until the Second World War. Then, as we entered the Second World War, and again as a temporary wartime measure, it was increased to $20 a lane. For 20 years it has continued in effect at this rate, although the Congress has eliminated many of the temporary wartime tax increases imposed on other industries.

We have never previously come to Congress and asked for relief through the repeal or modification of this tax because we have not until the past 3 years experienced serious economic distress. We are essentially an industry of small businessmen, and so long as we have been able to do so, we have paid whatever taxes Congress has seen fit to levy upon us. Today over 80 percent of the bowling lanes in the United States are owned by individuals or companies operating three or less bowling establishments. Due to the fact that more and more of our bowling proprietors have been unable to meet their obligations, we are for the first time coming to you for relief.

Bowling is no luxury. Bowling is the poor man's golf, tennis, polo, and bridge all rolled into one. Bowling is the American sport which has more participants than any other sport or recreational activity. It is a sport in which whole families engage. Bowling is fundamentally a participation, and not an exhibition, sport. The American Bowling Congress and the Women's International Bowling Congress have in membership in the United States more than 8 million men and women who bowl at least once a week at least 26 weeks a year. And those organizations alone sanction more than 17,000 bowling tournaments each year.

It is a paradox that, at a time when more people are bowling than in any previous year, and when the public is spending more money on bowling than ever before, we should be suffering from the severe economic distress with which we are now confronted. This is explainable by the fact that in 1961 the percentage increase of bowling lanes was for the first time greater than the percentage increase in organized bowlers. And since then, although the gross amount spent on bowling on an overall basis has never been so large, the revenue per bowling lane has dropped precipitously.

I am not here to point the finger or seek to place the blame for the enormous irresponsible expansion of bowling lanes that took place some years ago, or for the philosophy that assumed that placing a bowling facility at any crossroads, no matter how sparsely populated, would produce profits. I am here to ask your assistance for our industry in our efforts to climb out of the quicksand in which we now find ourselves.

I call your attention, however, to the fact that the reports of the Small Business Administration, an agency of the Federal Government, disclose that in recent years it has made loans for the purpose of construction of new bowling establishments and the refinancing of already established operators which in the peak years almost equaled the amount of revenues collected by the Government from bowling establishments under the alley bed tax. In some cases loans were made by the SBA after loan applications to private lending agencies had been turned down because of their awareness of the precariousness of the business. In many such cases the bowling establishments constructed with the proceeds of such loans have been unsuccessful and in some cases the proprietors have gone into bankruptcy.

BPAA recently retained Dun & Bradstreet to make an economic survey of the bowling business. I attach a copy of the report for 1963 entitled "Cost of Doing Business in the Bowling Industry."

In this report Dun & Bradstreet stated that the overall reports from 504 bowling establishments showed a net loss of 0.4 percent. It shows that half of the participants reported a profit, and half reported a loss. Those that showed a profit reported a profit before taxes of 5.3 percent on average gross receipts of $204,555. Those that showed a loss reported a loss of 7.4 percent on average gross receipts of $188,281.

The health of any industry is, of course, reflected in the financial condition of those companies who are its suppliers. The two principal suppliers of bowling equipment and accessories are American Machine & Foundry Co. and Brunswick Corp.

For years these companies had no problems with their bowling accounts. For almost 30 years no bowling establishment was involved in a bankruptcy proceeding. Since 1961, however, the situation has been quite different, and this undoubtedly stems from the fact that these two manufacturers engaged in a race to urge a reckless expansion and the building of more and more bowling establishments, without regard to prudent business standards, and caused the opening of many more bowling facilities than the 20 million bowlers, and the expected increase in bowlers, could possibly absorb.

In 1962 Brunswick had to repossess 580 bowling lanes, and in 1962 it had to repossess approximately 1,800 more. In 1963 AMF had to repossess 1,300 bowling lanes. In 1964 both companies have had to continue to do this.

AMF primarily rents its automatic pinspotters, although it sells its other bowling equipment. It collects rentals from its pinspotters at the rate of 10 cents for each game bowled on them. Between 1961 and 1963 its bowling rentals decreased about $11 million on an annual basis. In 1961 AMF's annual volume from sales of bowling equip-

ment was $61,400,000; in 1963 it dropped to $35 million.

As of December 31, 1961, AMF's accounts receivable amounted to only $20,500,000; on March 31, 1964 they had increased to $74,400,000.

Brunswick has had a parallel financial experience.

Both companies have had to set up huge special reserves to meet expected defaults in their bowling accounts.

During the 5-year period immediately preceding 1963, primarily at the instigation of the equipment manufacturers and suppliers, many public and syndicated companies were formed that went to the public to obtain funds with which to go into the business of building and operating bowling establishments.

Unfortunately, because the SEC does not classify its registration statements by industry, we found it impossible to ascertain the total number and the aggregate amount of such public offerings. However, we were able to locate and examine the registration statements and subsequent annual reports of 30 bowling companies which had made public offerings during these 5 years, and found they had publicly offered their common stock and debentures in the aggregate amount of $33 million.

At the peak of the bowling fever which seized the financial markets, the securities of 20 of these issuing bowling companies that reported their market highs and lows, showed an aggregate high-market value of $247,506,129, which has now declined to an aggregate low-market value of $19,349,118. We feel that this tremendous drop in the market value of bowling securities is most significant and reflective of the present distress in the bowling industry.

Two of the bowling companies whose SEC registration statements and reports were examined have gone out of business. Three more have gone into bankruptcy, one under chapter X and two under chapter XI.

From information obtained from examining the SEC registration statements and subsequent annual reports of these 30 bowling companies, it appears that in 1959, 10 reported net profits, 3 showed net losses. In 1960, 14 reported net profits, 6 reported net losses. In 1961, 12 reported net profits, 9 reported net losses. In 1962, 10 reported net profits, 12 reported net losses. In 1963, 6 reported net profits, 13 reported net losses.

During this 5-year period, these bowling companies have fallen off sharply in their reflection of earnings per share and many have gone from a substantially plus earnings per share position to a deficit situation. The rise in earnings to a 1960 peak, and then the sharp downward swing through 1963, is apparent from the figures I have given you.

Financially, bowling is a sick industry, although paradoxically enough there are more people bowling and more money being spent on bowling than ever before. We are waging a strenuous fight to restore health to our industry. I have no doubt and every expectation that we will be successful, and that we will retain for our young people an exciting recreation which has remarkable character building effects.

If the Congress will repeal this "temporary war-time excise tax" you will be making a great contribution to our recovery. You will have given us the equivalent of an additional 7,500,000 games of bowling a year, and this will be a powerful shot in the arm. It will be substantial tax relief to some 10,000 small businessmen, and to many of us it may mean the difference between staying in and going out of business.

While the alley bed tax which I have just discussed is our primary concern, there are two additional excise taxes that have a serious impact upon bowling, to which I would like to refer briefly.

Many, if not most, bowlers bowl as members of bowling leagues. Those leagues customarily reserve the use of bowling lanes at a bowling establishment once a week for 26 to 33 weeks each year. More than 7,500,000 such league bowlers belong to the American Bowling Congress (ABC) and the Woman's International Bowling Congress (WIBC). They pay dues to the ABC and WIBC, and to the affiliated State and city bowling associations in their communities, and they also pay dues to their leagues which cover the costs of their league bowling. There are probably several million additional bowlers who also bowl as members of leagues outside of the ABC and WIBC. Duckpin bowlers, for example, bowl in leagues of the National Duckpin Bowling Congress.

Section 4241 of the Internal Revenue Code applies an excise tax of 20 percent "of any amount paid as dues or membership fees to any social, athletic, or sporting club or organization, if the dues or fees of an active resident annual member are in excess of $10 a year." Section 4242(a) provides that dues as used therein include any assessment, irrespective of the purpose for which made, and any charges for social privileges or facilities, or for golf, tennis, polo, swimming, or other athletic or sporting privileges or facilities, for any period of more than 6 days.

Bowling leagues do not, of course, own or operate their own bowling facilities. They do not have clubhouses or their own facilities. It has never been thought that the club dues tax is applicable to them and to the bowling charges which they incur.

However, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has now taken the position that the club dues tax is applicable, and in the case of *J. R. Johnston* v. *Commissioner*, Federal Judge Charles Wyzanski of the U.S. District Court for Massachusetts has recently held that the amount paid by a taxpayer as a member of a bowling club for participation in bowling league competition at commercial bowling alleys is subject to the dues tax. The court found that the right of the bowler, as member of a bowling league, to use the commercial bowling lanes in a bowling establishment on 26 specific occasions constituted repeated and general use of a common club facility for an appreciable period of time and so was taxable.

In the many years that there has been a club dues tax, it has never been thought that it was applicable to the cost of bowling as a member of a bowling league. If the cost of bowling is to be increased by such an additional 20 percent, it can very well result in a further loss of bowling business to the detriment of both the bowler and the bowling proprietor. It is respectfully requested that the committee make it clear that it was not the intent of Congress to make the club dues tax so applicable.

Finally, I call your attention to section 4161 of the Internal Revenue Code, which imposes a manufacturer's excise tax of 10 percent on bowling balls and pins, which in turn is passed on to the bowling proprietors. An average bowling establishment replaces 77 sets of pins each year, each set costing an average of $48. Multiplying the 77 sets per establishment by the 6,000-plus establishments in our association, would show an annual use of 462,000 sets of pins, and multiplying this figure by the average price of $48 per set indicates that approximately $22 million annually is spent by our members for bowling pins.

It is estimated that more than a half million bowling balls are sold annually at an aggregate price of $7,500,000. The annual sales of bowling pins and balls come to approximately $29,500,000. The amount collected by the Treasury under this 10-percent tax would total slightly less than $3 million annually.

The manufacturers of bowling balls and pins have indicated that, if this tax should be repealed, the tax saving would be passed on to the bowling proprietors. It goes without saying that if tax relief of this sort were given, it would be of tremendous assistance to our efforts to rehabilitate our very depressed bowling industry.

Galveston, Tex., Has Successful Project for School Dropouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 9, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, high school dropouts pose a major problem for American education. In addition to the personal tragedy to the individuals themselves, dropouts are a problem for society. School dropouts of 1962 had an unemployment rate of 28.6 percent in October 1962.

This summer, the people of Galveston, Tex., endeavored to meet the school dropout issue headon, and did so with apparent success. In a special instruction project at Galveston's Central High School, 87 percent of the class completed the course of instruction and advanced an average of one grade level. Most of the students had IQ's well below 100.

The people of Galveston are to be commended for their progressive attitude. I hope more of our communities will follow Galveston's example in doing more than merely talk about an unfortunate situation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Special Project for Dropouts Called Success." The article was published in the Houston Chronicle on September 3, 1964.

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

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Sept. 3, 1964]

SPECIAL PROJECT FOR DROPOUTS CALLED SUCCESS

GALVESTON.—A special instructional project for high school dropouts and potential dropouts conducted this summer was an apparent success, the Galveston school board was told Wednesday night.

Dr. Leon Morgan, principal of Central High School, and Frank Vollert, district curriculum director, reported progress during an 8-week period.

Dr. Morgan said Central's program began with 30 students, 26 of which stayed to the end. He said those students who remained advanced one grade level on the average and that attendance was 84.8 percent, well above the average.

He also said student attitude toward the program was very good.

The principal said special materials were used which allowed for more individualized instruction in numerical and reading skills. Psychiatric social workers, psychologists, and highly trained teachers conducted classes.

Most of the students had IQ's well below 100 Dr. Morgan said.

School superintendent, Dr. Morgan Evans said funds for a more extensive program are

not now available, but it is hoped that donations and grants will be made available to further the project.

He said he would like to start the program on the junior high level.

The program at Ball High School started out with a class of 15, but only finished with 5.

Dr. Evans said the administration will recommend the dropout program be continued during the regular term.

Seymour Siegel's Penchant for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article that appeared in the New York Herald Tribune magazine section of August 30. It is about Seymour Siegel, the indefatigable program director of radio station WNYC. Sy Siegel, as he is known by his friends, has been in charge of WNYC ever since Fiorello La Guardia put him there in 1934.

No testimonial to Sy Siegel and to the job that he has done in the public interest in his radio station could be better than this article by Ruth Biemiller. It is deserving of wide attention. Congratulations to the author, Ruth Biemiller, and to Sy Siegel of radio station WNYC.

The article follows:

SEYMOUR SIEGEL'S "PENCHANT FOR SURVIVAL"
(By Ruth Biemiller)

"Raise your right hand," said Fiorello Henry La Guardia.

Seymour N. Siegel raised his right hand. Seconds later he was, somewhat to his surprise, assistant program director of radio station WNYC. "And now, Sy," said the mayor, "your first assignment is to go across the street and close the joint down."

That was January 1934, 2 days after the Little Flower stepped into city hall to begin the first of three warm, turbulent, outrageously high-handed, benevolently paterfamiliastic and hotly reformist terms as mayor of the city of New York. One of his campaign promises had been that he would, if elected, save the people's money by scuttling the city's 12-year-old broadcasting station.

His chosen demolition deputy had not applied for the job. Siegel worked for La Guardia in the 1933 Fusion campaign and had known him since 1924, the year La Guardia, running on the Progressive ticket, had defeated his father, Justice Isaac Siegel of domestic relations court, then Republican candidate for Representative from the 20th Congressional District, an office Judge Siegel had held from 1914 until 1922. But in 1924 young Seymour Siegel (B.S., University of Pennsylvania, 1929; M.A., Columbia, 1932) was happily settled in a Wall Street brokerage firm, writing its daily market letter.

Today, 30 years later, the "joint" is still swinging, and Seymour Siegel with it.

Not only did he not liquidate WNYC. Backed by a La Guardia who was soon employing the station to the advantage of the mayor's office and to the delectation of the citizenry, he remained there, growing with the station as he found new ways to forge a communications link between various municipal departments (markets, health, education, parks, police, fire, etc.) and the people they were created to serve. That he also successfully pioneered in egghead programing—broadening the "good music" concept already identified with WNYC (recordings had been a staple since the station's early days) to include live music, folk music, hi-fi gospel and premieres of contemporary American and European music; experimenting with "talk" presentations of poetry, multilingual drama, books, discussions of issues of the day, comment on the United States from foreign periodicals, gavel-to-gavel U.N. proceedings, municipal budget hearings—speaks for the intelligence of the New Yorkers who are long-time devotees of WNYC, and for his prescience.

For the poets and professors and assorted long-hairs who were thoroughly noncommercial when Siegel first put them on air have since become relatively hot commercial properties. This creates a problem for Siegel—"they've come to like money, and I can't afford even token payment—not even carfare," he said recently. But he appeared undaunted. This is not the first, the worst, or the last problem of his municipal career, and it is obvious that he not only accepts but thrives on the crises presented by a zero budget for talent and the necessity to push onward and upward with both ears to the ground, one for the citizens of a great city, the other for their elected representatives.

As director of the Municipal Broadcasting System, to which post he was appointed in 1947, Siegel is now the boyish, crewcut dean of municipal appointees (Robert Moses having abandoned the city for greener meadows) and custodian of an octopine operation encompassing film production, an extensive public address system, two-way municipal radio communications, traffic coordination, the mayor's committee on living music, and a communications center known to the public as 999–1234, a telephone number which when called imparts up-to-the-minute information about traffic snarls and ferryboat contretemps as well as miscellaneous emergency bulletins occasioned by "weather" and other disasters. And, in addition to WNYC and WNYC–FM, there has been, since November 1962, WNYC–TV, an ultra-high-frequency television station, the only municipally operated television station in the country, and the most powerful television station in the world.

WNYC–TV is the most recent development in the electronic revolution which has overtaken the city under Siegel's direction. It is doubtful if the city fathers would ever have allocated funds for the facility, but Siegel, who long ago foresaw the usefulness to the city and its people of municipal television, not to mention its inevitability, effected a stunning deal with the Federal Communications Commission which made the installation financially feasible—that is to say, practically free. The city operated the station on an experimental basis for 1 year, enabling the FCC to test the effectiveness of UHF broadcasting in densely built-up areas. The FCC then turned over to the city $2 million worth of transmitting equipment, plus antenna, with the understanding that the city would pay off a $384,000 balance due RCA for leased equipment.

At formal dedication ceremonies of WNYC–TV, or channel 31, Mayor Wagner remarked on the man who has scaled countless creative and departmental Everests in the course of his career with the city. "You have a penchant for survival, Sy," said the mayor.

A penchant for survival, certainly: 30 years and four frequently-troubled administrations. But isn't there a passion for anonymity, as well? To the 350,000 to 400,000 New Yorkers who have listened regularly over the years to WNYC, the words "Seymour N. Siegel, director," are as familiar as the call letters of the station, yet few of them know more about the man than his name. Throughout this country and in Europe he is known and honored in his field. To many people in the world he is, in fact, Mr. Non-Commercial Broadcasting, but he has managed to function at top professional posts (presidency of National Association of Educational Broadcasters, the General Assembly of Prix Italia and chairman, International Broadcasting Council) and to receive distinguished honors (the French and Netherlands Governments have decorated him, and his awards and citations are literally too numerous to mention) with minimum fanfare and no personal exploitation whatsoever.

Could there be a relation between survival and anonymity? This question Siegel treated lightly—he is not in the least pompous—but added that personal publicity interests him very little, except where it increases public awareness of the constantly expanding services of the city. It is not often that a man who says he doesn't want publicity really means it, but Siegel was matter-of-fact and completely convincing on this point. If fame is eliminated as a motive, why does Siegel remain in public service, many aspects of which are sheer hell—budget limitations, pressures from politicians, pressures from citizens solo and in groups, some pro bono publico, some definitely self-seeking?

Money? Siegel started with the city at $3,000 and moved gradually and recently to $15,000. Any day he chooses to leave the city for commercial broadcasting, he could command a six-figure salary.

Not for money, obviously. Why, then?

"I know of no place where you could have as much fun," he said. "That and a wide range of experience. Take this morning. We had a session with the housing authority. It has become imperative that they have a police frequency if they are to protect their tenants. It happens that there is no frequency available. We're going to have to find one."

Until now, Siegel's manner had been friendly and easy—and precise and sure, the practiced sureness of a man accustomed to deal with the public who must therefore be a diplomat, accountable for what he says. Now, as he explored the possibility of finding a nonexistent frequency, the public servant syndrome vanished. Animated, absorbed in the problem, he launched into the story of a similar impasse. Not long ago it became obvious that ferryboats, in the interests of safety, must have a frequency. Marine frequencies in the New York area are densely occupied. On the technicality that ferryboats function as bridges, he was able to arrange a highway maintenance frequency. Months later, on the very day it was installed, Washington ruled that all ferryboats must have marine frequencies. After much legislative and legalistic causerie, a modus vivendi was achieved.

An even more complex problem has been finding a site for a new, powerful transmitter which will solve many technical problems that have plagued the municipal broadcasting system. "I've been in the real estate business," Siegel said, looking a trifle outraged, and there followed such a tale of crises involving several Federal and many local agencies and pressure groups and contract deadlines as to make the perils of Pauline pale. (It looks as though the transmitter will occupy 50 acres on Staten Island, part of a disused hospital site.)

The impact of the city's radio and television programs is in some ways difficult to assess. The city cannot afford commercial rating services, but Pulse and Nielsen frequently forward old reports made for commercial broadcasters from which it is possible to extrapolate information about the WNYC and WNYC–TV public. It is on this basis that the audience of 350,000 to 400,000 is established.

Siegel says, "One million words on public health go out each year. Are they effective? We really can't say. But suppose they did not go out?

"Again, 20,000 missing persons are reported yearly on our missing persons program. I know of only half a dozen who have been found directly because of our broadcasts. There may be hundreds more. I don't know. But I do know that there are other values. For families of missing persons, there is the knowledge that something is being done. That is a value."

Mail and telephone calls are obvious yardsticks. When the station drops everything, as it frequently does, for one of its festivals—a week or more of concentration on education, books, mental health, drama, music (from Lincoln's Birthday to Washington's Birthday for 25 years, the American Music Festival has flooded the airwaves with such a feast of American music as has never been heard or thought of elsewhere)—devotees of regularly scheduled programs scream with frustration, via letter, postcard, or telephone.

"If a United Nations program is canceled, the switchboards light up like Christmas trees," according to John De Prospo, Siegel's executive officer and himself a dedicated municipal employee. When WNYC carried direct live broadcasts of the recent FCC hearings on the decline and fall of original drama on commercial television, enthusiastic letters of appreciation poured in at the rate of close to 2,000 a day.

The instinct to eliminate the city's broadcasting system has not been limited to La Guardia. From the time WNYC was established in 1922 under the administration of Mayor John Hylan and under the special aegis of Grover Whelan, then commissioner of plants and structures, it has been a favorite target. As Siegel says, "With a $2 billion overall city budget, the only cut anybody can think of is the $500,000 for the communications system. It doesn't happen much any more, but when it does I make a point of going directly to the person and submitting the facts."

Actually, nobody seriously attempts these days to abolish WNYC, and it is largely Siegel's stewardship of the station which has removed it from annual and perennial danger of its life. Even the citizens' budget commission, which battled the station for 30 years as a waste of public money, admitted a year ago that the station was doing a good job for the people.

The facts submitted by Siegel are of course the long list of services the municipal broadcasting system renders other city departments and the money it saves them. The public address system alone covers 400 city functions a year, including park concerts, youth board dances (four a night during the summer). There is also crowd control: from Friday to Tuesday during the recent unpleasantness in Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant, Brooklyn, the police requested and operated five public address trucks. The two-way communications system, in its reports from reservoirs alone, saves the city $15,000 a month in toll calls.

Another saving to the city stems from what has come to be called "scrambled yeggs," the morning lineup which begins WNYC–TV's broadcasting day. Suspects face cameras at Centre Street headquarters. To protect their civil rights, the picture is scrambled beyond recognition before it goes on air. With a decoder, detectives view the lineup at five uptown precincts, thus saving the cost of the daily trip downtown.

There have been those who would abolish WNYC, and there have been those who would like to see it go commercial. But the fact of the matter is that costs would rise sharply were the city's broadcasting system to go commercial, and it is doubtful whether or not it could compete on a commercial basis with other stations. Certainly many of the service and creative aspects of its programing would change.

The immediate future for Siegel will obviously be getting channel 31 off the ground. There is a strong probability that the same battles he has fought for technical excellence and programing integrity for radio will have to be fought all over again.

In Siegel's future, also, is the implementation of a poverty project program which he has submitted to the Federal Government. As he visualizes it, 300 youngsters will be involved initially and the city's broadcasting system will be the training ground in technical and creative skills and disciplines, with orchestral and choral groups a distinct possibility.

The poverty project program will be an extension of an internship plan which has existed for the past 15 years. Young people enrolled in it have not been paid, as they will be in the new venture, but every station in New York City and many elsewhere have WNYC alumni on staff.

Siegel has approached broadcasting mindful of its potential and has striven to push that potential to its limits, in terms of service on two levels: the working of the city and the cultural enrichment of the city. In the face of many odds, he has done a superb job. But he was lucky; nobody in the world has had quite his chance to function creatively on such a scale in this relatively new technological world. In other countries, noncommercial broadcasting is by and large propaganda ridden, locked up in political considerations. Commercial broadcasting has its own limitations.

One can, with feeling, wish a long life to WNYC, WNYC–TV, and Seymour Siegel.

Dr. Fred D. Maurer, of Texas A. & M. University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 9, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the people of Texas are, I believe, justly proud of the many fine accomplishments which have taken place over the years at Texas A. & M. University. The advances in agriculture and engineering which have been the fruits of painstaking research by Texas A. & M. scientists have helped raise the living standards of all Americans.

The hope that Texas A. & M. will continue its outstanding work has been swelled by the appointment of Dr. Fred D. Maurer as associate dean and professor of pathology. Dr. Maurer has recently been awarded the Nation's second highest peacetime award, the Legion of Merit, by the U.S. Army.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Army Awards A. & M. Dean Second Highest Honor."

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

ARMY AWARDS A. & M. DEAN SECOND HIGHEST HONOR

COLLEGE STATION.—Dr. Fred D. Maurer, new associate dean and professor of pathology at Texas A. & M. University, College Station, has been awarded the Nation's second highest peacetime award, the Legion of Merit, by the U.S. Army.

A retired colonel, Dr. Maurer was presented the award by Maj. Gen. Joseph E. Bastion, Jr., commanding general of the Armor Center at Fort Knox, Ky.

The new A. & M. faculty member will assume duties here September 1 after 20 years' military service. He is known for his research with viruses and animal diseases.

A Cornell University graduate, Dr. Maurer earlier was cited by the Army for establishing laboratory practices that curbed animal diseases threatening the livestock of Canada.

His latest assignment was with the Army Medical Research Laboratory at Fort Knox, where he headed the department of pathology and division of medicine.

Dr. Maurer also is president of the American College of Veterinary Pathologists.

Certificates of Deposit and Bank Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 21, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert S. Messersmith, president of the National League of Insured Savings Associations, has recently made some interesting remarks on the improper and dangerous practices going on with respect to certificates of deposit. A certificate of deposit, Mr. Speaker, is a negotiable instrument created by a commercial bank and which represents a deposit liability of the bank. These instruments represent an increasingly popular means for banks to attract large deposits quickly. Recently it has come to my attention that this instrument has been the subject of grave abuses. Mr. Messersmith, on the president's page of the August 1964, issue of the National League Journal, has the following comment on the Federal banking agencies' failure to regulate the use of certificates of deposit:

CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSIT
(By Robert S. Messersmith)

The most extraordinary aspect of the fiasco over certificates of deposit is that the Federal banking authorities have yet to take one single regulatory action against the commercial banking industry to prevent issuance of worthless certificates of deposits.

So far as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is concerned, only two actions have been taken: (1) It has closed the allegedly insolvent banks which issued the certificates of deposit; and (2) It has refused to pay some depositors in the now defunct banks who probably thought that the certificates of deposit they bought from a broker at a premium were insured at least to $10,000. Whether the latter is good or bad, right or wrong, is beside the point and will, in any event, be decided by the courts.

The real issue is whether the Federal banking authorities are going to tighten their regulation to protect the public against commercial banks selling in the public marketplace certificates of deposit which may prove later to be of little or no value.

While the banking authorities ponder the problem, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has stepped into the picture to provide new regulatory protections for the savings and loan business. But the fact remains that the problem is not fundamentally one for the Bank Board; it is a clear-cut problem for the FDIC and other bank regulators.

Moreover, the recent bank failures in Texas and Michigan disclose serious regulatory shortcomings which ought to be examined and remedied. Banks ought not to be immune from the kind of tighter regulations which the Bank Board has recently promulgated for the savings and loan industry.

Appendix

The Reapportionment Question Requires Deep Consideration by Every Citizen in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, although the House has already passed the Tuck bill, and I cast my vote for it, there is growing indication that the provisions of that bill will not be affirmed by the Senate.

However, a measure of some kind should be enacted to postpone for a reasonable period the effectiveness of the recent Supreme Court decision on this important matter.

There are numerous bills, mine among them, which would provide that for 7 years the Federal courts could have no jurisdiction over any action to reapportion one house of a State legislature if the other house of such legislature is apportioned according to population.

During the grace period the several States could consider and act upon a constitutional amendment which would permit the States to apportion one house of their legislatures on considerations other than population.

Constitutional amendments require approval by three-fourths of the States, or 38 States under the present makeup of the Union. Surely if that many States desire to operate under the so-called Federal system, the popularity of that system should be manifest. I am not impressed by the argument that the Federal system was a compromise effected when the smaller colonies held a gun to the head of the larger ones back in our formative days. The important thing is that the system has worked, no matter what kind of labor pains it has had.

The country is clearly divided on the issue, but all divisions do not necessarily follow the expected line; that is, small town or rural communities opposing the High Court, and urban concentrations supporting it.

Appearing on the same day, September 1, 1964, in newspapers 1,100 miles apart, were the following two editorials taking essentially the same theme. One was in the Washington Daily News, Nation's Capital flagship of the great Scripps-Howard chain, and the other in Fred Morain's Jefferson (Iowa) Bee, the weekly county seat newspaper of Greene County, Iowa. Both argue for giving the people, through their legislatures, a chance to ratify a restatement of the guidelines to be employed in constituting a State legislature.

The Supreme Court's view of the 14th amendment, through which they reached this tortured ruling, is a pronouncement so far reaching that the only possible time to remedy the potential damage is now, while a free and unpressured electorate can still assert itself.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point, I include herein the two editorials heretofore mentioned, one from the Washington Daily News and the other from the Jefferson Bee:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Sept. 1, 1964]

THE REAPPORTIONMENT ISSUE

An argument that rings the bell with us in the heated debate over the Supreme Court's equal-population-basis decision for apportionment of State legislatures is:

Why should it be unconstitutional for a State legislature to be set up along lines regarded as strictly constitutional for the Federal Legislature? To wit, one house on a population basis and the other on a basis including geography.

The Supreme Court gave short shrift to this line of argument in its controversial 6-to-3 decision on June 15, holding that under the 14th amendment it is unconstitutional for either house of a State legislature to be apportioned on other than a population basis. The Court majority said the Federal-State situations were not analogous.

This decision now, of course, is the law of the land.

But there is great disagreement as shown by the strength of the Dirksen-Mansfield "breather" amendment in the Senate and by the 218-to-175 House vote last week for the Tuck bill to deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction over apportionment of State legislatures.

And just how important is the Court's decision was stated best by Justice Potter Stewart in his vigorous dissent:

"The Court's draconian pronouncement, which makes unconstitutional the legislatures, of most of the 50 States, finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of our Federal Union."

With the situation as chaotic as it is in many States and with the issue of such overriding importance, it seems mandatory for Congress upon its return after the Democratic Convention to pass something such as the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment. This would give Congress time at its next session to decide whether to submit to the States the proposed constitutional amendment to allow a State, if its voters approve, to set up a legislature along Federal lines—one house on a strict population basis and the other taking geography and other factors into account.

Such a constitutional amendment seems highly desirable. The States should be given some latitude on how they want to set up their legislatures.

Under the highly regarded Federal system, for example, New York with 16.5 million people has 2 U.S. Senators and Nevada with only 285,000 citizens also has 2 U.S. Senators. That's constitutional and—so far—hasn't ruined the country.

Why shouldn't it be made constitutional for the voters of California, for instance, if they so choose, to set up one house of its legislature on an other-than-population basis to keep Los Angeles County from dominating its legislature?

[From the Jefferson (Iowa) Bee, Sept. 1, 1964]

REAPPORTIONMENT AND THE CONGRESS

The matter of legislative reapportionment continues to be a hot issue at both the State and National levels.

There is widespread feeling that the Federal Supreme Court decision which would seem to require that both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned strictly on a population basis is just about as extreme as are legislatures which have neither house on a population basis. The feeling has led to a number of suggestions in the Congress which would take the matter away from court control.

Some of the congressional bills are foolish, some—it seems—are unconstitutional. However, one which is cosponsored by Iowa's Senator Jack Miller, with bipartisan support, would require that one house of a State legislature be apportioned strictly on population but would give to the people of a State the exclusive power to determine the makeup of the other house.

Miller, in his explanation of the bill, says: "There are many who believe that to have a check-and-balance legislative system, other factors than population should govern the composition of the second house. It isn't just a case of representing acres. Economic interests which are vital to a State and its people, such as agricultural land, mineral deposits, recreational areas, industrial section, are not necessarily accompanied by a large resident population. It would seem that the people of a State should have the right to take such factors into account, if they wished, in establishing a check-and-balance legislative system."

When the people of Iowa began their debate on reapportionment several years ago, there was no thought that both houses should be entirely on population. We are convinced that, if given an opportunity to vote on the matter at this time, such would not be approved. There is recognition that the "other factors" of which Senator Miller speaks—particularly that of agriculture—are entitled to legislative representation in Iowa on a different basis than a simple count of hands.

The Congress will probably not get around to passing the measure before it adjourns this fall but it should be high on the agenda when it reconvenes after the first of the year.

In the meantime it will be interesting to watch for the expression of opinion from those who asked for "fair treatment" when the shoe was on the other foot.

Mrs. Michael Kutzmonich's Homemade Delicacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago while reading one of the distin-

guished weekly papers published in my district, the Mountain View, I came across a story where a well-known TV personality, Nick Adams—"The Rebel"—was visiting relatives in the area. Later on, as a guest on Jack Carson's program, he loudly praised the cooking and canning prowess of his cousin, Mrs. Michael Kutzmonich, of Mountain Top, Pa., my congressional district.

I noticed that the products which were put up and canned were peaches, pears, pickles, strawberry and plum preserves.

As you know, I make it a point from time to time to call attention to the Members of the House that I have other things than coal mines in my district. I have quite a substantial agricultural economy, and whether they are farmers' wives or miners' wives, I have always known there are no better cooks or home canners in the country than I have in my district.

I got in touch with the editor of the Mountain Top View, Mr. Andrew Yurkanin, asked him to get in touch with the lady in question, and if she had any extra jars of these wonderful preserves and fruits, I would be tickled to death to bring them down here, take them to the House dining room, and see that you, Mr. Speaker, had a sample.

Within a week Mrs. Kutzmonich appeared at my residence and left for me some of her peaches, pickles, pears, strawberry and plum preserves.

Well, as you know, Mr. Speaker, I put them on the table in the House dining room, and I never saw anything go so fast in my life. If I had not been there when they were opened, I would never get a taste of them myself. As it was, I got a taste of one pickle, one peach and some of the plum preserves out of the whole batch. I noticed, particularly, the "Big City" boys from New York and Philadelphia, really gobbled up these homemade delicacies—and I know you enjoyed your little taste as well.

United States Pushing Rural Defense To Protect Food Sources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRAHAM PURCELL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, in its July 19, 1964 edition, carried a story by James E. Vance which outlined the effort being made in rural America by the Office of Civil Defense.

It tells of the progress being made in helping prepare our rural citizens for the possibility, however remote, of nuclear attack. It also tells of the frustrations faced by officials charged with this task in making people aware of the needs.

The Civil Defense Director for Region 5 at Denton, Tex., Bill Parker, provided Vance with the information on which this article is based. I commend this article to my colleagues:

UNITED STATES PUSHING RURAL DEFENSE TO PROTECT FOOD SOURCES

(By James E. Vance)

DENTON, July 18—Human nature being what it is, people often develop an "I could care less" attitude rather than show concern—except when danger appears.

The task of changing that attitude falls to a small army with a two-fold goal should the United States come under a nuclear attack.

"The first job would be to save lives," said Billy J. Cox. "The other would be production of food."

The latter would depend largely on protection of farmers and ranchers and their soil and livestock.

The complex plan for both jobs was unfolded at the Denton Federal Center. The big underground facility serves as the hub of Civil Defense in a five-State area.

Bill Parker, Civil Defense director, said the installation would become the nerve center of all Government activities in the area in the event of a disaster. It's the first of eight such installations.

Cox, education and training specialist, said much emphasis had been placed on shelters and survival of residents in cities.

New emphasis is being placed on rural areas.

"There's no question there would be a substantial number of people killed in a nuclear attack," Cox said. "However, with shelter against fallout, millions would be spared in urban areas.

"In the rural areas chances are that 9 out of 10 people wouldn't be affected by the blast or thermal effects, but it's protection against fallout they and their livestock need."

He said any way to get mass (earth, concrete, or other materials between the drifting menace and people and animals would enhance survival.

The Agriculture Department and its many agencies already are actively engaged in rural defense.

A survey shows 50 percent or more of the population within the five State area (Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana) is within the rural or under 10,000 concentration category.

"Each State and county has a defense board," Cox said. "These are headed by personnel of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. Each of the agencies has a specific assignment in case of disaster."

County agents and specialists of the extension service are training rural people to protect themselves and their livestock.

"A big percentage of rural people have some type of shelter against weather and for storage of food," Cox said. "With a slight modification, including extra dirt on top, a buffer wall at the entrance, and possibly additional ventilation, the existing shelters could be made fallout proof."

Dual-purpose shelters are encouraged offering protection plus space for daily use such as a spare bedroom or storage.

The nature of a nuclear disaster casts an even bigger responsibility on agricultural agencies, farmers, and ranchers to feed people.

"There are reserve stocks, but they are inadequate," Cox explained. "That's the reason we must educate people how they could get soil and livestock productive again when necessary."

He admitted that motivation of people is a difficult task, especially before danger or disaster occurs.

The Agricultural Research Service is engaged in tests with soils, crops, and livestock to determine lethal limits of radiation and action for recovery to reach their normal production.

Cox said the newest approach is a training program for county agricultural agents to qualify for evaluation of rural facilities.

"It just makes good sense for county agents to know how to tell a farmer or rancher how to beef up his facilities to be protected against fallout," Cox explained.

He said future plans call for a rural radiological monitoring network.

"It may sound farfetched from raising crops and livestock," he said, "but it's necessary. Although problems are basically alike, intensity of fallout varies from farm to farm."

The monitoring procedure would be learned from a few hours of instruction, and qualified farmers and ranchers would be issued monitoring instruments. Stockmen could avoid areas with lethal dosage.

By the nature of the civil defense program, Cox admitted people are lackadaisical toward major disasters happening in this country.

"When tension is brought on by such action as the Cuban and Berlin crises, interest in self-protection steps up to a pace equal to grocery grabs on supermarket shelves," Cox said. "It's hard to make people believe the time to get prepared for danger is before it happens."

Devoted Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Kansas recently lost one of its able and hard-working weekly newspaper editors. Chet Bowline, who had spent most of his life in the weekly newspaper field, passed away at the age of 67 in McPherson, Kans. At the time he was editor of the McPherson County News and the Inman, Kans., News. Mr. Bowline was a good friend of mine who loved his work and his fellow man. He was active in his church and he practiced the Golden Rule in his relationships with his friends and neighbors.

Kansas is indeed fortunate to be served by many outstanding weekly newspapers and men like Chet Bowline who are devoted to the enlightenment and progress of their communities. We will miss Chet Bowline but we are heartened by the fact that his wife and family will continue to publish the weekly newspapers in McPherson and Inman.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial of September 4, 1964, from the Topeka Daily Capital:

DEVOTED EDITOR

Chet Bowline, McPherson weekly newspaper editor who died unexpectedly this week, was typical of the large group of Kansas newsmen who have served their State and fellow citizens well.

While he had in recent years been in newspaper work at Lindsborg and then at McPherson, Mr. Bowline was best known for his long tenure as editor of the Hope Dispatch. For 31 years he published the Dispatch until fire wiped out his shop on Hope's main street.

Chet Bowline didn't want to leave the small Dickinson County town he knew so well because he had a love for it and its people. He knew every section of land in the

Hope community and the people who owned it and farmed it, and he liked to dig into the history of the area.

Mr. Bowline was a man who believed that advancing age was no excuse for mental inactivity. He once told a fellow editor that to keep his mind alert, he set out to memorize the names of counties in the various States, whenever he had a few minutes of leisure time. We have no doubt that he accomplished his memory task.

Active in Baptist Church work, Mr. Bowline was also devoted to civic and school endeavors while he was Hope's editor. He and men like him leave their mark on their communities—a mark for good and decent living.

When Law and Order Collapses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that we do not become so callous and indifferent that we condone lawlessness and a breakdown in law enforcement such as we witnessed in the city of Philadelphia a few days ago.

Much has been said in regard to extremism but I strongly doubt that anyone can find a more frightening example of extreme lawlessness than that which resulted in injury to so many people and the destruction of so much property. Here was extremism at its ugly worst, completely unprovoked, and in a city where racial discrimination is scarcely discernible.

As for moderation, those who excuse the Philadelphia police for standing idly by while a crowd of hoodlums ransacked stores, destroyed property, and threatened innocent people, are simply saying that our lives and property must continue in jeopardy if law enforcement means, even remotely, that the party in power might feel repercussions at the polls. For the fact will always remain that this was completely a matter of political expediency and the police were left impotent in the face of pillaging crowds simply because someone told them to keep hands off. And to suggest that an appeal might have gone out for the State police and the National Guard is unthinkable since such forces in Pennsylvania would move at the direction of a Republican Governor.

The final payoff is had in the bland statement that the Federal Government will be called upon to advance the money necessary to the rehabilitation of the devastated area—another example of bringing Washington into a situation that should have remained under local control from the start.

The Upper Main Line News is a reputable newspaper published in my district and circulating throughout the area adjacent to Philadelphia. Hear what the editor of that paper has to say on this subject in his September 3 issue, entitled "Did Law and Order Die?"

DID LAW AND ORDER DIE?

The recent riots in the streets of Philadelphia should be labeled as one of the darkest days in law enforcement history.

There are those who will argue quite to the contrary and point out that the Philadelphia police handled a wild riot without one single death on either side. This is true, and the darkness which settled over law enforcement in the city is brightened by the almost unbelievable restraint shown by those police officers who were forced to cringe behind automobiles while seeking permission to return fire against a man shooting at them from a rooftop. It is brightened by the very fact that many police officers feel very badly about the way the situation was handled.

But, it was a sad day for policemen everywhere when Philadelphia officers were ordered to remove their badges to prevent rioters from ripping them from their shirts and using them as weapons against them.

Throughout the history of modern law enforcement, the policeman's badge has been the symbol of law and order. It has been worn proudly by many men. It has gleamed from the breast of many a dead policeman who felt the emblem of law and order was worth dying for.

But now, the policeman's badge has become a weapon against him. Now, in the face of enemies of society, he is told to remove his badge for fear it will be ripped from his chest. He sadly tucked his badge into his pocket in Philadelphia, and though the politicians and leaders of the city say no one died in the riots, the policeman knows this is not so.

For when those policemen tucked their badges into their pockets a little bit of every good policeman in the city died. Indeed, there is a good chance that law and order itself died in Philadelphia.

And, if, as the city officials have stated, police were not under orders to restrain themselves from preventing looting, law and order did die.

But, we find it extremely difficult to believe policemen would allow such incidents to occur if their hands were not tied. We find it impossible to believe that any policeman would cringe behind an automobile while he was being shot at—and ask permission to shoot back—unless he was ordered to keep his gun in his holster. We find it impossible to believe groups of policemen would stand by and watch a long line of looters waiting to enter a devastated store—unless they were under orders not to move against them.

While the mayor is asking for investigations let him investigate his own administrative back yard and find out what happened to law and order. Let's find out if police were under such orders, and if so, who gave them. And, if no such orders were given, let's find out where the breakdown occurred in the chain of command.

But, most important of all, let's find out why the city wasn't prepared to meet the emergency when the officials are now saying it was a well-organized riot which they had information about some time ago. If the city wanted their policemen restrained for political reasons, the State police or the National Guard should have been called in to assure the peaceful residents of the community the full protection of the law.

The Washington Post on Tax-Exempt Foundations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, an editorial, "Tax-Exempt Foundations," which appeared in the September 7 issue of the Washington Post, deserves to be read by a lot of people. It points up poignantly the need for legislative action in matters pertaining to tax-exempt foundations, which have unfortunately taken too many billions of dollars off the legitimate tax rolls. They have been abused so outrageously that in my opinion the Congress of the United States has no more urgent matter before it.

Time and again my hard-working and earnest colleague, Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN has brought to light some incredible abuses of so-called educational and charitable foundations.

These abuses are to our tax structure veritable killer viruses. They weaken respect for the Government's legitimate tax claims upon its citizens. In effect they seem to point up the ability of people of great wealth to avoid taxes.

The Post editorial, while recognizing the difficulty of writing legislation that will correct horrendous abuses of the tax-free foundation concept, indicates in part what corrective measures might be taken.

Certainly something must be done, and the Nation is tremendously indebted to Chairman PATMAN for educating the public on the need for taking action.

TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN'S investigation of the Life Line Foundation, an organization financed principally by the Texas oil magnate, H. L. Hunt, raises some very difficult questions about the propriety of exempting from taxation institutions that are engaged in the propagation of political ideas.

When an organization is exempted from Federal taxation, it in fact receives a subsidy from the taxpayers at large. Contributions to most tax-exempt foundations are deductible, and to the extent that they reduce the revenues of the Federal Government, an additional burden is imposed on all taxpayers. The same type of subsidy is awarded where the foundation receives operating income on which no taxes are paid.

There is nothing inherently objectionable about Federal subsidies, but there is something very wrong about compelling people to subsidize—however indirectly—the propagation of political ideas that they may abhor. Those who are repelled by the Life Line Foundation's concept of the good society should not be forced to underwrite it with their tax dollars. And by the same token, those who share Mr. Hunt's views should not be forced by the Government to subsidize the activities of the tax-exempt fund for the Republic.

Clearly the Federal Government should not be subsidizing the dissemination of particular political ideas, but assuring its neutrality is no mean feat. Under the present law, which rests upon precedents established in the Internal Revenue Act of 1894, the Internal Revenue Service is entrusted with the delicate task of determining whether organizations are eligible for tax exemption. An important criterion is that "no substantial part" of the activities of an educational organization be devoted to influencing legislation.

Difficulties arise when one attempts to frame a workable definition of substantiality. And other dilemmas arise. If a radio broadcaster, sponsored by a tax-exempt foundation, attacks the medicare proposals with copious references to the Scriptures, is he propagating religion or attempting to influence legislation?

One way of minimizing these difficulties and insulating the Internal Revenue Service against the insidious pressures to which it was subjected during the McCarthy period

of political hysteria would be to limit severely the scope of tax exemptions. If exemptions were limited to publicly chartered schools, colleges and universities and to those organizations engaged in providing health and welfare services, the degree to which the dissemination of particular political ideas is involuntarily subsidized would be substantially reduced. And the abuses of those foundations established only to avoid taxes or to provide vehicles for corporate mergers and acquisitions would also be eliminated.

There is no easy or obvious way out of the foundation dilemma. The policy suggested above could in practice prove deleterious or fraught with administrative difficulties. What is obvious is that Congress should review the statutes governing tax exemptions. Those creatures of the 19th century should be the object of a major investigation, the thoroughgoing sort that the House Ways and Means Committee is now making into excise taxes.

None Dare Call It Treason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the National Committee for Civic Responsibility, a nonpartisan organization actively led by some of the most articulate citizens of Cleveland has prepared a report on a book entitled "None Dare Call It Treason." The National Committee for Civic Responsibility is headed by Mr. Thomas C. Westropp, executive director of the Women's Federal Savings & Loan Association of this city. Mr. Westropp also serves as the first vice commander of the 13th District of Ohio American Legion. By its code of regulations, this organization is prohibited from taking a partisan position on any public issue except in instances where violence is advocated or practiced or where calumny—the malicious use of falsehood—is used to intimidate or discredit. The National Committee for Civic Responsibility has issued several reports and they have received extensive support and encouragement from the newspaper media in the Cleveland community.

Following is the official report of the National Committee for Civic Responsibility on "None Dare Call It Treason," which I recommend and bring to the attention of the distinguished Members of this body:

NONE DARE CALL IT TREASON

1. This seems to be the only publication of Liberty Bell Press. Florissant, Mo., listed as the address of Liberty Bell Press, is a suburb of St. Louis, Mo. There is no telephone listed to Liberty Bell Press in Florissant and none in the Greater St. Louis area.

2. The listed price of this book is 75 cents, but it is being distributed in Cleveland at prices ranging from $1 to free by such right-wing organizations and their representatives as the John Birch Society and the Organization To Fight Communism, Inc. Booksellers in Cleveland receive their copies from Klein News, a large distributing company. Klein News receives its supply from William Shepler, area coordinator of and public spokesman for the John Birch Society in Cleveland. Klein News pays 20 cents a copy with the unlimited right to return all unsold copies. Both the price and the arrangement are much more favorable than normal practice. From an article in the New York Times on July 23, 1964, it would seem that the distribution of this book is a John Birch Society project in other parts of the country as well.

3. Since this book contains 818 references supposedly substantiating the material contained therein, it gives the appearance of being the well-documented study which it claims to be. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Stormer relies heavily for his documentation on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and upon testimony given before committees of the Congress but in most instances he fails to give the name of the person whose testimony he relies upon or the name of the person who inserted the material into the RECORD.

Since the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains material on every conceivable side of every issue along with much extraneous material, and since hearings before congressional committees contain testimony from many unreliable sources, including Communists, it is necessary to know just who is saying what if one is to properly make an evaluation. Stormer seldom provides this information in his documentation.

4. If the reader does not understand the nature of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and if he cannot differentiate between testimony before congressional committees and the findings of those committees and so is led to believe that such "documentation" is in any way official or necessarily factual, the fault is not entirely Stormer's.

5. But the reader has a right to expect that references set forth by Stormer as documentation will at least say what Stormer claims for it. In case after case, the author has subverted those references to give a totally erroneous impression and even to say precisely the opposite of what his own reference claims.

6. Some examples:

A. Stormer, pages 169 and 170: "This became sharply clear in an article by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Assistant to President Kennedy, which set forth the plan for achieving socialism in America" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 6, 1962, p. A881). Schlesinger outlines no such plan; in fact, Schlesinger's remarks, inserted in the RECORD by Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL, of New York, February 6, 1962, pages A881–A884, said precisely the opposite:

Page A881: "The socialist state is thus worse than the capitalist state because it is more inclusive in its coverage and more unlimited in its power. Organization corrupts; total organization corrupts totally. The socialist state justifies itself on the ground that the concentration of power is necessary to do good; but it has never solved the problem of how you insure that power bestowed to do good will not be employed to do harm, especially when you remove all obstacles to its exercise."

Page A882: "The more varieties of ownership the better; liberty gets more fresh air and sunlight through the interstices of a diversified society than through the close-knit grip of collectivism. The recipe for retaining liberty is not nationalization but muddling through."

B. Stormer, page 29, paragraph 2: "In 1943, congressional investigations later revealed, before the United States had itself assembled the first atomic bomb, half of all American uranium and the technical information needed to construct a bomb were sent to Russia. Is it any wonder that the Communists became a nuclear power years ahead of expectations? (Hearings, Shipment of Atomic Material to U.S.S.R. HCUA, 81st Cong., p. 1156.) The testimony referred to was given by Maj. George Racey Jordan who wrote several books making sensational charges but whose accounts varied so much from time to time that his charges have been discredited (see Time magazine, Dec. 12, 1949; Newsweek, Dec. 19, 1949). Nowhere in this reference does Major Jordan or anyone else refer to "technical information needed to construct a bomb" being sent to Russia, nor is any mention even made about any atomic bomb information. Major Jordan does discuss shipment of radioactive material on pages 1156 and 1157 of the hearings. Quoted from page 1157 is the following response by Major Jordan to a question from Mr. Tavenner, counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities:

"Mr. Tavenner. I was very embarrassed when I found you only located 45 pounds of uranium when the papers I had called for 500 pounds. So I listened to General Groves' testimony, and I understand that while they asked for 500 pounds they were only able to locate 45. So when I testified in perfectly good faith they got 500 pounds, I thought they did, but it turned out they only filled that particular order to the extent of 45 pounds. I took it from the papers.

"When I talked of heavy water (an alternative method of making nuclear devices), I saw 'heavy water' on the papers. I have since been told there was none in the United States, and that what I thought was heavy water was sulfuric acid. I was being perfectly honest."

It is on the basis of such testimony that Mr. Stormer would have the reader believe that congressional investigations revealed the shipment to Russia of one-half the U.S. stockpile of uranium and the technical assistance to construct an atomic bomb. The congressional investigation revealed nothing of the sort, nor was there even such testimony. What the investigation did reveal was that, at best, Jordan's testimony was unreliable and Stormer's attempt to pass this testimony off as committee findings puts his writing in the same category.

C. Stormer, page 29, paragraph 4: "In actual conduct of the war, military decisions were made, not according to the tactical needs of the day, but for the long range political advantage of the Communist conspiracy (Roosevelt and Hopkins, Sherwood, p. 590)."

Page 590 of Sherwood's book contains nothing whatever to support this charge, nor is any mention made of such a happening. Page 591 says the following:

"It has often been said that Churchill's advocacy of the 'soft underbelly' approach to Europe demonstrated his farsightedness—that he was motivated by the long range purpose of keeping the Red Army out of the Danube Valley and the Balkans. In the opinion of some of the American authorities who were involved in the strategic discussions, this claim gave Churchill credit for too much prescience. He may have had such thoughts in mind in 1944, but certainly not in 1942; and one may ask, in this connection: if Anglo-American strength had been concentrated in southern and southeastern Europe, what would have stopped the Russians from marching into the Ruhr and Saar and even into Normandy? The American Chiefs of Staff believed that Churchill's strategic concepts were much more easily explained: he had an incurable predilection for 'eccentric operations' which had guided him in the First as well as the Second World War; he preferred operations which depended on surprise, deception and speed in terrain (for example, the Balkan valleys) where there was not sufficient room for huge ground forces to be deployed."

Again Stormer's "documentation" does not support his assertion and seems in fact, to be saying quite the reverse of Stormer's allegation.

D. Stormer, page 126, paragraphs 2, 3: "Among his (Dr. Harry F. Ward) closest associates and most devoted pupils in the religious field were such conspirators as Rev. Jack McMichael, Rev. Chas. Webber, Rev. Alanson Smith, Dr. Willard Uphaus and Rev. Lee Ball. The controversial Methodist bishop, G. Bromley Oxnam, was Ward's pupil, secretary, and one-time apologist."

The references to and activities of the several named ministers are in the process of being checked with the proper authorities and will be added to this report immediately upon receipt of the necessary information. But Stormer's references to G. Bromley Oxnam is an excellent example of pulling a reference out of context in order to twist it to the opposite meaning. Stormer is, of course, implying that Oxnam is pro-Communist but the very reference which Stormer gives (hearings, HCUA, July 21, 1952, p. 3725; actually, the correct date is July 21, 1953) makes it quite clear that such a linking of Oxnam to Ward and so to communism is unjustified if not downright dishonest. The testimony cited is as follows:

Question: "Is he (Ward) a good friend of yours?"

Oxnam: "I will have to answer that by telling you when he was and what my relationship is with him now."

Question: "Well, please do that."

Oxnam: "Professor Ward came to the Boston School of Theology, I believe, in 1914. I was a student. He was a brilliant teacher. He was an inspirational personality. He made an extraordinary contribution to the students of that institution. I was very, very fond of him. I took dictation from him as a part-time secretary in the dictation of one of his books. I knew his family. Professor Ward was a leader in the social movement of the Methodist church and over a long period of time rendered, I believe, very valuable service.

"There came a time in my mind when I believed that Professor Ward had shifted his views concerning the whole Communist question. I found myself in fundamental disagreement with Professor Ward as early as 1928.

"In 1932 I had to propose I believe—no—it was 1928 that I proposed the message that was drafted by the Methodist church for the resolution on the social question. It was in opposition to Professor Ward's proposal, but what I proposed was carried by the Methodist church.

"In 1936, I drafted the resolution that put the Methodist Church on record as one of the earliest denominations in opposition to communism and fascism. We were, but nobody had ever said that before, and I wanted it in a clear resolution.

"From 1936—and I'm not sure I saw Professor Ward even then—I've seen Professor Ward once—I know since 1936—I think probably since 1932.

"Now then, he was an inspirational teacher, to whom I owe very, very much. He was a dear personal friend. When he shifted his views, as I believe, I had to break with Professor Ward. He understood it.

"I can bring for the committee, if it wishes, the letters that I wrote to him back at that time indicating a complete break in the matter of what he was standing for and what I believed we should stand for."

E. Stormer, page 58, paragraph 3: "Weapons and ammunition were supplied to the underground in Cuba by the CIA in such a way as to insure that they could never be used." His documentation for this charge is a column written by Edith Roosevelt in the Shreveport Journal, September 15, 1962. If Edith Roosevelt, a frankly partisan right-wing writer had made such a charge, it would not necessarily have been an accurate statement. But the fact is that she said no such thing. Edith Roosevelt writes that CIA dropped caches of weapons and ammunition at random freedom fighter depots in the expectation that the underground would be able to mount a coordinated attack in which ammunition and weapons would be properly distributed. She quarrels with this concept and points out that this resulted in some weaponry not having proper ammunition. At no time does she say or even imply that this was done to "insure that they could never be used."

F. Stormer, page 168, paragraph 1: "Despite exposure of the Communist control of the CIO by congressional investigations in 1938–39, the Communists remained in open control for at least 7 more years." (Ref. 7, ch. 10: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 22, 1950, p. A6831.)

There is simply no mention whatever in the reference which Stormer cites as to how long the CIO remained under Communist influence subsequent to the congressional investigation, or whether it remained so at all. This is a spurious reference.

G. Stormer, page 32, paragraph 6: "Gen. James Van Fleet, another Korean commander told Congress: 'My own conviction is that there must have been information to the enemy from high diplomatic authorities that we would not attack his home bases across the Yalu'." (Ref. 30, ch. 3: Hearings interlocking subversion in Government departments, SISS, 1954, pp. 1653–1708; 1711–1733; 2019–2046.)

Stormer has lumped this reference in with several previous ones, making it rather difficult to find. But when General Van Fleet's pertinent testimony is discovered on page 2033, we find that Stormer has embroidered a bit although he is purporting to quote General Van Fleet directly. The actual quote, as it appears in the record is, "My own conviction is that there must have been information to the enemy that we would not attack his home bases." Under questioning, the general affirms that this is a supposition and that he has no evidence to support it.

The significance of this example is that Stormer added words to an item which he purported to be quoting.

H. Stormer, page 205, paragraph 4: "If U.S. proposals for arms control and disarmament are accepted, U.S. military forces will be transferred to the U.N. peace force, which is directed by the Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs, who has always been a Communist." (No documentation.)

Stormer does not document this statement, although he certainly could have. Dozens of rightwing organizations have circulated this myth, and, by quoting each other, have compiled an extensive file of meaningless documentation. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 2, 1963, Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican, of California, quotes the following paragraphs from the Long Beach, Calif., Independent, a metropolitan daily newspaper, of March 15, 1963, as follows: "The U.S. Government is trying to put all its Armed Forces under the command of a Russian general, John Rousselot told 600 persons in municipal auditorium Thursday night. Rousselot, John Birch Society district governor for six Western States and former Congressman from California's 25th District, spoke on 'Disarmament: Blueprint for Surrender.'"

"This office (referring to Under Secretary for Security Council and Political Affairs) is held by a Russian general," he said, "and if the United States turns over its Armed Forces to the U.N., the Russian general will command them."

After quoting those paragraphs, Senator KUCHEL went on to say, "Those fantastic charges, Mr. President, are false—completely false. But when one, who was honored to be a Member of the Congress for 2 years—or even one who writes for an undisguised hatesheet, utters such a cry, there are Americans who listen and believe." The Senator then said, "There is no Russian colonel, or general, or military or civilian individual who is 'Secretary of the United Nations' or 'Secretary of the U.N. Security Council.' Let the record be clear that there are 19 Under Secretaries of the Security Council, of which 13 are filled by Americans or representatives of our allies and of which 2 are Soviet bloc nations. None of them has anything to do with the command of any joint U.N. military operations. There is no world police force in the U.N. And, of course, no Soviet national ever gave Gen. Douglas MacArthur any orders." The Senator then said, "I sympathize with some of my constituents who are honestly bewildered and confused by the trash of the rightwing extremists. I even feel sympathetic with those who have been taken in as dupes. But I have nothing but seething contempt for the originators of the hoaxes and swindles, from the ludicrous leaders of the Birch Society to the equally ludicrous director of the Cinema Educational Guild, including any and all of the several hundred similar self-styled patriotic groups. They are anything but patriotic. Indeed, a good case can be made that they are unpatriotic, and downright un-American. For they are doing a devil's work far better than Communists themselves could do.

7. Documentation:

The front cover of "None Dare Call It Treason" presents the claim that it is "The carefully documented story of America's retreat from victory." The back cover of the book calls it "a careful compilation of facts from hundreds of congressional investigations and dozens of authoritative books."

The research committee of the National Committee for Civic Responsibility finds that it is neither carefully documented nor factual and that the word "authoritative" does not apply to many of Stormer's sources.

In support of these conclusions, the National Committee for Civic Responsibility research committee presents the following examples:

A. (1) In 32 instances, Stormer uses as his authority "Human Events." This publication is an admittedly biased rightwing publication which the Anti-Defamation League has referred to as "an extremely rightist Washington newsletter." (Cross-Currents, p. 145, Forster and Epstein.) The John Birch Society (p. 81, the Blue Book) says, "Human Events not only feels also that we complement each other well, but for this reason is willing to join us in offering bulk subscriptions to the two periodicals together at a reduced price."

(2) In 12 instances, Stormer cites as his authority books which comprise the John Birch Society packet "One Dozen Candles."

(3) In at least 35 other instances Stormer has used as his authority such documentation as the "Dan Smoot Report," the "National Education Program," the bulletin of the John Birch Society, "America's Future," and other biased rightwing publications.

Such publications can, in no sense, be considered "authoritative." They cannot do much more than attest to the fact that someone else in rightwing circles shares Stormer's views.

B. In 66 instances, Stormer gives as his authority "hearings" before congressional committees, and in most instances gives no indication as to who is testifying. This is no documentation at all since many persons testify with opposing viewpoints and, in fact, this is the purpose of hearings. To cite testimony given at hearings as being somehow "authoritative" or "official" is unjustified.

C. In 65 instances Stormer cites the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as his authority. As is the case with congressional hearings, Stormer often fails to identify the person inserting these things into the RECORD. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains all views and opinions of all Congressmen and much other

material as well. The only thing official about the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is that it is a record of everything that goes on in the Congress and whatever other material Congressmen choose to insert. Certainly no case can be made for using the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an "authority" upon which to document anything, for by doing this, one could "prove" his case on either side of any controversial issue or on both.

D. Stormer's sometimes vague, incomplete or otherwise faulty citations make research of his material difficult. Some examples:

(1) References 60 of chapter 3 refers simply to "Consul General for Yugoslavia versus Artukovic," without mention of where, when, or by whom such a hearing was conducted.

(2) Reference 32 of chapter 2 refers to "House Document 227, page 4." Without any information as to the date or session of Congress in which this document is issued, it is virtually impossible to find.

(3) Reference 13 of chapter 9 refers to "A Draft Act Covering Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill," and then says that a "majority of States" have mental health laws based on it. He does not identify the source of the "draft act" nor those States which supposedly based their laws upon it.

E. Perhaps the best single example of Stormer's combined use of distortion and faulty documentation to prove his point is contained on page 216. Stormer seeks to show that the United States is deliberately keeping Communist countries from collapsing. To answer the question of why this is allegedly taking place, Stormer says: "The answer was provided by another CFR member, Dr. Lincoln P. Bloomfield, in an official study entitled 'A World Effectively Controlled by the United Nations.' It was prepared on a contract with the State and Defense Departments in 1962. In it, Dr. Bloomfield discloses, perhaps unwittingly, why U.S. planners consistently aid world communism. He says, '* * * if the Communist dynamic was greatly abated, the West might lose whatever incentive it has for world government.' That is the answer. If American aid were stopped, the Communist empire would likely collapse.

Here Stormer first prepares the reader to believe that the views expressed in the report represents the thinking of our Government by terming the report "official" and pointing out that it was written under contract with the State and Defense Departments. The title page of this document, however, bears the following clear disclaimer:

"The judgments expressed in the study memorandum are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute for Defense Analysis or of any agency of the U.S. Government."

The same disclaimer is contained in the foreword by IDA Associate Director of Research James E. King, Jr.

This document is a highly theoretical 38-page study which attempts to envision how and under what conditions the U.N. might be transformed into a world government, and to postulate the type of military and other power such a government would need in order to operate effectively. The author expresses no views regarding the desirability of such a development.

The full statement from which Stormer quotes his sentence is as follows:

"On any count it is unsafe to assume that the ideological and power struggle between communism and the West will not continue indefinitely. This assumption of course throws into question any program requiring that both sides subordinate to a supernational authority themselves, their power and their ambitions. This is the central dilemma of world politics today, and it applies with ultimate force to the proposition of world government. The logical trap is completed with the familiar paradox: Given a continuation unabated of Communist dynamicism, the subordination of states to a true world government appears impossible; but if the Communist dynamic were greatly abated the West might well lose whatever incentive it has for world government." (P. 12.)

And so, Stormer wrenches a single sentence out of context from an unofficial report, intended to explore the possibility, not the desirability of world government and attempts to use it as documentation that communism would collapse without American aid. The full quotation from which the sentence is taken points out that world government is impossible so long as the Communist dynamic remains unabated while, paradoxically, if it were not to so continue, the West might lose its incentive for world government. The issue of American aid to Communist countries is, of course, not even mentioned in this report.

A more flagrant and dishonest misuse of quoted material would be hard to imagine.

8. Chapter 14, entitled "What Can You Do?" urges the reader to join such organizations as the John Birch Society, the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation, and the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade.

The emphasis of all these organizations is upon the alleged control by Communists of America's political, religious, civic, educational, and judicial institutions as well as of our press, radio, and television. This chapter also urges the reader to subscribe to various rightwing publications, one of which he designates as a "Catholic publication" and another of which is designated as a "Protestant publication." The one designated as a Protestant publication is the "Christian Beacon" whose director is the Reverend Carl McIntyre, founder of the militantly anti-Catholic American Council of Christian Churches. In September 1945, the "Christian Beacon" said that Roman Catholicism is the "greatest enemy of freedom and liberty that the world has to face today" and that "one would be much better off in a Communist society than in a Roman Catholic Fascist setup."

The items contained in this report by no means constitute an exhaustive study or research into the statements or documentation of Stormer's "None Dare Call It Treason." Since the National Committee for Civic Responsibility is prohibited from taking any position on issues and must restrict itself only to those areas which advocate violence or engage in calumny, only 43 items have been checked by this committee. The discrepancies outlined in this report reflect only those items which were uncovered in the process of checking those 43 documentary references.

9. In dishonestly seeking to undermine the confidence of the American public in our schools, churches, universities, newspapers, TV, and radio as well as in our Government agencies and top officials, Stormer seems to be doing the Devil's work as outlined earlier by Senator KUCHEL.

Stormer's pretensions to scholarship and documentation might easily deceive many high-minded and intelligent but largely inexperienced people and undermine their patriotism by creating doubts about our political, social and economic system.

To the average reader, his documentation seems impressive and few will take the time to discover for themselves that it cannot withstand even the most cursory examination.

The nature of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and testimony before congressional committees being what they are, surely research would have provided Stormer with accurate references which would tend to concur with whatever assertion he wishes to make. That Stormer did not even bother to do such research and so led any careful reader directly to material which refutes his allegations, would seem to presuppose that he did not write the book for the careful or well-informed reader. For the very nature of some of Stormer's charges would insure that such a reader would check the documentation and, once that is done, Stormer's game is up.

The many and obvious distortions of fact, historical and otherwise, are not within the province of the National Committee for Civic Responsbility's concern, but since this is done to prove a pattern of treason within the United States, some examples would seem to be in order.

A. Stormer states on page 55 that Laotian Prince Boun Oum was the "legal head of the anti-Communist Government of Laos" in 1962 and that he "was ordered (by the United States) to give Communists key positions in his cabinet."

The truth is that Boun Oum was not the legal head of the Laotian Government; that, in fact he attempted to overthrow the legal head of that government—neutralist Prince Souvanna Phouma—and failed. As a result of the attempted coup, Communist forces counterattacked and Phouma joined forces with them. The result was that Oum was badly defeated and the coalition government restored with Phouma at the head and neutralists predominating the cabinet which also included some of Boun Oum's representatives and Communist representatives.

Today, with the Communist seeking to take control, Phouma has joined forces with the rightist elements to preserve his government. Stormer, seeking to make his point, lumps neutralist and Communist cabinet members together when, since they are now fighting each other, they are obviously not on the same side.

B. Stormer, page 74: "In 9 months an estimated 8 million packages of Communist propaganda material from Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Red China were imported in the United States. Placed in the U.S. mail, American taxpayers paid the postage for delivering the Red propaganda to schools, churches, homes, and libraries all over the Nation." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 1, 1962, p. 2828.)

No such information is contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. On page 3174, in a report entitled "Report of American Bar Association Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives" (pp. 3170–3176), inserted into the RECORD by Senator DIRKSEN, the statement is made that "Communists are spending $3 billion a year on propaganda which is reaching every city and hamlet in our Nation. In 1 day Communist propaganda coming through New York City alone fills three large warehouses. This propaganda comes not only from Russia, but also from Red China, from Iron Curtain countries, and from Western Europe. Much additional Red propaganda is published in the United States by Communist publishers."

On page 3108, second column, under title "Subsidizing Soviet Propaganda in the U.S. Mails," Representative CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, complains of three booklets sent out by the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D.C. He says it was sent at the special subsidized third-class bulk rate and went to Adams Public Library (Adams, Nebr.) for only 7 cents. Amendment to the postal bill would make it first-class mail and make Reds pay 51 cents to send it. He charged that at third-class rates, U.S. taxpayers subsidize it.

These are the only references to this topic in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. Nothing is said about 8 million packages or about sending anything at the U.S. taxpayers' expense other than Representative CUNNINGHAM'S charge concerning pamphlets that were sent at third- rather than first-class mail.

C. Reference 29 in chapter 8, in which Time magazine is accused of lying about the affiliations of Gustavo Duran in order to discredit Senator Joseph McCarthy, refers to

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 14, 1951. Congress was not in session on November 14, 1951, consequently, there is no RECORD for that date.

In summary, the subject book is, at best, an incredibly poor job of research and documentation, and, at worst, a deliberate hoax and a fraud. This conclusion has been reached without giving any consideration whatsoever to those things which Stormer presents as a matter of his own opinion or that of others. Matters of that kind must properly be left to partisan debate.

For the National Committee for Civic Responsibility:

HAL STEIGMAN,
Executive Secretary.

Goldwater's Tax Cut Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRAHAM PURCELL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my newsletter, Report From Congress, dated September 14, 1964.

REPORT FROM CONGRESS

(By GRAHAM PURCELL, Representative, 13th District, Texas, September 14, 1964)

DEAR FRIENDS: I was surprised, to say the least, when Senator GOLDWATER made his proposal last week to reduce personal and corporate income taxes by a total of 25 percent. The surprise was partly the result of my recollection that the Senator was such a vocal opponent of the tax reduction and reform measure which was enacted this year.

However, when I studied the Senator's proposal more closely, my surprise turned to shock. For, if the Republican candidate for President is the strong advocate of balanced budgets and deficit reduction he claims to be, his proposal is surely not consistent with his previous statements.

Let's examine our Federal expenditures, and see what would be necessarily eliminated by the tax reduction of the magnitude contemplated by the Senator. A reduction of 25 percent in personal and corporate taxes would amount to $18.7 billion per year.

The Federal budget calls for spending $54 billion per year on national defense. Surely Mr. GOLDWATER would not want to reduce this figure. He is a strong advocate of complete preparedness, and has even criticized this administration for not maintaining our defense capabilities at a high enough level.

The budget includes $11.1 billion for interest payments which cannot be avoided. There is no way to reduce this figure significantly in the near future.

The budget includes $5.1 billion for veterans benefits and services. These programs have been promised to our veterans, and Senator GOLDWATER would surely not want the United States to go back on its word to those who fought to defend our freedom.

International affairs and finance, another necessary item, amounts to $2.2 billion. And general Government operations, the cost of operating Congress, the courts, and other necessary parts of the Government, amounts to $2.2 billion per year.

Senator GOLDWATER has had some criticism of our space program. So, for the purposes of this examination, let's assume that he would suggest a 10-percent reduction in this program. That would leave a total of $4.5 billion which is necessary for the space program.

These necessary expenditures come to a total of $79.1 billion. A reduction of 25 percent in taxes as suggested by the Senator would leave the Federal Government with almost exactly this amount for its operation. This obviously means there would be no funds at all left for any other governmental functions at the Federal level.

Let's look at what would be necessarily eliminated under the Senator's proposal. The complete operations of the Department of Agriculture, costing $7 billion, would be eliminated. This would mean discontinuing all farm commodity programs, which is consistent with the Senator's views. But it would also mean complete elimination of those valuable services to all Americans which consume the major portion of the Department of Agriculture budget, operation and maintenance of national park system, agricultural research programs, the Federal Extension Service, the Rural Electrification Administration, and many others.

Also eliminated necessarily would be all services and programs under the Department of Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and others. And elimination of the programs of such vital agencies as the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Small Business Administration, and many others. Funds would be eliminated for the Pure Food and Drug Administration, National Institutes of Health, the U.S. Weather Bureau, the Federal Aviation Agency, just to mention a very few. Also eliminated would be contingency funds for such emergency programs as the current fight against the encephalitis outbreak in Texas. I could go on and on, but I think you get the idea.

On the other side of the ledger, the Senator is on record as favoring an increase of $5 billion per year in defense expenditures over the next decade. He has advocated increases in veterans' benefits. He proposes central Arizona version of the TVA which would cost billions. And his platform, which he says he fully endorses, has recommended tax credits for elderly, medical and hospital care, education, and fishing vessels which would cost at least $2 billion annually in lost revenue, as well as excise tax cuts and tax transfers to the States.

It appears obvious to me that the Senator is making an irresponsible and desperate appeal for votes with a proposal he does not really feel is proper, or he has become the most fiscally irresponsible man in Government. He just doesn't make sense. His statements are becoming more and more inconsistent.

Conflict and Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the campaign for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States has begun. Between now and November 3, the issues facing our country, as well as the character and personalities of the candidates for these highest offices, will be considered by the voters as they ponder the course the Nation should take during the next 4 years.

An incisive analysis of the formal opening of the campaign was presented in the editorial columns of the Washington Post on September 8. I believe the editorial, entitled "Conflict and Unity," should be read by all Americans. The editorial follows:

CONFLICT AND UNITY

The campaign opened, officially, on Saturday; and it seems plain that the country is going to be in for a boisterous and strident time until election day, come November. President Johnson took note of the opening by a news conference plea for national unity and understanding. But his plea had to be heard over the crackle and static of two rousing, tub-thumping, name-calling speeches by the rival vice-presidential candidates.

The elocutionary honors of the day went, we thought, to Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, the GOP presidential nominee, who indulged in nothing more than a brief introduction of his running mate, WILLIAM E. MILLER, at Lockport, N.Y. It would be too much, perhaps, to say that the Senator's speech was characterized by good humor; it did contain humor, however—barbed and enlivening. He gibed at Mr. Robert Kennedy, until a few days ago the Attorney General of the United States, now a New Yorker running for election to the Senate from that State. Mr. Kennedy must regard New York as a nice place to represent, the Senator observed, "but he wouldn't want to live here." And he added that Kennedy must be running on "a commuter ticket."

That was about all the human of any kind that the day brought forth. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, opening the Democratic drive at Minneapolis, hammered away at his party's theme that Senator GOLDWATER is "trigger happy" and "irresponsible," while lauding President Johnson as "a giant of a man."

Congressman MILLER confined himself almost entirely to denunciation. He has been widely characterized as a "gut fighter" and appears to regard this somewhat unattractive appellation as an accolade. He demonstrated beyond contradiction, at any rate, that he deserves it. He indulged in a personal attack on Senator HUMPHREY which, for sheer irrationality and imputation of evil has been unrivaled in American politics for many a decade.

The GOP seems to have decided to run against the ADA—that is, against Americans for Democratic Action, a small, energetic, liberal group which has contributed numerous constructive proposals to the country's political dialog. Senator HUMPHREY has long been a member and an officer of ADA. Mr. MILLER began by imputing to the organization ideas which it has never advocated, went on to impute these ideas to Mr. HUMPHREY, despite the Senator's long and brilliant record of opposition to them as a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and ended by imputing them to President Johnson. This is very different indeed from Senator HUMPHREY's acceptance speech at Atlantic City—of which the Miller speech was an obvious imitation. Senator HUMPHREY assailed Senator GOLDWATER by citing a series of specific record votes in the Senate in which the GOP candidate himself voted in opposition to a majority of his fellow Republicans.

This is not so much gut fighting as it is gutter fighting. And the country will be the poorer if it is allowed to continue. Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD called this attack "one of the most vicious, false, and malicious documents in American political history." There is a recklessness and meanness in Mr. MILLER's kind of politicking which pose a terrible danger to the country. Anyone who fights in this way for public office demonstrates that he does not deserve it.

There has always been a lot of roughness and extravagance in American politics. This country can take this kind of robustness when it falls within the traditional bounds of decency and good taste and when it recognizes the essential good faith and loyalty of political opponents. What Mr. MILLER did on Saturday, however, was to prove that President Johnson was quite right in his

assertion that "this Nation's most important concern, as far as we can see ahead, is and should be the unity of this country."

National unity is not a product of uniformity of opinion. It grows out of the resolution of conflict through the democratic process of debate and discussion. There are real differences of opinion and philosophy between the nominees of the two major parties. They ought to be aired vigorously. Debate does not require confrontation of candidates before television cameras. It requires confrontation of ideas.

Let the candidates say as vehemently as they please what they think about the control and use of nuclear weapons, about medicare and social security, about the ways in which to assure civil rights to American citizens, about how to maintain order in the streets of great American cities, about taxes and budgetary deficits and other economic issues, about the whole long range of difficult problems facing America.

But let us put a stop now to the fracturing of America—the inculcation of hatred and distrust and the pitting of race against race, of section against section. It is for a nation that the coming election is to choose a government. It is for the Presidency of the United States that the rivals are now seeking public confidence.

Congressman Donald Rumsfeld Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, during this 88th Congress, I have periodically mailed a newsletter commenting on the work of the Congress to interested individuals in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois. The following is my final newsletter of the 88th Congress, dated September 15, 1964:

CONGRESSMAN DONALD RUMSFELD REPORTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—With Labor Day behind us, the conventions concluded, and fall election campaigns gaining momentum, Congress is still in session and seems headed for another record-breaking year, having already passed over 700 bills and resolutions. With reelection campaigns facing all (435) of us who serve in the House, as well as 35 Senators, Congress is attempting to complete its business, but there is every indication that we may still be on the job in Washington, D.C., in early October. Major legislation passed by the House since my last report included the following:

EDUCATION

Certainly this will be known as the education Congress. Bills in some way connected with education passed by this Congress with my support included an urgently needed and greatly improved vocational education program, an expansion of the Manpower Retraining Act (both aimed at alleviating unemployment), and mental health and retardation legislation including training grants. Bills for Federal aid to medical schools and aid to higher education also passed. I opposed these latter two bills because of the current $8.3 billion Federal deficit and the serious need to establish priorities in Federal spending, the already substantial efforts in these areas of private as well as public resources, the fact that antidiscrimination amendments to both bills were omitted, and because of my strong preference for the education bill I have introduced. My bill would provide individual income tax deductions for education expenses, thereby enabling such schools to charge the tuitions necessary to meet their needs. Regrettably, it has not had a hearing in the House.

Within the past month, two additional education bills passed the House, both with my support. First, the National Defense Education Act was expanded and extended, raising student loan authorizations annually to $200 million by fiscal year 1967, increasing the number of graduate fellowships to 6,500 by 1967, and providing matching grants to States for the purchase of equipment for use in teaching science, mathematics, and foreign languages. This bill extended the program for construction, operation, and maintenance of schools in districts "impacted" by Federal military and civilian activities, such as Glenview. The second was the Nurse Training Act, which authorizes $90 million in Federal funds over a 4-year period for construction or rehabilitation of nursing schools, a program of grants to the improvement and expansion of nurse training programs, and a new student loan program, to help alleviate the shortage of trained nurses.

"FOOD FOR PEACE"

The House passed, and I supported, an extension of Public Law 480, the law permitting the sale in local currencies and grants of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities to needy foreign countries. Under this program, needy peoples of over 100 nations have enjoyed the abundance of our Nation, and, I believe, the free world has in certain instances been strengthened, and communism weakened, by our participation in the program. Regrettably, this has not been the case with the United Arab Republic. In the past 10 years, Nasser's U.A.R. has received over $1.1 billion of U.S. agricultural commodities, and, recently, $200 million in annual grain shipments, enabling him to divert his resources for the purchase of modern arms from the Soviet Union through a cotton-for-arms barter agreement. By so doing, the United States of America has helped, and, in fact, encouraged, Nasser to continue his arms buildup, continue U.A.R. aggressions against Yemen (thousands are already dead in the Yemen war) and against Israel, and step up his frequent anti-American diatribes. An amendment was offered to discontinue further U.S. aid to the U.A.R. after the current agreement expires (a new 3-year agreement is apparently now being considered). I supported and spoke for this reasonable amendment. Unfortunately, it was defeated by a narrow margin only after President Johnson and the Democratic leaders of the House marshalled their forces after a forced 24-hour delay in the debate. Copies of the debate are available on request for those who may wish to attempt to better understand this unfortunate situation.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

United Nations: 15 member countries of the U.N. are more than 2 years behind in paying their U.N. assessments. Under the U.N. Charter, these nations are subject to a loss of their vote in the General Assembly unless they reduce their debt before the Assembly meets in November. A resolution was passed by the House, with my support, clearly expressing the recommendation that the U.N. Charter be enforced on these nonpaying member nations. Note: The 18th Annual Report covering U.S. participation in the U.N. during 1963 is being printed as House Document 188 and will be available through my office on request.

Vietnam resolution: The House passed, and I supported, a resolution supporting U.S. action in the Bay of Tonkin, following the attack of North Vietnamese gunboats on U.S. destroyers off the coast of North Vietnam. The resolution restated U.S. intention to "take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

Coffee agreement: A bill to implement the International Coffee Agreement by authorizing the President to limit imports of coffee from countries which have not joined in the agreement was passed by the House last year, and amended by the Senate. The conference report was recently rejected by the House. I opposed this bill last year and also opposed the conference report. The fact that since 1962, the year the Coffee Agreement was accepted, the price of coffee has gone up over 20 cents per pound should be some indication of the inadvisability of this international cartel which the administration has sponsored.

MISCELLANEOUS BILLS PASSED

Veterans: Bills increasing and revising non-service-connected disability and death pensions for veterans of World War I, II, and the Korean conflict and their widows, and authorizing programs of nursing care for aged veterans, affecting some 8.3 million veterans, passed with my support. Securities and Exchange Act: The House passed a bill amending the Securities and Exchange Act providing standards and safeguards for investors dealing in over-the-counter securities. The Migrant Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act: Passed with my support, and requires registration of labor contractors and proof of financial responsibility and liability insurance on migrants' transportation vehicles, to minimize abuses of migrant farmworkers. I supported a bill providing for repayments to the Seneca Indians for land lost to them due to construction of a dam on the Allegheny River. Commission on Automation: The House, with my support, approved legislation to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, to study past and current effects of technological change, innovations in production and employment which will likely occur in the next 10 years, and means for channeling new technology into existing industries. The Housing Act of 1964, funding housing and urban renewal programs, passed with my support and included plans for construction of low-cost rental housing for domestic migrant farmworkers and training grants for city planning. Nuclear materials ownership: I voted to amend the Atomic Energy Act to allow commercial ownership of special nuclear materials under certain prescribed circumstances.

ODDS AND ENDS

Pressure is building up to pass the proposed Becker constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court prayer decision, with more than 176 of the needed 218 signatures now on the discharge petition to bring the bill up for an immediate vote. Last month, I introduced a resolution expressing the concern of the U.S. Congress over the increasingly alarming reports of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, including the confiscation of synagogues, restrictions on cultural expression, and executions for so-called economic crimes. The Senate is currently holding hearings and might act on this matter before adjournment. Senator BYRD, Democratic chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, reports President Johnson has added "7,948 new Federal employees in the first 6 months of this year" or at the rate of 325 per week. End of the session tempers are high in Congress, with one Member calling another Member the "No. 1 hoodlum of the United States," and a third Member calling the first "cowardly and not deserving of the name 'Congressman.'" Comment: How fortunate we are that duels are out of vogue. The Bobby Baker scandal

continues to smolder with the latest revelations of $25,000 kickbacks for political contributions—a Federal offense—bringing the FBI into the investigation.

PERSONAL NOTE

This will be the last "Rumsfeld Reports" newsletter of the 88th Congress (1963–64). With the anticipated adjournment of Congress in late September or early October, I will be returning to Illinois for the remainder of the year. If you have friends who would like to receive these periodic "Reports," or if there is an error in your address, please let me know. After the conclusion of Congress, I will, as last year, prepare and mail a "Legislative Report" summarizing the work of the 88th Congress.

I sincerely hope that these "Reports from Washington, D.C." have been of interest to you.

With my best wishes,

DON RUMSFELD.

It's Campaign Time—A Time To Adjourn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include an editorial which appeared in the Providence, R.I., Journal on Wednesday, September 9, 1964, which is entitled "It's Campaign Time—A Time To Adjourn":

IT'S CAMPAIGN TIME—A TIME TO ADJOURN

After a brief Labor Day holiday, Congress is attempting to buckle down to its tasks in an atmosphere that is hardly conducive to responsible legislative activity.

Election day is less than 2 months away. The Presidential campaign is in full swing. The air is filled with election oratory, and many a Congressman is torn between his duty at the Capitol and his desire to return to his home district and plunge into the political swirl.

In other Presidential election years, Congress has managed to clean up its work with more expedition. The 1960 session adjourned September 1; the 1956 session adjourned July 27. But this year the session has run beyond the convention period and beyond Labor Day and promises to drag on into October. This presents an awkward dilemma for those Congressmen who are running for reelection and who are eager to get back home for some fence mending.

Two principal snags have prevented an earlier adjournment this year. One is the medicare bill, which has been passed by the Senate and now rests before a reluctant House. The other is the congressional attempt to push through legislation which would delay application of the Supreme Court's ruling on State legislative reapportionment.

Both measures are highly controversial. Both seem likely to survive or fall by narrow margins if they are brought to final votes.

But they differ in one important respect. The medicare proposal has been around for years and has been thoroughly studied and debated, whereas the reapportionment delay proposal popped up abruptly at this session and is being pressed by its proponents chiefly as an expedient to meet an unexpected emergency.

These newspapers support the medicare program. It offers a logical extension of the social security system into an area that badly needs attention. These newspapers, however, have serious reservations about the proposal to delay application of reapportionment. There is a constitutional issue involved here which has grave implications—the issue of legislative infringement on the judiciary. Until that issue has been much more fully explored, it would be unwise for Congress to take any precipitous action.

However, these matters are disposed of at this time, it is important that Congress wind up this session as promptly as possible. The session has been extremely productive. A great deal of important legislation has been approved, including a notable Civil Rights Act, a substantial tax cut, and an important first step in an antipoverty campaign.

The plain fact is that the time has come to adjourn. The longer adjournment is put off, the greater the risk, because responsible legislative activity can hardly be expected in coming days when the average Congressman, quite understandably, is keeping an eye on the calendar, a hand on his satchel, and is chafing to get off to the hustings.

Scott County, Iowa, Soil Conservation District Teaches the Value of Conservation Through Annual Soil Conservation Workbook Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, grade school students in Scott County, Iowa, are learning about the value of soil conservation by participating in an annual contest to see who can compile the best workbook on soil conservation.

These contests, sponsored by the Scott County Soil Conservation District, bring a great number of entries from students in the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades in Scott County.

This year's winning entry was compiled by Miss Mary Jo Myer, of Walcott, Iowa. It is full of valuable information but what impressed the judges as much as any feature in the workbook, was Mary Jo's statement on "What This Conservation Workbook Has Taught Me."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring Mary Jo Meyer's statement to the attention of my colleagues:

WHAT THIS CONSERVATION WORKBOOK HAS TAUGHT ME

(By Mary Jo Meyer)

We are living in the age of new discoveries, through modern science and technology. If we are willing to learn they will supply us with the answers. As one man has stated, "The farmer and gardener will be in a much better position to practice what science teaches if he is told not only how he should proceed, but if he understands at the same time why the various recommended measures are likely to lead to success."

At man's first glance at this country the soil was considered inexhaustible. Today, people all over the world, must wake up to the fact that the soil is exhaustible if not cared for properly. Therefore, we must guard our soils to insure the health and happiness of future generations.

You may ask, "How can we do this?" First, every man should have some goal which he would like to accomplish instead of coasting along doing little. Second, he should have a soil resource map compiled to show the various areas of his land, as well as a soil test taken to determine what plant nutrients may be lacking in his soils. Third, he should undertake the task of acquiring knowledge and then putting it to good use. If he should have questions that he is not sure of he may call on one of the many organizations or clubs in this area for assistance. They will then help him to answer his questions and suggest possible corrections.

If the farmer has taken the time to learn he will be quick to see the many benefits he will receive. There will be better crop yields of higher quality resulting in more feed and, of course, more money for less time and labor.

These are only a few of the ways man can maintain the soil for future generations. Do you have your goal set, or are you just coasting along?

Youth on Call

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, we appear to be living in a world of tension which is not only influencing the thinking of adults but teenagers as well.

Read or listen to news media on any given day and you will probably learn of a youth gang war where shooting and stabbing occur. Over the past weekend many were shocked to read "Hooligans Smash Beach Community—10,000 Teenagers Invaded the Area, Causing Damage Counted in the Thousands After 4 Hours of Rioting."

The Governor of the State probably placed the blame directly where it belongs. He said, "You can't blame police for lack of parental discipline."

Youth properly occupied avoid trouble. An organization in York, Pa., is to be commended for the work it is doing in this field. The following is a brief résumé of its activities. I commend it to communities everywhere:

YOUTH ON CALL

(By M. Richard Jacobs)

Youth on Call is an organization whose primary purpose is to promote summer part-time jobs for high school students.

It originated at York, Pa., in 1959 when representatives of the York Recreation Commission, the Pennsylvania State Employment Service, and the York City School District, recognizing the need for an organization that would facilitate job placements for teenagers, made plans for its formation.

Youth on Call is sponsored by the York Recreation Commission which is responsible for the administration as well as providing headquarters and miscellaneous supplies. The Pennsylvania State Employment Service makes the referrals for the jobs. The York Rotary Club and the Soroptimists Club of York both contribute financial aid to the program.

Although Youth on Call is supervised by an adult director, the youths themselves are responsible for most of its operation. This is carried on chiefly through a youth steering

committee composed of student leaders representing the high schools in the immediate York area. A major responsibility of the group is to initiate and carry out methods of informing the public of the availability of approximately 100 teenagers who are "on call" to perform any type fo job. Methods of publicizing the program to the community include the following: Making tapes for radio spot announcements, appearing on TV in skits and panels, talking before service and social clubs, passing out fliers, making posters, participating in parades, and publishing a newspaper.

An adult steering committee meets annually at which time it evaluates the program and makes suggestions for its improvement. It is composed of representatives of the Recreation Commission, Employment Bureau, Rotary Club, Soroptimist Club, Chamber of Commerce, Industry, and various civic organizations.

Youth on Call is completing its sixth summer of operation and to date has filled 1,992 jobs and the youths have earned in excess of $110,000. This amount does not include income received when employers had youth perform additional tasks or retained them throughout winter months. The rate of pay is determined by the employer and in 90 percent of the cases it is $1 per hour. Although yard work, babysitting, and housework are the most frequent types of jobs performed, the members have become ditchdiggers, wallpaper scrapers, buffet helpers, vacation companions, store clerks, baggers, painters, mothers' helpers, chauffeurs, theater ushers, inventory clerks, et cetera.

Several training sessions have been conducted on completing job applications and clinics were held for sales clerks, youth leaders, and babysitters. Specialists, parents, and youths participated on these programs.

Although the chief function of Youth on Call is to make possible more part-time job opportunities for teenagers, its members also render services on a voluntary basis on projects that benefit the community. Participation in these activities have added dignity to the program, helped in advertising Youth on Call, and the efforts have been appreciated by the community. These experiences have been invaluable to the members who have had opportunities to meet and discuss problems with leaders in government, business, industry, press, civic organizations, and other groups. These projects have included: reading to the blind guests at home for aged, participating in naturalization, court activities, collecting books, magazines, and jig-saw puzzles for the county jail, hospitals, children's home, and home for aged, lobbying before State senate committee for passage of a bill to restore local historical buildings, making posters for national "Employ the Handicapped Week," and performing various jobs for the historical society. The youths receive no pay for their services on community projects.

Beginning this fall the program will operate on a year-around basis. Many young people have indicated a need for part-time jobs after return to school. Also, a survey has shown that employers could use part-time help throughout the year.

The most rewarding phase of Youth on Call is the fine quality of work done by teenagers.

Not To Be Confused With Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune, August 31, 1964, entitled, "Not To Be Confused With Herbert Hoover." The first sentence which reads, "The only resemblance between HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY, the Democratic vice-presidential nominee, and Herbert Hoover is in the capital letters," well summarizes what follows:

NOT TO BE CONFUSED WITH HERBERT HOOVER

The only resemblance between HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY, the Democratic vice-presidential nominee, and Herbert Hoover is in the capital letters. The thing to be noted about HUBERT is that he is a little to the right of Castro. But he has lately made a frantic effort to put on a William McKinley starched 3-inch collar and pass himself off as a "moderate."

This flight from firebrand "liberalism" has even propelled HUBERT into business circles which view him with unalloyed suspicion, there to ladle out blarney and pose as one of the fellows.

"I suggest," he told the American Management Association in New York on July 10, "that we drop once and for all the myth of hostility toward business by Government and get on with a fruitful business-Government partnership. * * * To make the promise of America a reality will take cooperation and respect between business and Government and above all intelligence and courage."

That's lovely, if the businessmen choose to forget that Senator HUMPHREY was a founding father of Americans for Democratic Action, has been its national chairman, and is now a member of its executive committee. As James Burnham has observed, "On every specific issue in every field, ADA supports Government control, planning, financing, or takeover." Any "partnership" of business with men in Government who have that outlook is not going to be comfortable.

Senator HUMPHREY is for easy money, deficit financing, unbalanced budgets, and, necessarily, inflation.

"Public debt figures, or a chart picturing them," he says airily, "provide no basis in themselves for concluding that a government is or is not wasteful." To him "there are worse things in life than an unbalanced budget." What the Federal Reserve Board should do is "ease credit."

While he is now trying to allay the fears of business, he said in the West Virginia Democratic presidential primary of 1960, "The Federal tax laws are rigged against the middle- and low-income families—and for the big corporations."

Senator HUMPHREY is a 100 percent welfare stater. He is for every proposal of that sort. There would be no limit to the size, scope, and intrusiveness of government if he had his way. As Senator GOLDWATER remarked, the presence of HUMPHREY on the ticket destroys the fiction that the Johnson party has the faintest attachment to conservatism.

Senator HUMPHREY has been a militant in the civil rights battles. At the 1948 National Convention he inflamed the southern Democrats during a floor fight to put liberal amendments into the rights plank, stating, among other things, "The time has come to get out of the shadows of States' rights." The ADA with which he is identified is for open occupancy laws.

The plaintive remarks of Senator SMATHERS, of Florida, after having been ordered by President Johnson to second the HUMPHREY nomination, express the universal feeling of the South that HUBERT will be as welcome a candidate in that sector as Typhoid Mary. "I know," SMATHERS said resignedly, "the difficulty of carrying that load in the South."

One other notation on HUBERT. He is a veritable wind machine, addicted to nonstop garrulity. When he went to Russia, he and Khrushchev talked for 8 hours and 25 minutes straight. Immediately after that gabfest, Khrushchev went before the Communist Party's central committee and harangued it for 6 hours. HUBERT must be catching.

First Choice—President Lyndon Baines Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared August 28, 1964, in the Longview Daily News. Col. Carl Estes is the very outstanding publisher of the Longview Daily News Journal.

The editorial follows:

FIRST CHOICE

When Lyndon Baines Johnson—the man from Texas whose only label is "An American first, a Democrat second"—was nominated by acclamation as the Democratic Party candidate for the Presidency, it was a great day for both Texas and the Nation.

In these perilous times when our Nation and the free world walk a tightrope of hopeful peace over a seething cauldron of world unrest and uprising fanned by Communist revolutionary agents, it is vitally important to free people everywhere to have a man of broad experience, wise judgment, and a cool head as chief executive of the United States.

We believe that—come war with its perils from the outside, or continued peace with its pressures from inside—our Nation's hope at this crucial time must be placed in the capable hands of an experienced leader whose courage and faith are unquestioned, whose fairness and responsibility are well known in all quarters, and whose calm and deliberate action in emergency is respected or feared by all.

Our Governor—John Connally of Texas—backed up by seconding approval of eight other nationally prominent Democratic leaders—sounded the basic keynote that should govern public decisionmaking in this Presidential campaign when, in his nominating address for his longtime personal and political friend, he said of President Johnson:

"When he speaks, it is the voice of commonsense, the clear voice of reason, the calm voice of responsibility to this Nation.

"Mr. Johnson has never let America down, and he never will, because he is an American first, a Democrat second.

"We can thank God that Lyndon Johnson is, above all else, a man not of rashness, but of responsibility; a man not of uncertainty, but of decision; a man not of indifference, but of compassion; a man not of fear, but of hope; a man with the steady hand of leadership to guide America and the world to new fulfillment of mankind's ageless dreams."

While Mr. Johnson is a native Texan, he now occupies a place of responsibility that is broader in scope and greater in demand than as a Representative or Senator from our State. As the President, naturally he seeks to be the President of all the American people. In this role, as in some of his previous high positions as minority leader in the 83d Congress and Senate majority leader in the 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses, he has not always pleased all Texans.

It has been our privilege to know Lyndon Johnson for some 30 years. We have not always agreed with him, have told him so and openly opposed some of his positions, especially some sections of the Civil Rights

Act. But we have had great respect for his ability, admired his courage and forthrightness, and have found him to be enormously warm and friendly and charming—characteristics of great usefulness and value in the Presidency.

Experienced observers of the Washington scene recently said of Mr. Johnson that he "thinks big, aims high, and usually gets what he wants." When we apply this to the announced Johnson goals of peace, preparedness, and prosperity, most Americans can agree the bigger he thinks and the higher he aims for our country, the safer we will be as a nation and the happier as a people. He most certainly has proved over the past 9 months that he has the sure hand of experience and calm judgment to hold our Nation on a steady course in a time of emergency.

President Johnson has made it clear that he is attempting to take a sane and reasonable position in the center, between extremes on the left and on the right. This is a position in which he confidently expects to find sufficient middle ground on which to unite the great majority of Americans in a purposeful forward program for peace and progress. This is a position in which he has drawn appreciation and respect and understanding from both business and labor, educators and churchmen, industrialists and workers, and the great body of us who call ourselves the common people.

As one of the most active and hardest working Vice Presidents the Nation has ever known and as President during a period of national tragedy, Mr. Johnson has proved that he is a man of the people who is in close touch with reality both at home and abroad. As fate took a hand in his rise to the Presidency, so circumstances appear to be moving him surely toward his own full term in the White House, a personal call to high duty that would bring out the very best in any man.

Just as Mr. Johnson became the first choice of his party—standing head and shoulders above any possible challenger, so that none dared to let his name be considered—we believe that during the give-and-take of a wide open campaign leading up to the general election in November, it will become increasingly clear to Americans in every walk of life that Lyndon Baines Johnson should be the Nation's first choice for President.

CARL L. ESTRA.

Indian Ocean Bases: Discussions and Explorations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the geopolitical significance of the Indian Ocean has been recognized for centuries. Homer Lea, in his perceptive book, "The Day of the Saxon," first published in 1912, emphasized the importance of India in the control of this vast sea area and its littoral.

Westward of the Indian subcontinent, there are the Arabian Peninsula and the east coast of Africa to Capetown; southward, the entire Indian Ocean and its advantageously located islands; eastward, the Malay barrier, including Singapore; and southeastward, Australia.

It was, therefore, with the greatest interest that I read in the August 29, 1964, issue of the Washington Post an illuminating summary by Robert H. Estabrook of unpublished high-level current United States-British discussions and hydrographic surveys concerning the potentials of Indian Ocean islands to serve as naval air bases.

Because of its national defense and budgetary implications, I commend the indicated article for reading by all concerned with this matter, especially members of cognizant Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the Congress:

UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN CONSIDER INDIAN OCEAN BASES

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

LONDON, August 28.—The United States and Britain are jointly exploring the possibility of a series of island bases in the Indian Ocean to reinforce security in south and southeast Asia.

Unpublicized high-level discussions have concerned possible construction of an American naval communications facility on the British-owned island of Diego Garcia in the Chagos Archipelago about 1,000 miles southwest of Ceylon.

Several other British administered islands in the sweep of ocean bounded by the African coast, the Arabian peninsula and the Indian subcontinent are under consideration for development as potential air and sea bases and as staging areas for the airlift of troops to trouble areas.

Among these are the Aldabra Islands off the east coast of Africa about 100 miles north of Madagascar. Additional islands in the Chagos Archipelago also are being explored.

Diego Garcia, however, is the most likely point for initial development. Funds are available for building a naval radio relay station there, although the island was not explicitly named in the bill.

A small group of American Navy officials aboard a British ship currently is conducting a survey of islands in the Indian Ocean.

Closely guarded negotiations have been going on here and in Washington between the State Department with Pentagon representation and the British Ministry of Defense and Colonial and Commonwealth relations offices.

So sensitive have been the arrangements that tight security precautions were taken. However, word has leaked out in London.

TOUCHY ISSUE IN U.N.

The issue of island bases has been regarded as especially touchy because of possible criticism by the United Nations Colonialism Subcommittee, which is heavily weighted with Asian and African members. Britain has encountered its sting over Southern Rhodesia and Aden.

Although the U.N. "Committee of 24," as it is called, is now in recess, it has taken a jaundiced view of military bases in general as vestiges of colonialism. It has recommended liquidation of the big British base at Aden.

Island bases long have been a planning objective of some U.S. Navy strategists because of the political turmoil affecting base rights in other countries. It is recognized frankly that the only reliable bases for the long run are those not subject to nationalist agitation.

The State Department also has strongly supported an American presence in the Indian Ocean as a political stabilizer. But such a presence often produces an initial outcry, and this has been a factor in the extreme secrecy.

For example, when a small contingent of warships from the 7th Fleet visited the Indian Ocean early this year in "Operation Concord," there were protests in India even though the single aircraft carrier, two escorts, and an oiler did not touch at an Indian port and called only at Aden and Mombasa, Kenya.

UNOCCUPIED ISLANDS IDEAL

Ideally, any bases built would be situated on uninhabited islands, with British or American nationals brought in to staff them. That procedure would involve fewer political liabilities than any other means of exerting power in the area.

Uninhabited islands are likely to lack harbors or fresh water, however, and the necessity of providing anchorages or installing distillation plants would greatly increase development costs.

The present survey mission has been conducting an on-the-spot exploration of the islands under consideration, most of which were selected from maps and theoretical knowledge, to determine their physical suitability. Previously Americans had rarely visited them.

The objective is to learn which islands could lend themselves to naval anchorages and which could accommodate air landing fields.

In addition to providing sea and air bases, the islands could be useful as staging points for troops dispatched to carry out Commonwealth responsibilities in Malaysia or SEATO responsibilities in assisting, say, Thailand. Present plans, however, do not call for regular troop garrisons.

ADEN BASE IMPORTANT

The island project is viewed as a complement rather than alternative to the British base at Aden, which the United States also regards as important for stability in the area.

Britain plans to hold on to Aden as long as this is politically feasible, but many observers think that retention may not be possible beyond 5 years because of demands that Britain withdraw.

Although the revised constitution of the Federation of South Arabia envisages continuation of the base, political opposition leaders in Aden have called for its eventual abandonment.

President Nasser of Egypt also has renewed his verbal attack on the Aden facility while conceding that use as a staging base would not be in the same category as use for a permanent garrison.

SHIPS HAD GOOD EFFECT

Additional facilities also would complement British air bases at Gan and Hulele in the quasi-independent Maldive Islands southwest of Ceylon. The British installations there have been the subject of some internal controversy in the Maldives.

The visit of American warships in Operation Concord early this year accidentally coincided with the unrest in east Africa after the Zanzibar revolt and is thought to have had a calming effect. Kenyan President Jomo Kenyatta in particular is said to have appreciated their call at Mombasa.

Britain has been interested in base development for similar reasons. Not only has she sent sizable numbers of troops to bolster Malaysia against the challenge from Indonesia, she also responded to the request of three east African countries for military units to quell army mutinies after the Zanzibar revolt.

Although the area east of Suez has been regarded as primarily a British responsibility for peacekeeping purposes, British officials have welcomed the prospect of American participation.

It is possible that some of the long-range projects actually will be joint bases reflecting the closest sort of Anglo-American cooperation, although this has not been definitely decided.

MUTUAL USE RIGHTS

Alternatively, they might remain under British operation but with full American use rights. Britain and the United States now permit use of each other's bases by ships and aircraft, with monthly exchange of bills.

Diego Garcia, largest of the Oil Islands 7° south of the Equator, is legally a dependency of the self-governing colony of Mauritius, 1,200 miles southwest.

The 12½- by 6¼-mile island had a population in 1962 of 619, largely transient laborers from Mauritius. Most of these are understood to have left.

Islands in the Chagos Archipelago produce coconuts, copra, guano, and salted fish.

The Aldabra Islands near Madagascar, which also have been mentioned, are a dependency of the Seychelles, some 700 miles northeast.

Labor Day Statement of Robert Taft, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which was issued by me on this Nation's observance of Labor Day:

LABOR DAY STATEMENT

(By Congressman BOB TAFT, JR.)

Labor has made our country great and rich and powerful. It has built our cities, our roads, our dams. It has transformed arid desertlands into lush green fields. Our cars, our radios, our television sets are all the work of American labor.

This record of past achievement is excelled only by the prospects for future growth and progress. Benefits almost inconceivable only 50 years ago now stand within reach. One danger places this potential in peril, however:

If it is not alert and aware, labor could lose the progress it has attained through the freedoms of our system.

These freedoms, the bulwark of our American society, are threatened by:

Persistent interference by the Federal Government in the free collective bargaining process which is essential to our private enterprise system.

Suppression of an individual member's political preferences and priorities by some power-hungry union leaders.

Compulsory arbitration of grievances, enforced by the Federal Government, causes the free bargaining process to disintegrate. Rigid postures are assumed by labor and management when both know the Government will intervene as the final referee. Each holds back, in the belief that complete candor at the bargaining table will weaken the case to be made ultimately during arbitration.

I am most certainly in favor of equitable and impartial administration of our labor laws. But I am unalterably opposed to compulsory arbitration.

It serves no purpose other than to delay agreement which should be reached freely through the interchange of proposals by the participating parties, and this delay generally is costly to all concerned. It interjects the Government into an area where it does not rightly belong, and represents dictatorial domination by external authority. It puts labor in a position where it must try to dominate Government.

Collective bargaining agreements spring from a sensitive balancing of rights and privileges. The Government should not be allowed to upset this balance, no matter which way the scales dip.

Under the recent "case by case" review policy adopted by the National Labor Relations Board, for instance, neither labor nor management can be sure of their rights or their obligations. The principle of equal opportunity is firmly established as part of the American tradition. Both labor and management should be permitted to function in the knowledge that they are assured of equal opportunity to solve their own difficulties without external interference.

The Government can assume a proper role in this field, and there is no better example of this than recent enactment of changes in the Davis-Bacon Act covering wages paid to workers employed on federally aided projects. The act stipulates that fringe benefits must be included in computation of prevailing wage rates for the locality in which a project is located. The contractor must pay at least the prevailing rate.

I voted for this measure because I believe we in Congress have a responsibility to see that the principle of equal opportunity is protected, especially when the use of tax revenues collected from all Americans is involved.

Individual union members must not become partisan pawns in the hands of a few greedy men. They must not be forced to turn over political proxies to union leaders who will cast them as they see fit, regardless of the sentiments of the rank and file.

Such a trend, which is a danger today, ultimately will break down individual citizen responsibility. It will supplant individual representation with representation based only on economic and functional factors.

A man's politics relate directly to not only his job—but to his home, his community, his family, his children's education. He must be permitted to make a free choice when determining how he will exert his influence as a voter. Certainly, his employment and economic situation will guide him. But in individual instances, they might not be the determining factors. He should be allowed the opportunity gauaranteed by our Constitution to weigh each factor independently before making a final judgment.

In our society, no group has the right to act without due regard for the effects of their actions upon others. Many union leaders recognize that they assume this responsibility when they take office, and hopefully more of them will meet it in future political deliberations.

The rank and file of the labor movement are beginning to watch carefully the pattern of increasing Government influence. In a growing number of instances, they have focused a jaundiced eye upon the abuse of political influence by some union leaders.

Labor wants to reach its own decisions. It resents desk-made decision handed down from Washington. It knows how to fight and win its own battles. The independent spirit that is America is very much alive in our great labor population today. As we pause to celebrate Labor Day this year, we fervently pray it may ever be so.

Political Poverty Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have long been proud of the brand of independent editorial opinion exhibited by the newspapers in my congressional district. I am particularly impressed with the high standards in this regard which are so consistently maintained by the Mount Morris Index. In a recent editorial they proffered the opinion that under this administration we have seen more accomplished to end political poverty than economic poverty. In this connection allusion is made to the decision of Democratic convention and voters in New York and California to import candidates for the U.S. Senate from outside State boundaries. Although the editorial to which I refer is written somewhat tongue in cheek it still carries a very incisive message; namely, that the modern thinkers of our present era assail as political destitution a Congressman who honestly tries to represent the viewpoint of the people who elected him to office rather than what this egocentric little group of self-styled modern thinkers have interpreted as the national or international interest. As the editorial points out, these people do not believe in government by the people. They believe in government for the people by a few elite persons gifted with superior intelligence and in many cases inherited wealth who stand at the top of the political pyramid and grandly dispense the favors of government to a benighted populace.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that the American people will reject this kind of sophistry in the forthcoming election. Under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith the entire text of an editorial from the Mount Morris Index of September 3, 1964, entitled: "Political Poverty Cure."

POLITICAL POVERTY CURE

There has been no great breakthrough yet in the war on economic poverty but some major accomplishments have been reported in the war on political poverty.

The poor in Appalachia are still waiting for someone to turn the spigot and start the dollars flowing from Washington and people in the city slums and the rural depressed areas throughout the Nation are awaiting the arrival of newly recruited domestic peace corpsmen to cure them of poverty.

While these programs are just getting off the ground political poverty has been wiped out in brilliant fashion in the Nation's two most populous States—California and New York.

Washington sent Pierre Salinger to California which was so impoverished that it had no suitable senatorial candidate of its own and more recently Robert F. Kennedy volunteered to stamp out the same kind of political poverty in New York.

With this marvelous start there is no end to which the war against political poverty can be carried. Washington undoubtedly is full of dedicated people who would be willing to go into States and congressional districts too poor, backward and parochial to develop their own Senators and Representatives.

We are not sure how Washington will determine which areas are politically depressed but surely some kind of commission can be set up to establish standards and guidelines for making the evaluations.

The modern thinkers in fact have some standard tests that they apply to determine the quality of representation that a particular State or district is receiving.

They feel that political destitution is apparent when a congressman tries to repre-

resent the wishes of the people back home rather than vote for things which the group deems to be in the national or international interest.

This, according to the new-think group, is the great weakness of our present legislative system for it causes Congress to give people what they want instead of what the group thinks is good for them. The group puts the emphasis on government for the people and is appalled by the idea of government by the people who just aren't capable of knowing anything about the problems of these complex times.

Due to the bipartisan makeup of the new group they can furnish a State or district with right-thinking candidates on both tickets so and send a people-directed man to represent them.

The only members of the group who doubt that political poverty can be wiped out completely are the few who remember a little of the history they had in school. These have a hazy recollection that the people of America fought a war of independence because they got tired of rulers imported from England.

Congressman Fogarty Continues To Keep Rhode Island Nation's Better Health Pace Setter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the closing days of the 88th Congress affords a propititious time for reviewing the actions taken by this Congress in securing the health and well-being of the American people and a time for surveying the effects—present and projected—of health legislation on my home State of Rhode Island and on all the States of this great Nation.

In the area of social and health legislation—an area with which I am particularly concerned—the 88th Congress made notable contributions toward meeting the health needs of the people, and will be remembered by posterity for its record of outstanding achievements. First, I would like to review briefly some of the health measures passed by this Congress, and then I would like to show how my home State of Rhode Island well illustrates the ways in which congressional health legislation may be used for the greatest benefit of all our citizens.

One of the most significant pieces of new legislation was signed into law by the late President Kennedy on September 24, 1963. This was, of course, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, which provides a total of $236,400,000 over a 3-year period for the construction and renovation of educational facilities to be used in training medical, dental, and other health workers. The bill also authorizes the establishment of a student loan program to help these students—so desperately needed—meet the continually rising costs of this vital training.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare for over 15 years, I have had the critical and ever-increasing need for more health-trained workers repeatedly placed before me by doctors, scientists, educators, and many interested citizens. Time and again I myself have introduced legislation in previous Congresses in an effort to meet this need, but the time was not ripe. The passage of this act gives me such a sense of deep personal gratification that I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues and the many individuals and groups who have worked so dilligently for the enactment of this legislation.

My only disappointment in the passage of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act is the deletion of the forgiveness clause on student loans to physicians and dentists who practice in areas of the Nation which have the greatest need for their services. I have, as many of you know, introduced a bill—H.R. 9396—which would reinstate this clause and I am still hopeful that this Congress will extend the progress made in meeting the critical manpower shortage by the passage of this measure.

The clearing of the congressional mind as to the critical need for support of education of health workers has been again evidenced by the passage by both the House and Senate of the Nurse Training Act of 1964. Although nurses were included in the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the report of the Surgeon General's Consultant Group on Nursing clearly indicated that the provisions of that act would never come close to answering the problems faced by the nursing profession in training adequate numbers of new nurses.

The Nurse Training Act provides separate appropriations to establish a 4-year program of grants for construction and rehabilitation of our nursing schools, along with a program of project grants to aid these schools in meeting additional costs necessary to strengthen and improve their training programs. The bill will extend and expand the existing programs of traineeships to help professional nurses meet the growing costs of desperately needed advanced training, and will establish a student loan program for nurses modeled after the National Defense Education Act to encourage more of our Nation's youth to enter nursing.

Another monumental step was taken by this Congress to help alleviate a sadly neglected area of public health when it passed the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. This act provides $329 million for the construction of research centers for mental retardation, for research into the causes and cures of mental retardation, for the construction of community mental health centers and a small amount for the training of teachers of the mentally retarded and otherwise handicapped children.

The original bill as passed by the House contained a clause authorizing $427 million over an 8-year period, to pay part of the cost for initial staffing of the community mental health centers. This clause was deleted by the Senate. With the favorable climate of opinion that exists today, I am confident that we shall see this provision reinstated.

In passing the Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963, this 88th Congress once again proved its readiness to accept responsibility for health measures and social legislation. This act doubles the authorization for Federal grants for maternal and child health services administered by the Children's Bureau and provides grant funds for health care of expectant mothers as well as research into maternal and child health problems.

In reviewing the legislation of the 88th Congress, I would be remiss if I did not also mention the passage of the vocational education bill, the youth training program, the monumental civil rights bill, the extension of the Hill-Burton program of hospital construction funds and the health research facilities program. I would like also to thank this Congress for its continued support of the recommendations of my committee favoring high level support for this Nation's medical research programs.

It has been my privilege to serve the people of Rhode Island as their Representative to Congress from the Second District for 24 years. In that time I have seen my home State emerge as a national leader in health care and medical progress. I have watched the people of Rhode Island take advantage of Federal programs for health care support and initiate new State and local programs for improving the health of the people of Rhode Island.

I now watch with pride as Rhode Islanders again apply the new congressional measures—measures for which I have urged support—and develop new programs to answer the needs in many areas of health care. One notable example of Rhode Island's taking the initiative can be seen in the field of mental health planning.

In anticipation of a national effort, Rhode Island adopted a law providing for the establishment of Community Mental Health Boards in 1962. Within the State department of social welfare, a coordinator for mental health planning was appointed, and a special council on mental health was established. The council, working under Federal grant-in-aid planning funds made available through the National Institute of Mental Health, is meeting regularly in task forces concerned with planning in specialized areas to meet the mental health needs of the State.

Rhode Island is ready to put to use the new Federal laws regarding the construction of mental retardation and mental illness facilities. In fact, Washington County, the southernmost county of the State, has already taken the initiative and has sponsored a community mental health center for children. This is a pioneering effort—Rhode Island is among the first of the States to direct its attention to the mental health of the young people in its communities. Following the Rhode Island tradition of effective community action, I know that other counties will soon follow the ex-

ample of Washington County. I hope that they will cut through administrative redtape—if need be—and establish similar and much-needed facilities.

In utilizing Federal funds provided under the Hill-Burton program, Rhode Island has not lagged. Since the initiation of the program in 1946, Rhode Island hospitals, nursing homes, and rehabilitation centers have applied for and received at least 50 grants-in-aid for the construction and renovation of hospital and medical care facilities. Some 1,500 new beds have been placed in Rhode Island hospitals and about $10 million in Federal funds have served to produce new medical care units at a total expense of over $55 million.

Three of Rhode Island's seven schools of nursing have already made use of the funds provided by Hill-Burton—Our Lady of Fatima Nursing School has a new nurses' home in use; the Roger Williams General Hospital School of Nursing has a nurses' residence and school under construction; and, last fall, it was my privilege to speak at the dedication of the new nurses' residence at the Rhode Island Hospital School of Nursing.

These facilities were much needed and much appreciated, yet Rhode Island nurses saw the continuing need for more and better facilities and training. Miss Mildred Schwier, director of nursing of the Rhode Island Hospital School of Nursing, presented effective testimony of the need for more help in this area to the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, during the hearings on the Nurse Training Act. Letters from the dean and assistant dean of the College of Nursing at the University of Rhode Island prompted me to speak out strongly in its behalf before the House and Senate acted favorably on the measure.

Because many institutions plan to construct both their educational and research facilities simultaneously, I am sure Rhode Island will take full advantage of the Nurse Training Act and of the new Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. Many applications under the latter act's provisions have already been made, and as soon as funds are appropriated by Congress and made available for use, Rhode Island will be ready to benefit from them.

Rhode Island has for the past 10 years been utilizing another congressional program—the health research facilities construction—to transform itself into the leader in medical and health-related research.

Through the merit and excellence of its institutions and personnel, it has been awarded $2,164,601 on a matching basis for the construction of health research facilities. As of December 31, 1963, six projects had been completed. Brown University has a new laboratory for psychology research in addition to a new building and a remodeled building for biology studies. Providence College has a new structure housing basic medical research laboratories. Rhode Island has at its disposal, a new research building and facilities devoted to cancer research. These completed projects represent only about half of the work being carried out with funds made available through the health research facilities program.

Rhode Island is today benefiting from and contributing significantly to medical research. In fiscal year 1963 some 67 individual research grants totaling well over $1,600,000 were awarded to researchers in Rhode Island to initiate or to continue support of research in many significant areas of disease and basic biology. One of these grants, to Dr. Glidden Brooks at Brown University, was awarded for the establishment of a center for aging research in Rhode Island, an area of research that has previously been neglected. This is, as many of you know, an area of particular interest to me, and in which I have stimulated research interest. Through such work as Dr. Brooks' we may learn to distinguish between the processes of aging and those of diseases with which they are so closely related.

Rhode Island is also a key State in the collaborative perinatal project coordinated by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness. In this project over 50,000 expectant mothers will be examined throughout pregnancy and mothers and their children will be examined during the years of childhood to accumulate a mass of data in an effort to discover factors in perinatal development that lead to cerebral palsy, mental retardation, and many other congenital conditions. Brown University in Providence served as a model for the participation of 14 other institutions throughout the country.

In the past few weeks, the Nation has been given the heartening news that research in the area of virus causation of leukemia is nearing the "payoff stage" and that a vaccine against this dread killer of little children may be in the not too distant future. I share the hopes of the Rhode Island Hospital, that their new cancer research laboratories, built with the help of Federal funds, will play a role in the hopes for conquest of leukemia.

In the past 20-odd years, the years of my experience in Congress, I have seen many diseases as dreaded as leukemia, virtually wiped out as a result of progress in medical research. I have seen the pace of this research quickened under the stimulus of Federal support.

However, one of the greatest challenges remaining before us in health matters is the problem of assuring adequate facilities and educational resources to provide sufficient numbers of health-trained workers to carry our research results to all the people of the Nation. The 88th Congress can be proud of its record in taking several affirmative steps toward meeting this need.

I have seen the results of research successes clinically applied in a well-organized team effort by the people of my home State. With continued excellence in leadership, with continued public interest and support, Rhode Island will maintain its position of prominence as a leader in the inauguration of new programs to spread the wealth of medical know-how to all of its people.

The 89th Congress will continue the work of this Congress, and the individual States—utilizing such measures as we have applied in Rhode Island—will bring to the American people the finest health care in the world.

Free Surplus Weapons and Ammunition to Gun Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a thoughtful letter from a constituent in respect to the longstanding program of the Department of the Army that furnishes ammunition and surplus weapons to civilian gun clubs.

Aptly, the writer, Mr. Ross C. Miller, concludes his letter by stating, "It just doesn't make sense."

Well, Mr. Speaker, it does not make sense. Other House Members have questioned the wisdom of the program and the response from the Pentagon bureaucracy has been as unsympathetic as the responses I receive when I protest against invasion of employee privacy in post office washrooms and use of lie detectors by Government agencies.

In mid-August the Associated Press moved a story in which the Army itself estimated that since 1960 it has spent more than $7 million for ammunition distributed free to various civilian gun organizations.

Now, the program is open to criticism on at least two counts. First, rightwing organization leaders have announced their intention of infiltrating civilian gun groups, such as the National Rifle Association, in order to gain access to free ammunition. This brings about a danger that ammunition may go to such avowedly antidemocratic groups as the Minutemen.

In the age of nuclear weapons, it also seems quaint that the Army is so intent upon training skilled riflemen among the civilian population. I would wager that few of these skilled marksmen are qualified for military service, if this is the Army's rationale.

I am well aware of how stanchly the gun club members defend the programs. Not infrequently their letters to me on this score also contain various denunciations of Federal programs, terming them "handouts." While on the one hand they protest against bread for families of the unemployed, they see nothing incongruous in lining up themselves for Government handouts of bullets.

Mr. Speaker at this point in my remarks I include Mr. Miller's letter:

HON. EDITH GREEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: In the August 20, 1964, issue of the Portland Reporter there is an Associated Press news item reporting that in the past 5 years the U.S. Army has spent

"at least $12 million for its program of supplying guns and ammunition to civilians." The article details to some extent the major areas of this expense and suggests that this does not cover the cost of other related programs of the Army, such as selling guns at cut rates to members of the National Rifle Association.

I can hardly believe that this article can be printed on page 28 of the newspaper with what one might interpret as the treatment warranted by a rather routine news release about a remote and not too interesting an aspect of Government spending. My reaction is disbelief and dismay. I am writing to you to implore you, please, as my representative, do whatever you can to stop this rediculous farce. I do not want my Government spending its money this way.

I am sure that there must be one or more groups lobbying in favor of such programs, and I assume that there may be some rationalizations why the Government should provide arms to its civilians (though I honestly can't imagine what they might be). However, I am convinced that most Portlanders, most Oregonians, most Americans, as individuals don't want this happening.

As I look over what I have written I have to stop and wonder just what it is about this particular instance which prompts me to write to you. Though I am college educated, conscientious, etc., I am also guilty of Mr. Average American's fault of almost never writing to my legislators or to my newspaper to express my concerns or approvals. I suppose the precipitating factor in this situation is the fantastic stupidity of this use of governmental funds. In this year of 1964, when we live in a country where education and knowledge and communication have reached levels never before dreamed of and within the grasp of everyone—and we're handing out guns to our population. If it were written as the script of a movie or a television drama it would sound unbelievable.

I am the director of the Parry Center for Children and have occasion to talk with many, many people about the cost of various community and governmental services and the feelings of individuals about financing programs and services. It is not infrequent that someone says to me, "Oh, the work you do at the Parry Center for disturbed children is just marvelous—and I'm not questioning whether it's worthwhile—but can we really afford it? You know there are so many things to support, and funds are so limited—there just aren't enough funds to go around." And we can spend $12 million to provide guns to our citizens? For what? To assassinate a President? To shoot at the police during a riot? To carelessly shoot into a bush and kill another hunter? It just doesn't make sense.

Sincerely,

ROSS C. MILLER.

Texas Politics Prove Costly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURT L. TALCOTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1964

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, for those who once thought ARA was good politics, I include an article from the Dallas Morning News by Fred Pass of the East Texas Bureau of the News dated September 3, 1964.

Many facets of this ARA fiasco are apparent even by a cursory reading. The reporter points out the pros and cons. ARA is not all bad; in fact the idea and purpose are good. It has been discredited by crude politics and degraded by incompetent men.

One candid Crockett citizen's reaction: "We knew that to get anything through Washington you have to play politics." What a shameful contribution of ARA. Another pungent comment: "We tried to keep politics out of it * * * but politics enters most everything." Many good, honest people in and around Crockett who wanted to trust their Federal Government were deceived. But not all. In 1962 Benton Musslewhite, a big ARA promoter and benefactor, ran for Congress and carried Houston County. In 1964, running on his ARA connections and with ARA help, Musslewhite lost. Of course, ARA was not the only factor—nevertheless citizen taxpayers do not always appreciate having their noses rubbed in the Federal pork barrel.

Many people of Crockett lost money—some directly. Every U.S. taxpayer lost money in Crockett. Every Federal agency and every Federal official lost respect by the nature and manner of another ARA fizzle.

The article follows:

POLITICS PROVE COSTLY: CROCKETT'S FEELINGS MIXED ON FIZZLE

(By Fred Pass)

CROCKETT, TEX.—In the aftermath of a proposed Government-financed industrial project that fizzled, these are some of the comments and charges you get in Crockett today:

Federal officials were derelict in failing to check sufficiently a Houston promoter and his Audio-Electronics Co. before getting this east Texas city involved in the project.

Crockett businessmen lost up to $10,000 in the deal.

County Democrats used Houston County Development Foundation funds of more than $3,000 to stage a political rally for Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH and congressional hopeful Benton Musslewhite, while businessmen who worked hard to raise $60,000 for the project went ignored.

Answers to questions vary, usually according to political alliances. But on the basis of interviews, there is no question that the task of trying to obtain an industry through the Federal Area Redevelopment Act (commonly known as ARA or the depressed areas program) falls deeply into the realm of politics.

Crockett businessmen show mixed reactions to an article in the September issue of Reader's Digest titled "When the Bubble Burst in Crockett, Tex." The article relates the effort of the county's development foundation to obtain an electronics plant by offering to chip in approximately $60,000, along with Federal ARA funds of some $382,000, to build a factory. The deal also called for Audio-Electronics to put up $147,000.

The article charged Senator YARBOROUGH with speaking by telephone over a loudspeaker to a group of Crockett businessmen and promoting the project. And later, at a groundbreaking ceremony and barbecue, the Senator, along with State ARA Coordinator Ray Morrison and J. Paul Dawson, the president of Audio-Electronics, spoke glowingly of the plant.

But a plant never materialized. The Digest article stated that Dawson had a long record of legal difficulties and that while he was negotiating with ARA, there was pending against him in a U.S. district court in Montana a $21,000 suit for stock fraud under the Securities and Exchange Act.

Also, at the very time of the groundbreaking ceremonies, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission was conducting a stock-fraud investigation involving Visutronics Corp. of America and the arrangements whereby Audio-Electronics was to manufacture Visutronics inventions, the magazine reported.

Consequently, the deal fell through, with officials in Washington claiming patent troubles as the reason. The magazine said that "not only has Crockett's dream of a fine audio factory vanished, but a number of citizens have been hurt financially." It listed several people—a retired Air Force officer, a former Salvation Army captain and others—who lost considerably in the deal.

The development foundation has not yet issued an official answer to the article. The group meets September 10 and may do so then.

Among businessmen here, these are the most prevalent views:

1. ARA officials should have uncovered flaws early in the deal.

2. No barbecue ballyhoo should have been held before all was nailed down and it should not have been turned into such a political rally.

3. Crockett people lost very little, and the Houston County Development Association did not lose any of its $60,000 raised for the project. Most of those persons named as stockholders by Reader's Digest lived elsewhere and were not victims of promotion efforts in Crockett.

4. The magazine article was basically correct, the exposure of the situation was good and will do the city no harm.

H. B. Knox, Crockett furniture dealer who was president of the development organization during the negotiations and celebration last year, explained:

"We were to raise about $60,000 and we did. We spent half of it—$30,000—to buy 40 acres of land. That's all we spent of the money we raised, and we still own the land."

He said $12,000 of the money is deposited in a county bank and is drawing 4 percent interest. Approximately $13,000 was spent on building a railroad spur, grading, and other improvements for a furniture factory which located in Crockett since the ARA fiasco.

Knox also said that 65 persons who put up money were offered half of it back (the other half was tied up in the land) and only three or four persons took back the money, totaling about $1,000. The balance has been used to buy another small tract of land for industrial use.

"I'm not a politician," said Knox. "I never dreamed getting RALPH YARBOROUGH to speak here would cause all this uproar."

He wondered why ARA officials did not find out more about Dawson and his company, but Knox added:

"I want to make it clear that I think ARA is a wonderful thing. It fits a small community like this. Don't tell me the Government is easy. They're not. If anything, they spent too long on this. But we need something like ARA. We're not depressed, but we're underemployed. We want to survive, just as Houston and Dallas want to survive and grow."

Lanier Edmiston, a wholesale grocer and member of the Crockett council industrial committee, charged that the foundation-financed ground-breaking barbecue "was nothing but an integrated Democratic rally" (a large number of Negroes attended the event).

Edmiston pointed out that the county Democratic chairman, Roy Julian, was general chairman of the event, and that party leaders had control of it all the way.

"It cost the Houston County Development Foundation over $3,000 for the barbecue to

further the political ambitions of YARBOROUGH and Musslewhite, yet the businessmen who raised $60,000 were not mentioned," he said.

James Rector, president of the Crockett State Bank, admitted politics was being used to try to get the plant. But he said the barbecue was not held as a political rally.

"We were trying to get this thing rolled on through," said Rector. "We knew that to get anything through Washington you have to play politics, so we used the help of Senator YARBOROUGH and his office."

As for the barbecue, the banker said the development foundation, which substituted for a dissolved chamber of commerce, was new and had never held a membership meeting.

"Our organization is made up of a number of communities," he said. "We had been planning to have some kind of get-together. When this came up, we decided to tie it all together."

Rector said he is pleased that nearly all persons who had contributed to the fund left the money in. Both he and Edmiston pointed out that money on hand helped in acquiring the furniture plant.

Robert King, an automobile dealer in Crockett, was one citizen who invested in Audio-Electronics stock and lost. He estimates that about $10,000 worth of stock was sold to Crockett businessmen.

"I bought 2,000 shares at 50 cents a share," he said. "I paid a thousand dollars for it, and finally sold it for a dollar. I lost $999. I bought the stock because I believed the company would be a good thing for the city."

King said he believes Ray Morrison was a sincere man and interested in Crockett, but added he thought Morrison was "derelict in his duties in not making an investigation of Dawson and his patent rights."

King said he nad been named cochairman of a special committee to raise the needed $60,000.

"Everybody thought this was a wild promotion," he said. "But we felt that if the U.S. Government was willing to spend and finance a $200,000 building in Crockett, it would be worth $60,000 to us to have it here."

Edmiston and Knox agreed with King that the general feeling was that, once built, the building would not be moved from Crockett even if the electronics firm failed. Thus, the city would come out ahead.

Glenn Cook, the development association's executive secretary, said he believes that if the groundbreaking celebration had not been held, the Government and Audio-Electronics might have worked out of the problems.

"I believe the mistake was made in having the affair prior to the establishment of the plant," he said. "We tried to keep politics out of it, because ours is a countywide organization with members having different political views and opinions. But politics enters into most everything."

The barbecue event, he said, cost between $3,000 and $4,000 which came from the organization's operating fund. He pointed out that some 3,500 persons attended, and that the event was used for presenting rural community awards and other countywide functions.

"All of the expense for it should not be charged to the groundbreaking ceremony," Cook said.

His organization did not promote the sale of stock, he declared, and as far as he knows, none was sold to anybody other than to businessmen interested in getting the plant for the city. He said he believes the Reader's Digest article was written for politics.

"All we have actually lost in the deal is the barbecue money," said Cook. "But we can lose a lot more now, if we let politics divide us."

Speeches by Senator Scott and Christopher Emmet at Polish Army Veterans Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on August 31, I had a statement read for me before an important meeting of the Polish Army Veterans, in Philadelphia. Appearing in my place was the distinguished Christopher Emmet, chairman of the American Friends of the Captive Nations, who delivered an eloquent address.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my own remarks and those of Mr. Emmet.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR HUGH SCOTT TO MEETING OF POLISH ARMY VETERANS, AT PHILADELPHIA, ON AUGUST 30, 1964, COMMEMORATION OF THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WORLD WAR II WARSAW UPRISING

Twenty years ago this month hundreds of thousands of Polish patriots rose up in revolt against their Nazi oppressors. Outmanned in everything but courage, they fought and bled and died, while their beautiful and historic capital of Warsaw literally crumbled into ruins around them.

Some 20,000 Polish soldiers were killed, and untold thousands of civilians slaughtered. But they could not know that their lives, given for their country and ancient heritage, also constituted the opening of Communist Russia's imperialistic onslaught against free men everywhere.

The mighty Red Army, ostensibly an ally in the war against Nazism, camped outside the gates of Warsaw while Poland's finest were being slaughtered and Warsaw destroyed. Then, and only then, did they move in and take over the ruined city, and eventually the entire country.

This aspect of the Warsaw uprising, the ruthless tactics employed by the Soviets to replace Nazi domination of Poland with their own, must not be allowed to be forgotten.

Yet, many in our country today seem to fear that somehow we might wound Soviet sensibilities by references to their brutal conquests and oppression of East European peoples. The administration's recent proclamation of August 1 as Warsaw Uprising Day did not even mention the calculated treachery of the Soviet Union and the part it played in the tragic outcome of that uprising.

I do not believe that the so-called detente which many say now exists between the United States and the Soviets justifies our ignoring the harsh history of Soviet imperialism.

SPEECH BY CHRISTOPHER EMMET AT MEETING OF POLISH ARMY VETERANS IN PHILADELPHIA COMMEMORATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF WARSAW, AND HONORING THE COMMANDER OF THE UNDERGROUND ARMY, GEN. BOR KOMOROSKI, WHO SPOKE AT THE MEETING

Mr. Chairman, Gen. Bor Komoroski, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply honored to take part in this meeting, and I share your regret that Senator SCOTT, who has been such a good friend of Poland and the other captive nations could not be here. It is a very rare and a very thrilling experience to be able to celebrate one of the glorious deeds of history in the presence of a living hero of those events, as we are doing today in the presence of General Bor.

I know that Senator SCOTT would have been as moved as I am if he could have been with you. It seems to me very appropriate that you invited Senator SCOTT to address you, for you are commemorating one of the heroic episodes of Polish history. For centuries the Poles have been known among the nations for their bravery. And as for Senator SCOTT, whatever else his political opponents may say about him, no one could ever accuse him of lacking political courage, as he has proved once again in recent months.

THE OTHER BATTLE OF WARSAW

Before giving you some reflections on the meaning of the Battle of Warsaw for us today, I would like to recall two other dates in modern Polish history when Poland rendered a service to the whole free world—and suffered for it. In 1920 the Poles stopped the advance of communism into central Europe by the great victory of General Pilsudski before the gates of Warsaw. With the chaotic conditions existing in central Europe at that time, and the disunity of the Western Allies, there is no telling what the course of history might have been if that First Battle of Warsaw had not been won by the Poles.

It was not until 24 years later that Communist armies ventured into central Europe again in 1944. And as we shall see in a moment, if the Western Allies had learned the lessons of the Second Battle of Warsaw, Soviet Armies would not be where they are today.

The Poles rendered the same service in preventing a final Nazi conquest of Europe, which they rendered in protecting Western Europe from communism. In 1939, when the Poles refused to surrender to Hitler as Czechoslovakia had done, the Polish people knew that it was physically impossible for the British or the French to give them substantial military aid. The Poles fought although they did not have any mountain barriers or fortifications to defend their frontier against the Nazi armies. If Poland had not fought then, and thus forced the British and French to go to war to honor their pledges, Hitler would have taken all Europe without firing a shot. The British would have been isolated, and eventually the United States would have had to fight Hitler and Japan almost alone.

SECOND BATTLE OF WARSAW JULY 30—OCTOBER 2, 1944

And now turning to the second battle of Warsaw in 1944, you have already heard an outline of the facts from General Bor—how the Nazi armies were in demoralized retreat, how the Soviet armies crossed the Vistula and were within 10 miles of Warsaw, how the Soviet Air Force controlled the air over Warsaw, how the Moscow radio and the Soviet generals called on the Polish armies to rise against the Germans, because the Russians were at the gates to help them—and, finally, how the Polish underground army rose and within 24 hours captured most of the city, only to see the Soviet Air Force disappear from the skies over the city, to hear the Soviet guns go silent, and to wait in vain for the promised Russian aid. This was a betrayal on the most gigantic and diabolical scale that we know of in recorded history.

I need not add to the facts which General Bor has told you, but I would like to read you a few quotes from Winston Churchill,

because they confirm everything which the General has said. These quotes are taken from the sixth volume of Churchill's great history of the war, "Triumph and Tragedy." Here is part of a message Churchill sent to President Roosevelt on August 18:

"An episode of profound and far-reaching gravity is created by the Russian refusal to permit American aircraft to bring succor to the heroic insurgents in Warsaw, aggravated by their own complete neglect to provide supplies by air when only a few score of miles away."

In answer to this and similar messages from Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt, Stalin replied, on August 22:

"Sooner or later the truth about the group of criminals who had embarked on the Warsaw adventure will become known to everybody."

The criminals Stalin referred to were General Bor and the people of Warsaw, whom Stalin himself had urged to rise against the Germans.

Weeks later, after the Polish underground army and the people of Warsaw had been fighting the Germans for nearly 6 weeks, Stalin pretended to yield to the pressure of Roosevelt and Churchill. He then ordered the Soviet armies to advance into the suburbs of the city, as they could have done weeks before. This was a move to deceive the West and to pretend that the Russians were finally coming to the aid of the Poles. But it was just another ruse, for they stopped in the suburbs and gave no aid to the Poles, whom the Germans continued to decimate.

Describing this Soviet tactic Churchill says on page 144:

"The following day the Russians occupied the Praga suburb but went no farther. They wished to have the non-Communist Poles destroyed to the full, but also to keep alive the idea that they were going to their rescue.

THE LESSONS OF WARSAW AND THE YALTA AGREEMENT

By their incredibly prolonged resistance, the people of Warsaw and the Polish underground army had torn the mask from the Soviet Communists. The betrayal of Warsaw revealed that Stalin was stepping into Hitler's shoes as a menace to the free world, 6 months before the Yalta Conference. It was not the fault of the Polish people that this lesson was either ignored or quickly forgotten. Taking the facts as Churchill himself described them, the Soviet incitement and abandonment of Warsaw was an unforgettable act of treachery—yet, we made the Yalta Agreement 6 months later.

We are told now that there was nothing wrong with the Yalta agreement, except that Russia violated it. I cannot accept this because the agreement itself violated the key provisions of the Atlantic Charter, which was the only joint statement of Allied war aims, accepted by the Soviets on January 1, 1942. But leaving that aside, we must still ask why, after the battle of Warsaw, did Churchill and Roosevelt imagine that Stalin would not violate it? That will remain one of the mysteries of history.

Even earlier, ever since the tide was turned against Hitler in December 1942 by the Nazi defeats at Stalingrad and at El Alamein, Stalin had given evidence that he was already plotting for the control of Europe and the world even at the cost of postponing the victory against Hitler. He refused to grant bases in Russia for the bombing of the Rumanian oil wells, which would have shortened German resistance. He even refused to grant the United States fighter bases at Murmansk to protect the American ships which were delivering lend-lease oil to Russia, from the Nazi air force in Norway. As a result, hundreds of American sailors were drowned, many ships were lost, also many American planes and airmen were downed when we tried to bomb the Ploesti oilfields from distant bases. Think of the losses to the Russian people and the Russian armies by this refusal of Stalin which prolonged the Nazi war effort. Yet he preferred to have hundreds of thousands of Russian soldiers die rather than let the Russian people know the extent to which they were being aided and saved by America's help.

That was why Stalin feared to have American airmen based on Soviet soil. That is why, when Stalin briefly agreed to an American air base at Poltava, the Americans were forced to destroy every scrap of American newspapers and magazines, lest Soviet military personnel should be granted a glimpse into the truth about the West. Stalin refused to let the Russian people know that the lend-lease supplies, on which the Russian armies moved, came from America, until Ambassador Admiral Stanley, acting on his own initiative, forced one grudging admission from Stalin by threatening to cut off the supplies.

Finally, Stalin revealed his postwar plans by the murder of 11,000 Polish officers who were trying to organize the Polish armies to fight with the Russians against the Germans. The Polish troops in Russia would have fought as bravely as the Polish troops under General Anders in Italy, but Stalin did not want there to be any Polish Army, so he had the officers murdered. When the Nazi Army on their invasion of Russia discovered the mass graves of thousands of these officers in the Katyn Forest, they called in neutral scientists from Switzerland and Sweden, who testified, from the state of the bodies and the uniforms that they wore, that they could not have been killed by the Germans and must have been killed earlier by the Russians.

It was perfectly natural that the Allied governments refused to admit the truth of this publicly in wartime, for the sake of the common war effort against the Nazis. But what excuse was there for the Allied leaders not to recognize the facts privately and draw the inevitable conclusions about Stalin's character and policy toward the West, as revealed in this monstrous crime?

In the Katyn murders Stalin killed thousands of Polish officers who had chosen to surrender to the Russians rather than to the Germans when Hitler attacked Poland and Stalin stabbed Poland in the back. In short, he was murdering men who were friendly to Russia and who hoped to fight on Russia's side against the Germans. He murdered the Polish officers because he wanted to destroy the possibility of a Polish Army which could defend an independent Poland. And he incited the Polish underground army to its revolt against the Germans for the same reason.

WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN

Even if the eyes of Roosevelt and Churchill had only been opened by the similar Soviet crime in the battle of Warsaw, in the summer of 1944, there was still time after that for them to profit by the lesson. The Yalta Conference took place 6 months after the battle of Warsaw began. General Patton still could have occupied Prague and we still could have occupied Berlin, instead of letting the Russians get there first. And by telling the American people the truth our Government knew about our Communist allies, we could have prevented or at least reduced the hysterical, and partly Communist instigated, agitation to bring the American troops prematurely home from Europe in 1945, which enabled Stalin to take over Central Europe with impunity.

All this was the result of the tragic wishful thinking which caused even the greatest of Western leaders to deceive themselves about communism, until it was almost too late to save Western Europe from the Soviet armies. Even when Winston Churchill warned the West as late as March 1946 in Fulton, Mo., few American leaders or newspapers agreed with him.

Since President Roosevelt was a Democrat, and lest this appear to be a partisan attack in an election year, let me stress that General Eisenhower, as our Commander in Chief, shared some of the responsibility of what happened in Prague and Berlin. Let me also stress that nothing in this criticism of Roosevelt and Churchill detracts from the immeasurable previous services both those great men rendered to the whole free world.

WHAT WE SHOULD DO

But what are the lessons of the battle of Warsaw for us today? Once again I fear that we face the danger of wishful thinking. We are told that there was a new Soviet Russia after the death of Stalin. We are even told now that there is a new Khrushchev. But the record shows that Khrushchev has learned the lessons of treachery well from his master, Stalin.

We need only remember the reinvasion of Hungary after the pretended Soviet withdrawal, the arrest of the Hungarian Commanding General Maleter, who was negotiating under a flag of truce; and the kidnapping of Premier Nagy under a safe conduct granted by the Soviets. Above all, we need only remember the secret installation of the missiles in Cuba, behind the friendly assurances of Khrushchev in personal letters and messages to President Kennedy.

We have been giving aid to Poland since the Polish revolution in 1956, which won some freedom of religion and of speech, as well as freedom from farm collectivization for the Polish people. But while receiving generous American aid designed to maintain and encourage those new freedoms, the Gomulka government has been steadily whittling them away. The American Friends of the Captive Nations have just issued a pamphlet describing conditions in Poland today, by a distinguished Pole who is known to members of our committee but who writes under a nom de plume to protect his relations at home. Copies of this pamphlet are available if you will write to us. As the author says, we should make continued American aid conditional upon a change in these Gomulka policies, so that the generosity of the American people is not used to strengthen a Communist dictatorship.

The same thing applies to the proposed American credits and aid for the other Communist countries of Eastern Europe. We must aid the people to win back their freedom, not bolster the satellite governments which still deny them every basic liberty despite minor relaxations. These satellite governments desperately need American credits, chemical plants, and other factories. The Communists use trade and aid as a weapon of subversion. We must use America's economic power and the Communist economic crisis to defend and extend freedom.

The 88th Congress—Summary of Major Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the adjournment sine die of the 88th Congress, each of us will make an independent judgment as to the overall worth of our legislative accomplishments during the 2-year span of this

Congress. With the thought that it might be worth while to have before us a summary of major legislation, I include at this time a compilation for the 1st session of the 88th Congress, as prepared by the coordinator of information of the House of Representatives:

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

H.R. 2438. Extends for 4 years, to June 30, 1967, authority of President to draft 18½–26-year-olds into military service; also extends Doctor Draft and Dependents' Assistance Acts, and the suspension of personnel strength limitation on Armed Forces. Public Law 88–2.

H.R. 2440. Authorizes $15.3 billion for procurement, construction of planes, missiles, ships, in fiscal 1964; includes $363.7 million additional for RS–70 manned bombers. Public Law 88–28.

H.R. 6500. Authorizes $1.6 billion for construction projects at Armed Forces bases at home and abroad, including 10,000 family-housing units for members of Army, Navy, and Air Force. Public Law 88–174.

H.R. 7500. Authorizes $5.3 billion for National Aeronautics and Space Administration in fiscal 1964, for research, development, construction of facilities, and administration. Public Law 88–113.

S. 1745. Authorizes $216.2 million for Atomic Energy Commission in fiscal 1964, including $172.5 million for new construction projects. Public Law 88–72.

S. 2267. Authorizes supplemental appropriation for Atomic Energy Commission to make possible resumption of atmospheric nuclear tests in event of violation of ban treaty. Public Law 88–189.

H.R. 2842. Permits prosecution in U.S. district courts of offenses against this country committed abroad. Public Law 88–27.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

H.R. 7885. Authorizes $3.59 billion for mutual security programs, continuing foreign assistance for 1964; includes $1 billion military aid, $925 million development loans, $225 million grants and technical aid, and $160 million contingency fund. Public Law 88–205.

H.J. Res. 778. Authorizes funds for U.S. participation in Hague Conference on private international law. Public Law 88–244.

H.R. 5207. Authorizes final payments of $43 million to Philippine war-damage claimants; establishes $30 million educational exchange fund; bars payment of any part of funds to any former member or employee of the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission.[1] Public Law 88–94.

S. 777. Authorizes $20 million for operations and research of Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for 1964 and 1965. Public Law 88–186.

H.R. 3872. Extends Export-Import Bank 5 years to June 30, 1968; increases its lending authority from $7 to $9 billion and its authority for guarantees and insurance, under the export credit program, by $1 billion to a total of $2 billion. Public Law 88–101.

H.R. 7405. Authorize U.S. Governor on Board of International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) to vote for proposed increase of $1 billion in its capital. Public Law 88–178.

H.R. 6791. Extends for 2 years the reduction from $500 to $100 the value of duty-free imports allowed returning American tourists. Public Law 88–53.

H.R. 9009. Increases authorization for U.S. Peace Corps to $102 million, number of volunteers to 11,300. Public Law 88–200.

H.R. 4374. Proclaims Winston Churchill an honorary American citizen. Public Law 88–6.

[1] Embodied as amendment in the Foreign Service Buildings Act.

TREATIES

Executive M. (88th, 1st). Treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water, signed at Moscow, August 5, 1963, by the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Ratified September 24, 1963.

Executive H (87th, 2d). International Coffee Agreement, signed at New York, September 28, 1962, by 58 nations, to be effective for 5 years after ratification, to stabilize and regulate prices of coffee by a world system of export quotas established by an International Coffee Organization. Ratified May 21, 1963.

Executive N (88th, 1st). Convention with Mexico, signed August 29, 1963, for solution of problem of the Chamizal (parcel of land north of Rio Grande near El Paso). Ratified December 17, 1963.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

S.J. Res. 102. Authorizes binding arbitration on two issues of rail labor dispute: Use of firemen and makeup of yard and train crews; bars new work rules or strike for 180 days from August 28, 1963. Public Law 88–108.

H.R. 8720. Extends to June 30, 1967, the Manpower Development and Training Act; waives for 1965 requirement that States match Federal grants for training allowances for unemployed but requires one-third matching in 1966; increases authorization for 1965 from $161 to $422 million; broadens program to train uneducated and jobless youth. Public Law 88–214.

H.R. 7195. Apportions through 1971 funds for completion of Interstate and Defense Highway system; fixes January 1965 as cost estimate deadline; raises Federal payments for construction engineering; continues billboard control program for 2 years. Public Law 88–157.

H.R. 8969. Increases temporary limit on national debt from $309 to $315 billion through June 1964,[2] Public Law 88–187.

H.R. 6755. Extends for 1 year up to July 1, 1964, the 52-percent corporate income tax and the current schedule of excise taxes on liquor, cigarettes, automobiles and parts, telephones, and airline tickets. Public Law 88–52.

H.R. 5389. Withdraws silver backing of papér currency, averts shortage of silver for coinage by repealing tax on silver transfers and other obsolete sections of Silver Purchase Act of 1934. Public Law 88–36.

H.R. 4655. Reduces for 1963 temporary increase in unemployment compensation tax rate; fixes new formula for determining allotments to States for administrative expenses. Public Law 88–31.

H.R. 5795. Permits Postmaster General, for 3 years, to continue parcel post at present rates, pending congressional action on problem of deficits from fourth-class operations. Public Law 88–51.

H.R. 134. Requires that auto seat belts shipped in interstate commerce meet certain safety standards. Public Law 88–201.

S. 1035. Extends for 1 year, to April 4, 1964, period in which Maritime Commission may act on proposed rates in dual-rate shipping contracts. Public Law 88–5.

H.R. 1597. Provides for deduction from income taxes of redeemable ground rent. Public Law 88–9.

S. 1031. Repeals Inland Waterways Corporation Act and authorizes Secretary of Commerce to liquidate its affairs. Public Law 88–67.

[2] Earlier enactments: Public Law 88–30, raised temporary limit from $305 to $307 billion to July 1, 1963, and to $309 billion to September 1, 1963; Public Law 88–106 extended $309 billion limit to December 1, 1963.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

H.R. 9413. Authorizes the coinage of a 50-cent piece bearing the likeness of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Public Law 88–256.

H.R. 9291. Provides office facilities and assistance for 1 year, Secret Service protection up to 2 years and lifetime free mailing privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy. Public Law 88–195.

S.J. Res. 137. Authorizes the Commission investigating assassination of President Kennedy to compel attendance of witnesses and production of evidence. Public Law 88–202.

S. 1652. Extends for 3 years to September 1, 1966, period for raising contributions for construction of National Cultural Center. Public Law 88–100.

H.R. 3369. Extends life of Civil Rights Commission for 1 year to September 30, 1964.[3] Public Law 88–152.

S. Res. 78. Grants former Presidents of the United States privilege of the floor of the Senate and right to address that body. (Adopted—House action not required.)

H. Res. 504. Creates a select committee to investigate expenditures for research programs conducted or sponsored by Federal departments or agencies. (Adopted—Senate action not required.)

H. Doc. 117. Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1963, transfers to General Services Administration complete authority for operation of Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, N.Y., now run jointly with Department of the Interior. Because effective July 27, 1963.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

H.R. 12. Authorizes 3-year program of $175 million in matching grants to expand teaching and research facilities of medical, dental, and related-type colleges, and $30.7 million in student loans to increase health personnel. Public Law 88–129.

H.R. 6143. Authorizes 3-year, $1.1 billion program of loans and grants to aid colleges and universities in financing construction of academic and related facilities. Public Law 88–204.

H.R. 4955. Expands vocational education programs; authorizes annual increases through fiscal year 1967 in scale of grants to States, on matching basis beginning in fiscal year 1965; extends National Defense Education and Aid to Impacted Areas Acts to June 30, 1965. Public Law 88–210.

H.R. 6518. Strengthens air-pollution control program by: encouraging State and local prevention and enforcement activity, increasing fund authorizations for grants in aid through fiscal year 1967. Public Law 88–206.

H.R. 7544. Authorize 5 year, $350 million to increase aid to States for maternal and child health services and for crippled children's programs; provides grants for maternity care and research projects to prevent mental retardation. Public Law 88–156.

S. 1576. Authorizes 3 year, $238 million program to aid States in providing mental retardation research facilities, construction of community mental health centers and grants for training teachers of deaf. Public Law 88–164.

H.J. Res. 724. Authorizes increase of $50 million, from $225 to $275 million, for direct loans to nonprofit corporations and cooperatives for construction of housing for elderly. Public Law 88–158.

H.J. Res. 467. Extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1965, authority of FHA to insure mortgages for sale and rental housing for low and moderate income groups. Public Law 88–54.

H.R. 2085. Grants deserted wives tax relief for child-care expenses. Public Law 88–4.

S. 1409. Requires equal pay for persons performing same work, regardless of sex, by

[3] Embodied as amendment in minor bill.

amending Fair Labor Standards Act. Public Law 88–38.

H.R. 6100. Increases contributions and benefits under the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Compensation Acts; strengthens fund's financial position. Public Law 88–133.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

H.R. 5555. Provides $1.2 billion increases, effective October 1, 1963, in basic pay and subsistence for all members of the Armed Forces and Reserve components, except personnel with less than 2 years' service, and for the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; and readjusts retirement pay. Public Law 88–132.

H.R. 6996. Permanently fixes 6 years of service, including 4 months of active duty, for enlistees in Reserve program to fulfill their military obligations. Public Law 88–110.

H.R. 211. Increases payments to parents and children of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities. Public Law 88–21.

H.R. 5250. Increases payments to widows of veterans whose death was due to service-connected disabilities. Public Law 88–134.

H.R. 242. Permits Veterans' Administration to waive recovery on default on home loans in certain hardship cases. Public Law 88–151.

H.R. 199. Provides additional compensation for service-incurred loss of hearing in both ears. Public Law 88–20.

H.R. 214. Increases compensation for veterans suffering complete loss of speech. Public Law 88–22.

AGRICULTURE

H.R. 4997. Extends through 1964 and 1965 crop years the feed grains program in effect on 1962 and 1963 crops, providing price support for producers who make voluntary acreage reduction. Public Law 88–26.

H.R. 40. Authorizes Federal assistance to States, on a matching basis, to help finance additional research facilities for State agricultural experiment stations. Public Law 88–74.

S. 1703. Extends for 1 year, to December 31, 1964, the program for use of Mexican farm laborers. Public Law 88–203.

H.R. 5860. Permits livestock producers, packers, and related interests to join in voluntary program of promotion, research, and education for their industry. Public Law 88–61.

S. 581. Extends for 2 years permission to lease and transfer tobacco acreage allotments. Public Law 88–68.

H.R. 5067. Permits operators of cotton farms to transfer flooded-out acreage to another nearby farm operated by same farmer. Public Law 88–12.

S. 582. Extends for 2 years exemption of peanuts for boiling from marketing quotas. Public Law 88–76.

NATURAL RESOURCES

S. 20. Authorizes development and coordination of Federal and State outdoor recreation plans through studies, research, and education programs under guidance of Secretary of the Interior. Public Law 88–29.

H.R. 8667. Authorizes 2-year, $816.8 million program of improvements in 11 river basins and navigable streams, flood control, water-power projects of Army Engineers, and 1-year authorization for Bureau of Reclamation projects. Public Law 88–253.

S.J. Res. 33. Extends for 4 years to September 1, 1967, the interstate oil and gas conservation compact. Public Law 88–115.

H.R. 131. Provides for renewal, subject to negotiation, of long-term contracts between Secretary of the Interior and municipal, industrial, and domestic users of water service under the Reclamation Project Act of 1959. Public Law 88–44.

H.R. 4062. Authorizes Secretary of the Interior to market electric energy generated at Amistad Dam on Rio Grande River. Public Law 88–237.

S. 1523. Abolishes Beach Erosion Control Board; transfers functions to Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors; and establishes a Coastal Engineering Research Center. Public Law 88–172.

Acceptance Address of the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, U.S. Senator From the State of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the great address made by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY in accepting the Democratic nomination for Vice President at the Democratic National Convention was a magnificent statement of the high principles of the Democratic Party and of President Johnson and the Democratic nominee HUBERT HUMPHREY. I am proud to be able to offer this magnificent address for the RECORD and I commend it to my colleagues and to my fellow countrymen:

ACCEPTANCE ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, my fellow Democrats, my fellow Americans, I proudly and humbly accept your nomination. Will we ever be able to forget this unbelievable, this moving, this beautiful, this wonderful evening? What a challenge to every person in this land to live up to the goals and the ideals of those who have gone before us, and have charted the course of our action.

I was deeply moved last night. I received a singular tribute from a friend and a great President, a tribute that I shall never forget, and I pray to Almighty God that I shall have the strength and the wisdom to measure up to the confidence and the trust that has been placed in me. And please let me say thank you, my fellow Democrats.

I believe that I know President Johnson as well as any man. So let me tell you about him. I have known for 16 years his courage, his wisdom, his tact, and his persuasion, his judgment, and his leadership.

But I shall never forget those hours and those days of tragedy and crisis last November that we once again relived tonight, when a dear and wonderful friend and a great President was taken from us. And another stepped forward without a falter, without a moment of hesitation or a moment of doubt.

I was among those that he called to his side. He asked us, we, the people, Republicans and Democrats alike—Americans all—for our help. And I say thank God that John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the patriot that he was, that he had the foresight that day in Los Angeles to provide for his country.

Thank God for this country and for the peace of the world—that President Kennedy had the wisdom to choose a Lyndon Johnson as his Vice President.

I am sure you remember these words: "Let us continue." Those simple and direct words of President Johnson reached the hearts of our people. Those words rallied them, lifted them, and unified them.

In this world, disaster is ever but a step away. There is no margin for error. The leader of the free world, the leader of the American democracy, holds in his hands the destinies not only of his people, but holds in his hands the destinies of all mankind.

Yes, the President of the United States must be a man of calm and deep assurance who knows his country and knows his people. Above all, he must be a man of clear mind and sound judgment, a man who can lead, a man who can decide, a man of purpose and conviction. And, Lyndon Johnson is that man.

He is a man with the instincts of a teacher, who would rather persuade than compel, who would rather unite than divide.

President Johnson is respectful of the traditions of the Presidency, and he understands the compelling need for restraint in the use of the greatest power ever assembled by man.

In President Johnson's hands, our people know that our power is for justice, and in his hands our people know that our power is for peace. In his hands, our people know that our power is for freedom.

President Johnson has helped to make the Democratic Party the only truly national party. And this very convention demonstrates our strong and our abiding unity and brotherhood.

And what a contrast—what a contrast with the shambles at the Cow Palace in San Francisco. What a contrast with that incredible spectacle of bitterness, of hostility, of personal attack.

The American people have seen the contrast. The American people do have a clear choice, and I predict their choice will be Lyndon Johnson in November.

Ralph Waldo Emerson once spoke of "The two parties which divide the state"—the party of hope and the party of memory, my fellow Democrats. They renew their rivalry, he said, from generation to generation.

This contest, between the party of hope and the party of memory lies at the very heart of this campaign.

During the last few weeks, shrill voices have tried to lay claim to the great spirit of the American past. But they long for a past that never was. In their recklessness and in their radicalism, they distort the American conservative tradition.

Yes, those who have kidnapped the Republican Party have made it this year not a party of memory and sentiment, but one of stridency, of unrestrained passion, of extreme and radical language.

And by contrast, which is clear to all, under the leadership of President Lyndon Johnson, the Democratic Party stands today as the champion of great causes, as the party of purpose and conviction, as the party of national unity, and as the party of hope for all mankind.

Now let me document my case. Above all, the contrast is between the Democratic leadership and that of the Goldwater party is sharp and decisive on the question of peace and security. For 25 years, my fellow Americans, both parties have held the conviction that politics should stop at the water's edge, that we must be united in the face of our enemies, and we must be united in support of our allies and our friends.

And I say here tonight, to every American, to every friend of freedom, woe to that party of that spokesman that turns its back upon bipartisan foreign policy. Woe to those who are willing to divide this Nation, and beware of those who cast false doubts upon our great strength.

What great problems there are to solve: Problems to control the awesome power of the nuclear age, to strengthen the grand alliance with Europe.

To continue the task of building a strong and prosperous and united hemisphere under the Alliance for Progress.

To assist our friends in Asia and Africa in preserving their freedom and promoting their progress.

And to defend and extend freedom throughout the world.

Now, my fellow Americans, these urgent problems demand reasoned solutions, not empty slogans. Childlike answers cannot solve man-sized problems.

These problems demand leadership that is prudent, restrained, responsible. They require a President who knows that Rome was not built in a day, but who also knows that the great edifice of Western civilization can be brought down in ruins in 1 hour.

The American Presidency is not a place for a man who is impetuous at one moment, and indecisive the next; nor is it a place for one who is violently for something one day and violently opposed to it on the next, nor is it an office where statements on matters of major policy are so confusing and so contradictory that neither friend nor foe knows where he stands.

And my fellow Americans, it is of the highest importance that both friend and foe know that the American President means what he says and says what he means.

The temporary spokesman of the Republican Party—yes, the temporary Republican spokesman is not only out of tune with the great majority of his countrymen; he is even out of step with his own party.

In the last 3½ years, most Democrats and Republicans have agreed on the great decisions our Nation has made. But not the Republican spokesman, not Senator GOLDWATER. He has been facing backward, against the mainstream of American history. Most Democrats and most Republicans in the U.S. Senate, for example, voted for the nuclear test ban treaty. But not the temporary Republican spokesman.

Most Democrats and Republicans in the Senate voted for an eleven and a half billion dollar tax cut for the American citizens and American business. But not Senator GOLDWATER.

Most Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, in fact four-fifths of the members of his own party, voted for the Civil Rights Act. But not Senator GOLDWATER.

Most Democrats and Republicans in the Senate voted for the establishment of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency that seeks to slow down the nuclear arms race among the nations. But not the temporary Republican spokesman.

Most Democrats and most Republicans in the Senate voted last year for an expanded medical education program. But not Senator GOLDWATER.

Most Democrats and most Republicans in the Senate voted for education legislation. But not Senator GOLDWATER.

And my fellow Americans, most Democrats and most Republicans in the Senate voted to help the United Nations in its peacekeeping functions when it was in financial difficulty. But not Senator GOLDWATER.

Yes, my fellow Americans, it is a fact that the temporary Republican spokesman is not in the mainstream of his party. In fact, he has not even touched the shore.

I believe in the two-party system, but there must be two responsible parties, and there must be men who are equipped to lead a great nation as the standard bearers of the two parties. It is imperative that the leadership of the great parties move within the mainstream of American thought and philosophy.

I pledge to this convention, I pledge to our great President, to all the American people, my complete devotion to this task: To prove once again that the Democratic Party deserves America's affections, and that we are indeed the party of hope for the American people.

So tonight let us here and now pledge that the campaign that we will wage will be worthy of our great President Johnson, and, my fellow Americans, let us hereby resolve and pledge tonight that that campaign will be worthy of the memory of the late and beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

While others may appeal to passions and prejudices, and appeal to fear and bitterness, we of the Democratic Party call upon all Americans to join us in making our country a land of opportunity for our young; a home of security and dignity for our elderly; and a place of compassion and care for our afflicted.

I say to those responsible and forward-looking Republicans who put our country above their party—and there are thousands of them—we welcome you to the banner of Lyndon Baines Johnson. We welcome your support.

Yes, we extend the hand of fellowship. We ask you to join us tonight, for this President, my fellow Americans, is the President of all of the American people. He is the President in the great American tradition—for labor and for business; no class conflict—for the farm family that will receive the unending attention and care of this President and for the city worker; for North and for the South; for East and for the West. This is our President.

President Lyndon Johnson represents—in fact he is the embodiment of the spirit of national unity, the embodiment of national purpose, the man in whose hands we place our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.

I am proud to be the friend of this great President. I am very proud that he has asked this convention to select me as his running mate.

And I ask you, my fellow Americans—I ask you—to walk with us, to work with us, to march forward with us—to help President Johnson build the great society for America of the future.

Yes, let us continue. Let us, fellow Democrats and fellow Americans, go forward. Let us take those giant steps forward to which the President has called us, to end the shame of poverty, to end the injustice of prejudice and the denial of opportunity, to build the great society and to secure the freedom of man and the peace of the world. We can do no less, and to this, tonight, let us resolve to pledge our every effort. Thank you.

Pennsylvania GOP Youth Training Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a most interesting project recently conducted under the auspices of the Republican Party of Pennsylvania. I refer to the first annual GOP youth leadership training center, sponsored by the Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania, and held at the Pennsylvania State University during the week of August 23–29.

One hundred and ten youngsters from thirty-six counties attended the week-long program. Classes in the history of American political parties, the importance of the two-party system, party organization and structure, and the legislative process were included, as well as workshops in parliamentary procedure and teenage Republican—TAR—organization. Prominent Republican speakers addressed the group during the week, and the teenagers organized and conducted a model Congress and a campaign and convention for State TAR officers.

Elected as first Teenage Republican State chairman was Roger Richards, of Franklin, in Venango County. He is a sophomore at the University of Pittsburgh. Vice chairman is Ann Benfield from Boyertown, in Berks County. Ann is entering George Washington University.

I think the organizers of this program deserve heartiest commendation for their work in promoting good citizenship and interest on the part of our youngsters in public affairs and public service. Naturally, I hope the Republican Party will benefit by projects such as these; but I think that American politics, regardless of party, also can benefit.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania, and particularly its chairman, Craig Truax, for their foresight and initiative in establishing what will be an annual event in political education for young people interested in public life.

Mr. President, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the schedule of events of the first annual GOP youth leadership training center at the Pennsylvania State University:

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

PENNSYLVANIA GOP YOUTH TRAINING CENTER SCHEDULE

SUNDAY, AUGUST 23

At 4 to 6: Registration, Grange Hall.

At 6: Dinner, HUB Terrace Room.

At 7:30: Opening assembly, 111 Boucke; Buz Lukens, chairman, Young Republican National Federation.

At 8:45: Mixer, HUB main lounge.

At 10:15: Dorm meeting with counselors.

At 11: Lights out.

MONDAY, AUGUST 24

At 7:45: Breakfast, HUB Lions Den.

At 8:45 to 9:45: Class, 111 Boucke, "The Two-Party System," Craig Truax, chairman, Republican State Committee.

At 9:50 to 11: Discussion period, 301, 303, 304, 306, 307 Boucke.

At 11:15: Lunch, HUB Terrace Room.

At 1 to 2: Class, 111 Boucke, "Party Structure and Organization," Craig Truax.

At 2 to 3: Discussion period, Boucke classrooms.

At 3: Explanation of party system, campaigning, and convention at training center, 111 Boucke; party organization meetings.

At 4:45: Dinner, HUB Terrace Room.

At 7:30: Assembly, 111 Boucke, Mrs. June Honaman, vice chairman, Republican State Committee, Women's Organization; Mr. B. Clair Jones, chairman, Lycoming County, county organization.

At 9: Entertainment, Grange Hall recreation room.

At 10:30: Be in dorm.

At 11: Lights out.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 25

At 7:45: Breakfast, HUB Lions Den.

At 8:45 to 9:45: Class, 111 Boucke, "History of American Political Parties," Dr. Wallace Brewster, Penn State faculty.

At 9:50 to 10:30: Discussion period, Boucke classrooms.

At 10:30: Free time for party activities.

At 11:15: Lunch, HUB Terrace Room.

At 1 to 3: Class, "The Legislative Process," Frank O'Gorman, workship in parliamentary procedure, 111 Boucke.

At 3: Party meetings and preparation for model Congress.

At 4:30: Picnic, Hort Woods.

At 9:15: Dance, Grange Hall Recreation Room.

At 10:30: Be in dorm.

At 11: Lights out.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 26

At 7:45: Breakfast, HUB Lions Den.

At 8:45 to 9:45: Class, 111 Boucke, "Appraisal of National Administration," Robert Kunzig, administrative assistant to Senator HUGH SCOTT.

At 9:45: Organization of model Congress, 111 Boucke, committee meetings; consideration of bills.

At 11:15: Lunch, HUB Terrace Room.

At 12: Rules committee meeting.

At 1:30: Model Congress.

At 4:45: Dinner, HUB Terrace Room.

At 7:30: Assembly, 101 Chambers, State Senator Jack McGregor, campaigning; secretary of the Commonwealth, George Bloom, convention campaigning.

At 9: Entertainment, Grange Hall Recreation Room.

At 10:30: Be in dorm.

At 11: Lights out.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 27

At 7:45: Breakfast, HUB Lions Den.

At 8:45: Class, "Appraisal of the State Administration," Lt. Gov. Raymond P. Shafer.

At 10: Party meetings; election of candidates, preparation of platform; campaign and convention planning.

At 11:15: Lunch, HUB Terrace Room.

At 12:30 to 3: TAR workshop, 111 Boucke, directed by John Smither, State chairman, Teenage Republican activities.

At 3: Party activities.

At 4:45: Dinner, HUB Terrace Room.

At 7: Assembly, 111 Boucke, State Senator Richard Frame and Assemblyman Alvin C. Bush, "The State Legislature Organization and Procedure."

At 8:30: Reception, meet the candidates (for TAR offices), HUB main lounge.

At 10:30: Be in dorm.

At 11: Lights out.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 28

At 7:45: Breakfast, HUB Lions Den.

At 8:45: Preparation for convention, decorations, signs, campaigning.

At 11:15: Lunch, HUB Terrace Room.

At 12:30: Decorate convention hall, Conference Center Auditorium.

At 2: Convention, Keynote Speech; presentation and adoption of platform; nominations for TAR chairman and vice chairman; demonstrations; seconding speeches.

At 5:30 to 6: Box suppers, conference center.

At 7: Elections, Convention Hall. Victory dance, Convention Hall.

At 12: Be in dorm.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 29

At 9: Formal breakfast, HUB dining rooms A and B; presentation of certificates; speaker (to be announced).

Problems of Weather Modification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the issue of weather modification procedures has caused grave concern in various areas throughout the country. Many farmers feel that the use of aircraft and cloud seeding by orchardists has resulted in prolonged drought conditions. This view is hotly disputed by those who subscribe to his private weather modification service.

Because this subject is of general concern, not only to our country but to the entire world, I include here an article from the London Observer by John Davy which was reprinted in the Washington Post on September 5 under the title "Spectacular Cloud Explosions Caused by Silver Iodide Seeding" and call it to the attention of my colleagues. This is pertinent to the bill I introduced September 1, House Resolution 873.

The article follows:

SPECTACULAR CLOUD EXPLOSIONS CAUSED BY SILVER IODIDE SEEDING

(By John Davy)

LONDON.—Sir Graham Sutton, the head of Britain's Meteorological Office, told the British Association meeting in Southhampton that weather modification "must be approached with the greatest caution."

As he was speaking Nimbus I, the advanced American weather satellite, was making its first circuits of the earth. It can photograph global cloud cover every 24 hours—and it is out of the deeper understanding of the earth's weather that new ideas about weather control may emerge.

At any given time, there are 1,000 to 2,000 thunderstorms going on, Sutton said. They release energy equivalent to hundreds of hydrogen bombs, he said.

This gives some idea of the mighty forces weather controllers would have to grapple with. It also illustrates how difficult it will be to grapple with them. Weather modification, he suggested, will have to be a matter of cunning rather than brute force.

Extreme caution is needed because increasing rainfall in one spot could produce drought elsewhere. Clumsy manipulations might trigger appalling storms. Weather control could have ominous political and even military implications.

(Western Maryland farmers held a mass meeting August 24 in Boonsboro to protest cloud seeding elsewhere which they claim has resulted in dry spells in their area. Representative CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., Republican, of Maryland, has introduced a resolution calling for an investigation.)

Luckily, perhaps, there is no immediate prospect of the new political-military powers falling into our hands. Nevertheless, the soberest scientists agree that it is not nearly so distant a prospect as might have appeared a few years ago.

There are two reasons: first, vast progress in our understanding of the global circulation of the atmosphere through weather satellites and space observations and second, growing understanding of the processes which go on inside clouds.

This is illustrated by a series of large-scale experiments by two American scientists, Joanne S. Malkus, of the University of California, and Robert S. Simpson, of the U.S. Weather Bureau, in which they have made tropical cumulus clouds explode in a spectacular way.

They called in the U.S. Navy, which supplied five aircraft based on Puerto Rico, and equipped with cameras, elaborate radar, and other equipment.

The scientists sat in one aircraft, spotting likely clouds. Then two aircraft flew through the cloud, making measurements, followed by a third aircraft which dropped bombs releasing quantities of silver iodide vapor inside the cloud.

The measuring aircraft then doubled back to repeat their observations inside the cloud while another plane photographed the results from above.

Eleven clouds were studied; 5 as "controls," while 6 were "seeded" with silver iodide. Two of the latter were seeded too soon or too late. But in four cases, the clouds "exploded." They grew tall towers 1.5 to 3 miles higher than their unseeded neighbors.

After about 15 minutes, the tower growth stopped, and the base of the cloud started to expand horizontally to twice the original diameter, putting up new towers at the same time.

This whole process, the scientists say, must have involved energy releases inside the clouds equivalent to one or two Hiroshima-sized atomic bombs—all as a result of dropping about 60 pounds of silver iodide into them.

This reveals the mighty forces at work in the weather. But the scientists' satisfaction with this experiment comes from the fact that it was carefully measured before and after, and could be accurately matched with theoretical "models" of clouds. The match was good enough to give confidence in the theories and suggest new experiments.

Pollution: Everybody's Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the September issue of American Forests contains a fine piece by John Clark Hunt, of Portland, Oreg. The article, entitled "Pollution—Everybody's Fight," describes the pollution problem in the Pacific Northwest and remedial action in this field that has been taken in other parts of the United States. Water, it is being realized, is a precious resource. Those of us in the West are particularly aware of this. Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

POLLUTION: EVERYBODY'S FIGHT

(By John Clark Hunt)

One would think that the Pacific Northwest, a region blessed with shining streams, rivers, and lakes, would have clean, pure water for every purpose. True, the high country snowbanks are still clean and pure. Rain falls on millions of acres of national forests and trickles down to feed these streams and rivers. This water is clear and clean. But what happens to it after it leaves the high beauty of the Rockies and the Cascades and the shining green of the forest?

As an example let's trace the Snake River to see what man has done to it. The Snake, rich in history and the lore of Indians, mountain men, and the wild frontier, is born in one of the spectacularly beautiful spots of the Nation. It begins at Shoshone and Lewis Lakes in Yellowstone National Park between Yellowstone Lake and Jackson Hole. At first it is a wild, sparkling mountain stream. Then it enters Jackson Lake, emerges larger and stronger, and roars down a vicious canyon where Wilson Price Hunt and his American Fur Co. companions, known as the Astorians, almost died of starvation and exertion in 1811 when they tried to follow the canyon west to establish the trading post at Astoria, Oreg.

In its mad race the Snake soon reaches lower elevations and the valleys of Idaho. Here pollution begins.

A Public Health Service report shows that approximately 550,000 people live in the Upper Snake River Basin. In 1960, 59 towns and cities and 156 industries were discharging waste into the Snake and its tributaries. No doubt there are more by now. Only 18 percent of these had adequate sewage treatment facilities, and pollution was increasing every day. In fact, the pollution load pouring into the Snake was equal to the waste from a population of 2,400,000. Most of this was caused by 24 food processing plants.

Farther down the river in the Lewiston-Idaho area the situation is as bad or worse. At a water pollution meeting at Lewiston early this year it was reported that several towns were adding to the pollution load but these were of little consequence compared to the waste poured into the Snake and Clearwater Rivers by food processing plants and particularly by Potlatch Forests, Inc. This one wood products plant, according to a statement by the Public Health Service, is discharging industrial waste and sewage from its work force equivalent to the raw sewage from a population of 299,000 people.

Murray Stein, Chief of the Public Health Service Water Pollution Control Enforcement Branch in Washington, D.C., told the conference that a Federal study of the pollution showed it to be of an interstate nature and therefore subject to abatement under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. He said that the Public Health Service would work with Idaho and Washington in extending the study with a report to be completed and available by January 1, 1965. After that date a reasonable time—perhaps 2 years—would be allowed for the completion of water pollution abatement in the area.

The Snake River empties into the Columbia, the river of the West, which was the home of more than a score of Indian tribes and was the canoe and pirogue highway from the Pacific to the great inland country of the United States and Canada, the trail of Lewis and Clark, Wilson Price Hunt, and Captain Bonneville. The Columbia is a big river. Its current was fast and its waters were alive with salmon and steelhead, the big seagoing trout—until the white man began building dams to change it into a series of lakes and loaded its tributaries with many kinds of pollution.

The Yakima River Basin is another pollution problem. It is an important tributary of the Columbia, draining about 5,000 square miles east of the Cascades in Washington. Some 200,000 people live in the Yakima Basin. All of the communities have sewage treatment facilities and most of the industries not connected to municipal sewer systems have some type of water treatment of their own. But in spite of the facilities, which have all been built in recent years, pollution is serious and the low percentage of oxygen in the river below Yakima often becomes critical.

THE LOWER COLUMBIA IS A SEWER

On down the Columbia there is Camas, Wash., with its papermill; and then the cities of Vancouver and Longview and several small towns with woodworking plants. The Willamette River enters from the south carrying a load of pollution from Portland, Oregon City, Salem, and Eugene, Oreg.

The Columbia from the Camas-Vancouver area and the confluence of the Willamette downstream to the Pacific Ocean is a sewer. Commercial fishermen often find that the goop of pollution loads their nets until they can raise them only with extreme difficulty. That is how bad pollution has become in the lower Columbia. It is as bad, or worse, than it has ever been. This enormous mess will be cleaned up only when strong measures have been taken and agreements honored.

In 1959 the Willamette River at Portland was described in this way—"One swallow would contain enough germs to make a person deathly sick." There were 80 outfalls pouring untreated sewage and commercial waste into the river. The Public Health Service and the Oregon State Sanitary Authority got tough. They told Portland to live up to her responsibility or face a suit in which she knew she could not possibly defend herself. What has been the result? Many millions of dollars have been spent building sewage treatment plants. But to date not enough have been built for some untreated sewage and some industrial poison is still drained into the river. The condition of the water is still considerably below that of the Sanitary Authority's minimum standard.

WORST POLLUTION PROBLEM

What appears to be the worst pollution problem in the Northwest is that of Puget Sound. Many streams and rivers flow into this large estuary. They carry waste from numerous towns, cities, and industries. With the best of cooperation and dedicated effort the condition would be difficult to control, but with aggravated stalling it is serious.

A report published in 1962 by the Public Health Service and the State of Washington Pollution Control Commission states—"Seven pulp and paper mills in Puget Sound and the Strait of Juan de Fuca area are contesting the Washington Pollution Control Commission's orders requiring the mills to control the pollution created by them."

The report told of the efforts made by State officials since 1940 to bring about an abatement of pollution at these seven mills. But the commission is patient. It says a reasonable solution can be found and points to the record. Of the 532 industrial plants subject to permit regulations in the Puget Sound-Juan de Fuca area 493 are in compliance with effluent requirements established by the State—an average of 93 percent.

A last minute check with the Public Health Service indicates that prospects do appear better for solving the pollution problem on both the Snake River and on Puget Sound.

It has been reported that the State of Idaho will take action to enforce pollution control at the industrial plants along the Snake. It is expected that waste disposal facilities will be built within less than 2 years to prevent solids from reaching the river.

The Washington Pollution Control Commission has now issued operating permits to the seven mills which have been problems for more than 20 years. The State says that the mills have made some improvements and are developing plans for constructing waste disposal facilities. In the meantime the Public Health Service and the Washington Pollution Control Commission are continuing a study of Puget Sound pollution. The study has been underway for over 2 years and has cost the Federal agency $780,000 with another $300,000 to be spent in fiscal year 1965.

ACTION REQUIRES SCIENTIFIC PROOF

In a suit involving two State of Washington corporations, *Olympia Oyster Co., Inc.* v. *Rayonier, Inc.*, the U.S. district court judge said in dismissing the case last February, that he was convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the evidence presented contained no issue of fact for the jury to determine. The Rayonier case involved dumping sulfite waste into Oakland Bay. Rayonier, however, like many companies, had a State permit to discharge a certain amount of waste per week into the water; the court said that the plaintiff failed to meet scientific standards of proof to show that Rayonier had exceeded its waste quota.

A word of caution should be added here. Often emotion-charged accusations or a tendency to go into court with a lack of proof or with unsubstantiated charges hurts the conservationists cause. Too often newspaper headlines indict, try, and convict the accused company in one terse headline; too often an emotionally aroused public assumes that if the company has been haled into court it must be guilty of a violation. No one contends, of course, that allowing a certain amount of pollution of our rivers and streams is good; but in the eyes of the court, laws which allow such "partial pollution" are valid, and if the violation is unproven, the court must uphold the law in favor of the defendant.

SEVEN MILLS CAUSE 58.3 PERCENT OF THE POLLUTION

The latest action to abate serious and longstanding pollution problems in the Northwest was taken in May 1964, this time by the Oregon State Sanitary Authority.

After careful study the authority released a 74-page report showing that 7 pulp and paper mills are causing 58.3 percent of the pollution in the Willamette River, the principal stream in western Oregon and the drainage of the Willamette Basin in which the bulk of Oregon's population lives.

The report predicts that if the mills continue to allow their loads of waste to reach the river after the cities and communities have completed their sewage disposal plants the mills will account for 82.6 percent of the pollution by December 1966. These were the mills listed as offenders:

Crown Zellerbach Corp. (a sulfite plant), West Linn; Publishers Paper Co. (sulfite), Oregon City; Spaulding Pulp & Paper Co. (sulfite), Newberg; Columbia River Paper Co. (Oregon Pulp & Paper), (sulfite), Salem; Crown Zellerbach Corp. (sulfite), Lebanon; Western Kraft Corp. (a kraft plant), Albany; Weyerhaeuser Co. (kraft), Springfield. The sulfite plants are listed separately because their pollution in the Willamette is reported to be much more serious than that of the kraft plants.

During August and September of 1963 a minimum daily dissolved oxygen content of only 2 parts per million was recorded in Portland's harbor. The minimum permitted by Oregon's strong pollution law is 5 parts per million. Slime growths were found to be excessive. So were fiber and other settleable solids contained in pulp and paper mill effluents which has created bottom sludge deposits. It is obvious that salmon and steelhead runs cannot be maintained nor water recreation continued in such filthy water. Concern is felt for the 70 million Chinook salmon planted in the Willamette during the spring of 1964 by the State fish commission and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. It is doubted that these fish can return and spawn successfully during 1966, 1967, and 1968 unless the water quality has been improved.

The Oregon State Sanitary Authority is holding a series of meetings with the pulp and paper companies to learn the steps each mill can take to reduce pollution to meet the required water purity standard. A date for compliance will be set after the meetings are concluded.

WATER NEEDS FOR THE FUTURE

The question is—what are we really doing to stop it?

Our population is growing rapidly. In 1900 there were 76 million Americans. In 1950 there were 150 million. In 1960 there were 180 million. By 1980 it is expected that our population will reach 260 million. Obviously the more people there are the more water we have to have and the more sewage there will be. In the past 100 years water consumption in the United States has risen from a few gallons a day per person to about 700 gallons daily per person. Today the Nation is using approximately 323 billion gallons of water daily. Of this amount, industry uses 160 billion gallons; irrigation, 141 billion; municipal, 22 billion. In 1980 it will jump to 597 billion gallons per day, with industry using 394 billion; irrigation, 166 billion; and municipal, 37 billion.

It takes an ocean of water to maintain our jobs—1,400 gallons to produce a dollar's worth of steel; nearly 200 gallons for a dollar's worth of paper; 500 gallons to manufacture a yard of wool and 320 gallons to make a ton of aluminum. Water quality and quantity requires careful planning and only clean water will do for most of our needs. So, the water supply must be protected to keep it clean or it must be treated each time it is used until it is clean.

WHAT TO DO?

Anyone who has taken the trouble to check knows that it will cost a fantastic amount of money to cope with the tide of pollution. But if we can spend billions to put a man on the moon we can afford clean water. First, the Nation will have to exert itself to wipe out the backlog of pollution and start even with the problem. Then, each year, it must build new facilities, expand and rebuild old ones to keep abreast of the increase in population and industrial expansion.

One thing that we must not tolerate is the building of new towns, subdivisions, or factories without adequate sewage facilities to guarantee that they will not add to the pollution burden. We know that the job can be done—the whole job—for old towns and cities and factories as well as the new ones. Since 1956 when the first Federal water pollution control legislation was passed, about 4,500 communities have built sewage treatment plants. Others are under construction. Federal grants of approximately $400 million have been approved. And for each Federal dollar granted, local communities have spent five dollars for waste disposal.

THE BRIGHT SIDE OF THE COIN

The outstanding example of successful cooperative pollution control is the work of the Ohio River Authority. States, cities, towns, villages and industries have worked together to clean up the filthy Ohio river from Pittsburgh to the Mississippi. They had to do it if they were to continue to use the water and live beside the river. Now, they are proud of the job they have done.

In the Pacific Northwest another pollution headache shows some promise of finally being solved. In the very heart of the city of Seattle is beautiful Lake Washington. Like some other waters in the fast-growing region it became polluted and infested with algae. A metropolitan organization was formed a few years ago to clean up the lake. It is succeeding in spite of the fact that all towns and communities are said not to be cooperating. In 10 years Seattle expects its big, jewel-like lake to be clean. It will be an important victory.

The rest of the country must do a similar job. The pressure for clean water will never stop. It cannot. Conservation groups, including the American Forestry Association, report that pollution is the topic most on the minds of many of their members today. In days gone by, the AFA could meet in almost any part of the country and talk forestry and only forestry. But not any more. Today, more and more members are saying, "Fine, fine—but what are you doing about stream pollution?"

Is L.B.J. Sincere on Race Issue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Sept. 2, 1964]

IS L.B.J. SINCERE ON RACE ISSUE?

President Johnson has done a lot of talking about putting an end to racial violence in this country, but we have seen very little evidence that his talking about it has done much good in the State of Mississippi.

Reports of bombings have become so routine that we don't run all of them, but there was one the night that Johnson was renominated which we want to mention.

This time the bombing victim was a white woman—Hazel Brannon Smith. Readers of this newspaper will recall that she it the Pulitzer Prize winning editor whom Associate Editor Tom Pugh interviewed 3 weeks ago.

A bomb was thrown into her newspaper office. She wasn't hurt because she was in Atlantic City listening to President Johnson making another promise to "use the full resources of the Federal Government" to put an end to the kind of disorder which plagues Mississippi.

His latest promise didn't do her much good.

Nor did it help a Negro man whose house was bombed the same night. Somehow the justice which exists in Mississippi found a way to stick the victim himself in jail "for operating a garage without a license."

We're beginning to wonder just how serious Johnson is about using the power he so often speaks of.

As things stand now, Mrs. Smith's pen is making a bigger contribution to our democracy in Mississippi than Johnson's words.

Ohio Air Executive Keeps Big Business Flying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, it gave me a great deal of pleasure recently to read an article in the Sunday, August 23, 1964, New York Times regarding an outstanding gentleman from Youngstown, Ohio, Mr. Forest Beckett. This is a highly successful businessman who climbed the ladder of success the hard way and symbolizes the truly American success story.

I include this article for the pleasure and benefit of my colleagues:

OHIO AIR EXECUTIVE KEEPS BIG BUSINESS FLYING—BECKETT'S PLANES SPECIALIZE IN TRAVEL FOR CORPORATION MEN—FLEET OF 50 CRAFT LOGS 33,000 HOURS OF FLYING TIME YEARLY

(By Evert Clark)

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO.—It could be said that Forest Beckett sideslipped into aviation. He began taking flying lessons 25 years ago to collect a debt. Now he heads the world's largest fleet of business aircraft.

Mr. Beckett also plans to go after a share of the lucrative sales market now developing for business jets.

The five small companies informally known as Beckett Aviation constitute a sort of aerial supermarket. Most of the customers are large midwestern corporations such as the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. and the H. J. Heinz Co.

FOR SALE OR LEASE

They can buy Mr. Beckett's planes outright or lease them, with or without the services of Beckett Aviation's 45 rigidly trained pilots.

The fleet of 50 planes that Mr. Beckett owns, or operates regularly for others, ranges from 6-place, twin-engine aircraft to remodeled 40- and 50-passenger airliners.

The next largest business fleets are those owned directly by companies and operated by their own pilots. The Socony Mobil Oil Co., for example, has 28 planes and the General Motors Corp. has 22.

Within a few weeks, Mr. Beckett will begin adding Aero Commander's Jet Commander to his fleet. He also will sell the plane as a distributor. It is one of a half-dozen new business jets on the market or becoming available.

Mr. Beckett estimated recently that sales of the 3 or 4 smallest jets alone would total 2,000 planes in the next 5 years at a total of more than $1 billion.

THE 40,000 BUSINESS AIRCRAFT

Most of the 40,000 business aircraft in the Nation are piston-engine, 200-mile-an-hour planes. The jets travel at about 500 miles an hour, putting the traveling executive into the same speed league as jet airliners and cutting former trip times in half.

Mr. Beckett is a short man of 53 years with crewcut, graying hair. In the late thirties, he ran a gasoline and tire shop here and had no great ambition to fly. But a customer ran up a $60 debt—an appreciable sum in the depression days.

"He was a pilot," Mr. Beckett recalled. "I decided to let him pay me with flying lessons. I had 8 or 10 hours of instruction, but every time we'd go up, he'd borrow another $8 or $10.

"I finally decided it would be cheaper to buy my own plane."

A hangar fire destroyed that plane 2 months after Mr. Beckett bought it. He bought another. A year later World War II began and Mr. Beckett began instructing military pilots.

FIRST VENTURE CROWDED

After the war, he formed Youngstown Airways to sell planes and gasoline, train private pilots, and service their planes. He found that many others had the same idea.

"I decided too many pilots were coming into the business who had too little knowledge about business and weren't even safe pilots," Mr. Beckett said.

"I thought if we could sell planes to customers and then provide good pilots for them, we would have continuing customers who would stay in the market and trade in their used planes for new ones."

At first his pilots flew customers' planes at no charge. But some companies hesitated to buy their own planes. Mr. Beckett decided he could expand the market by leasing planes and charging for his pilots' services. For financing and tax purposes, he created Lease Air, Inc.

Soon he found the leasing and operating activities outstripping direct sales. To serve companies in the fertile Pittsburgh market, he formed the Beckett Aviation Corp. there. Twenty-nine of the world's 500 largest corporations are based in Pittsburgh, and 14 of them now own or lease planes, Mr. Beckett said.

HOLDING COMPANY FORMED

About 5 years ago, Mr. Beckett said, he became concerned about what would happen to the employees who had been with him from the beginning "in case anything happened to me." He combined his enterprises under a holding company, Aviation Enterprises, Inc., and sold 10 percent of it to customers. He also has instituted what his chief pilot, Don Minner, called "a liberal debenture plan" for employees of long service.

This year Mr. Beckett opened an office in Cleveland and he hopes to put 1 in Chicago, where only 18 of 87 large corporations now have their own planes.

The only other company in the leasing and operating business operates a fleet of six planes, Mr. Beckett said.

"People have come from England, Japan, and Germany as well as this country to see how we do it," Mr. Beckett said. "There isn't a week that someone doesn't come in to learn the secret. Actually, there's no secret to it."

If there is one, it is efficiency. The company uses the same kind of communication equipment as the airlines, and turnover among its pilots is low. A visitor to the Youngstown and Pittsburgh operations can readily see that morale is high.

THE 33,000 AIR HOURS YEARLY

In 20 years of flying an average of 33,000 hours a year, the company has had only two fatal accidents. They took a total of six lives.

Last year, the Beckett-owned companies did a $4-million business. Their founder expects the business jets to increase this appreciably. He prefers discussing the future to concentrating on past success, but he conceded:

"For a fellow whose first plane burned and put him out of business, that's pretty good."

A Report to The People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 21, 1964

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as has been my custom, throughout my public life, I desire to include at this time a summary account of my activities and speeches during this 88th Congress.

A MORAL OBLIGATION

In my conscientious conviction, the Biblical mandate "to render an account of thy stewardship" imposes upon every responsible public officeholder a moral obligation. It is an obligation that I have consistently attempted to fulfill.

It is obviously impossible to completely cover the whole record, espcially in view of space restriction regulations; however, I shall, herein, try to present and reveal my personal pronouncements and actions upon some of the more important and more widely publicized legislative issues that occurred in this 88th and recent Congresses.

AN EXPLANATORY WORD

Mr. Speaker, because I desire and intend to strictly observe the space limitations the outlines of the background and significance of particular bills I have included in the past will here necessarily and mostly be omitted. However, I will try to present, in these extracts of my remarks, paragraphs that will lead, I hope, to the fullest understanding of the subject involved.

This task is made somewhat easier because, of course, the great majority of our people are aware that most of our modern legislative actions are for the continuation of the amendment of laws that are already in effect and which are expanded or modified, by our determinations here, through the succeeding years.

TRUTH FROM THE RECORD

Mr. Speaker, there follows a review, under appropriate subject headings, of the speeches and remarks I have made in the House Chamber on particular occasions which reveal my convictions and actions on the prominent legislative issues that were determined:

THREE PARAMOUNT OBJECTIVES: MILITARY PREPAREDNESS, COMMUNIST CONTAINMENT, FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the manifest destiny of this Nation, in opposition to atheistic communism, is to safeguard our own freedoms and thereby preserve the light of liberty in a threatened and frightened world.

It is equally obvious that to accomplish this task we must ever strive to be war-deterrently equal, or even superior, to the Kremlin dictatorship in military might and space exploration; anything less than that could well provide a desperate temptation to reckless and ruthless individuals.

At the same time, it would be the height of folly and imprudence and an invitation to economic disaster for ourselves if we lessened our vigilance, or relaxed our supervision, in preventing waste and extravagance in our required military procurement and space research programs.

Our problem, then, is to provide for our full security against the Communist projection but to do it within a financial system and atmosphere of the most careful planning and the most frugal spending. This is the conviction with which I considered our military appropriations in this Congress, as well as in the past.

Mr. Speaker, indeed, there is no question about the imperative necessity, in the light of the belligerent attitude of the Kremlin, of our military forces being fully prepared to protect the security of the United States against any surprise move by the Soviets.

However, when the House returns to the consideration of this grave subject, in the near future, I most earnestly hope we will not be of a spirit to disregard the necessity for including every reasonable safeguard against and restriction upon wasteful and extravagant military spending that we can.

Adequate national defense is indeed vital but the people of this country are seriously disturbed by the continuing revelations of wasteful and extravagant spending by the military without regard to the fact that each and every penny spent comes out of the hard earned, and highly taxed, pay of the average American workingman and business. The duty of the Defense Department to guarantee our security does not carry with it any license to indulge in loose and careless financial practices.

THE REVENUE ACT OF 1963—TAX REDUCTIONS PROVIDE EMPLOYMENT, CREATE CONSUMER DEMAND, STIMULATE BUSINESS, AND SUSTAIN THE LONG-RANGE ECONOMY

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 8363, we are now debating, and which I earnestly hope we will forthwith approve, is unquestionably the most important measure that has yet come before this 88th Congress; it could well prove to be the most significant legislative tax act of modern history.

The anticipated impact of this bill practically constitutes the core upon which further major Government purposes are founded; it represents a vital segment in this Nation's future economic expansion plans; it provides a keystone in the overall architectural design to keep this country moving ahead in the basic areas of economic development, domestic progress, and world leadership.

Briefly, the objectives of this tax reduction proposal, accompanied with pledged economies in and prudent control of future Federal expenditures, are to encourage the long-term economic growth of the Nation, restrain the tendencies of increasing unemployment, restrict the historically recurrent forces of recession, contribute to the balancing of our international payments, and eventually eliminate the distressing pattern of chronic budgetary deficits.

To determine our action on this vitally important legislation it seems to me we must each ask of, and answer for, ourselves this simple question—do the provisions of this bill hold forth a reasonable prospect of fulfilling its objectives, which are admittedly in the best national interest?

To get the right answer to this question, I think it wise to use our time-tested first principles of decision, which are the lessons of past experience, attention to the voice of authority, acceptance of the weight of the evidence, and the exercise of conscientious judgment.

A summary application of these principles reveals that, in the economic history of our own and other countries, most recently in England, tax reduction does undoubtedly tend to stimulate the economy, encourage capital investment, and relieve unemployment.

With regard to the voice of authority, I think all Members here would agree there is none in this country higher or more respected than the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. He, with his dedicated associates on this great committee, have spent some 8 long and arduous months listening to witnesses, evaluating testimony, and formulating the bill they have now presented to us with recommendation for passage.

The President of the United States, in conformity with his sworn and solemn duty, to make recommendations to improve the state of the Nation, has testified before the country in explanation and favor of this legislation. Beyond these expert sources a majority of our leading economists; the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, composed of some 2,400 of our most respected industrial leaders; the officials of our great labor organizations; major insurance groups; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the Republican Governors' Association have also recorded their voices and sentiments in support of this bill's objectives.

It would appear then that the lessons of history and multitudinous voices of authority provide us, in this instance, with an overwhelming weight of evidence for approval of this bill. There remains then only the exercise of our own individual conscientious judgment.

Let us then, today, demonstrate our faith in the authority and dedication of a distinguished chairman and members of a great committee of this Congress. Let us avoid furnishing any further inspiration and material to Communist propaganda by showing proper confidence in the pledge of a President of the United States. Let us recall that our American citizens, through the Congress, have been exceedingly generous over a great period of time toward the people and welfare of other nations in the world. This is our opportunity to prove our concern for our own too long and too greatly burdened taxpayers and businesses. For the future progress of our country let us give the American taxpayer and businesses the tax relief they so urgently need and let us do it right now.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is now Public Law 272 of the 88th Congress.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1964—SOCIAL SECURITY—AMERICA'S ANSWER TO COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most sincerely hope that the Members of this House will, with unanimous voice, sanction the further improvements in the benefit and coverage provisions and the financing structure of our social security system, as recommended in this bill before us, H.R. 11865.

Although the improvements contained in this measure are not as liberal or expansive

as a great many of us had hoped they would be, the changes projected, nevertheless, will beneficially affect some 20 million of our American people. For the vast majority of these Americans social security benefits are their major source of support and for a great many they are the only source.

As has been already technically explained by the esteemed committee chairman the bill, among other things, will, in summary, provide a 5-percent across-the-board increase in old-age, survivors, and disability benefits; and eventual increase of family maximum benefit to $300 and the maximum individual benefit to $143.40; a continuation of a child's insurance benefit past the age of 18 and up to the age of 22 if the child remains in school; an election for widows to retire, with reduced benefit, at the age of 60; a special provision under which payment of benefits would be permitted, at age 72, to certain of our older people who did not work long enough under social security to meet the current work requirements for eligibility.

These proposed changes in the present system, with other coverage expansion provisions, are all in accord with past policies of the Congress and add improvements that are financially sound and economically imperative. The increases and improvements are adequately underwritten by the small addition to the contribution rates and insure that our system of social security continues in actuarial integrity.

There can be no question, Mr. Chairman, but what the overwhelming majority of the American taxpayers approve and urge the continuation and reasonable expansion of our social security system in accord with the economical trends of this nuclear age.

This measure offers us the opportunity to carry out the desires and instructions of our people to move forward toward further reasonable adjustment of this program in line with the economical standards under which we live.

May I say it offers us, also, Mr. Chairman, an opportunity to demonstrate to our American taxpayers and fellow citizens that, while we may have earnest interest in the rehabilitation of peoples in foreign lands our primary concern and obligation is and ought to be for our own people who are still making tremendous sacrifices for the promotion of peace and progress throughout a tense world.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963—EQUAL JUSTICE AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of supreme legislative conscience and duty I most earnestly urge and hope this Senate-amended version of the Civil Rights Act of 1963, which we passed here last February 10, will be unanimously accepted and approved.

The work the Senate performed on this measure follows the general lines of the House bill we acted upon here and there is no substantial alteration of the principles of equality embodied in the original measure. An overwhelming majority of both Chambers, as representatives of the American people, have already, in substance, approved this measure. In patriotic unity let us all close ranks and approve this bill.

For our inspiration toward this action we may timely remind ourselves of the immortal words of our late President John F. Kennedy when he urged us, just about a year ago, on June 19, 1963, to pass a comprehensive civil rights law. On that occasion President Kennedy appealed to the Congress with these words:

"Justice requires us to insure the pleas of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy, and domestic tranquility—but, above all, because it is right."

This measure will not, nor was it ever pretended that it could, resolve all of our racial problems. Such will not occur until each of us applies the lesson taught centuries ago, to do unto others as we would have others do unto us; only when we have universally adopted the practice of that divine law will discrimination, attitude, and oppression cease in this troubled world. History shows us the best intended legislation does not, overnight, change personal attitudes nor dissolve all animosities. Only human charity, love, respect, and consideration that come from the moral culture and religious heritage of a people can do that. On this score we, the American people, will certainly be on trial for a long time to come but at least we have begun this glorious journey with the proper legislative first step.

We have upon us now the promise of a new birth of freedom throughout every neighborhood in this Nation. To nourish this birth to maturity will require from all Americans everywhere great forbearance, great kindness, great understanding, great love for one another, and great patriotic dedication to America. This is the challenge of our time, this is the call of our destiny.

For God, for country, for our fellow Americans, and for men everywhere, let us meet the challenge, let us heed the call, let us fulfill our destiny.

Mr. Speaker, this historic act is now known as Public Law 352 of the 88th Congress.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963—EDUCATION IS THE FOUNDATION OF PROGRESS

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, in these days of continuing crisis, few, if any, legislative subjects will be presented to this body more vitally important to the national welfare than this bill, to authorize assistance to higher education institutions in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of their academic and related facilities.

In the light of the current and increasing Communist challenge, there is nothing more obvious, to meet and turn back this challenge, than our national need to perseveringly produce more and better trained scientists, engineers, doctors, teachers, and other educated personnel.

This measure before us is designed precisely to provide this Nation with the most urgent and essential services of these specially trained and disciplined people in the various sciences and arts.

The only possible source from which such personnel can come are institutions of higher education, and the authoritative testimony that has been revealed clearly shows they cannot do the job with their current resources; they need material help and encouragement to provide for the tidal wave of new enrollments that is just over the horizon.

To meet the pressing demands of today, and prepare for the enrollment crush of tomorrow, these higher educational institutions must rehabilitate and expand their academic facilities or else they will be forced to turn away thousands of qualified applicants and deprive the Nation of their trained talents during the most perilous hour of our history.

The prohibitions against any attempt or form of Federal control in the methods of instruction or administration of any educational institution involved are clearly defined and amply sufficient to prevent any Federal interference. That is certainly what practically all of us want to closely guard against, and the language of this measure surely accomplishes it.

The objectives of this bill, and the means defined to accomplish them, are firmly in accord with the foundation traditions of American policy and progress, and I earnestly hope the bill will be approved without crippling amendment or extended delay in the national interest of this day and forever after.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is now recorded as Public Law 204.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1964

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as one who was privileged to have participated in the enactment of the original National Defense Education Act of 1958, I am particularly pleased to rise in support of this measure, H.R. 11904, to amend and extend the original act.

Certainly there is no better investment for the lasting good of this country we can make than providing the fullest educational opportunities for our youth and encouraging them to take the utmost advantage of these opportunities.

Certainly the history of this legislation, which has enjoyed continuing bipartisan support since 1958, clearly demonstrates it was wisely conceived, it has been soundly administered at all levels, and has made an increasingly vital contribution to the progress of this country.

Since this legislation was first enacted the testimony shows there have been over 680,000 loans made to needy students who very likely could not otherwise have obtained a college education. The record further shows that the rate of repayment by students borrowing under the program has been five times as fast as the law specifies. I think this fact alone should renew our faith in the youth of this Nation and the worth of this legislation. However, beyond this fact, growing school enrollments, rising tuition costs, a continuing manpower shortage in crucial fields and ever-increasing demands for quality instruction convincingly appeal for the proposed extension and expansion of this program as proposed in the bill before us now. Indeed, it is my hope that it may become possible for us to provide a 3-year extension of this education act to permit participating educational institutions to more wisely and practically plan the best educational programs and I most earnestly trust that Public Laws 815 and 874, familiarly called the Federally Impacted School Districts Acts will be extended for at least 2 years so that local community officials and school administrators can plan and project their budgets accordingly.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge my colleagues here to overwhelmingly approve this bill, H.R. 4955, before us and to reject all amendments, however well intentioned, that would tend to cripple the effective provisions of this measure.

Even a brief examination of the statistics related to vocational education will clearly reveal that the need for this program is obvious and imperative in the national welfare. These figures show that the number of workers in the lower skilled occupations is rapidly declining each year. Between 1957 and 1962 there was a drop of 772,000 workers in these classifications within the manufacturing area. On the other hand, jobs for professional and technical workers will rise about 40 percent in the 1970's, and jobs for salesworkers, managers, and proprietors will rise about 20 percent. In health occupations at all levels the demand far exceeds the supply, and this situation will continue for a long time.

Young people are seeking work in greater numbers—2.6 million of them a year, estimated for this decade alone. At the other end of the scale, the number of older workers continues to increase. Moreover, half the women between the ages of 35 and 54 are expected to be in the labor market by 1970, some for the first time, some after long absence. Most will need training or re-

training opportunities to obtain employment.

In our continuing appraisal of the need for expanding vocational education opportunities it is primarily important to bear in mind that perhaps 80 percent of our fifth grade students today will not graduate from any college and, if the present rate of dropouts goes on probably more than 30 percent of these will not even complete high school. It is particularly urgent upon us, in my opinion, to make provision, in the public and national interest, for these citizens of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is now Public Law 210 of the 88th Congress.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY ACT EXTENSION

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to most earnestly urge my colleagues to unanimously approve this bill before us, H.R. 9876, to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending its provisions for 2 additional years and providing for a special project and study.

This bill is designed, with certain amendments, to continue and expand the program we adopted 3 years ago providing Federal grants to help local communities combat juvenile delinquency; the program initiated under that original legislation is just beginning to bear fruit and it would be obviously and extremely unwise to cut it off now.

Besides extending the act of 1961 for 2 additional years this bill additionally provides for a special study of school attendance and child labor laws and a national demonstation project on juvenile delinquency prevention and control in the Capital area.

This Capital City is now embarked on a broad and extremely promising program, in cooperation with the schools, which could very well develop new and more effective ways to work with underprivileged and delinquent children. Out of the lessons learned here there is every reason to believe there will emerge, for national application, a pattern of types of effective community action to combat delinquency throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, basically and fundamentally this program is an investment in a substantial part of our youth and, therefore, it is an investment in the future welfare of this Nation. Many legislative proposals have come before us in this Congress with what we might call greater publicity but, I daresay, few, if any, of them will prove to be more important to national progress than this particular bill, H.R. 9876.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal is now known as Public Law 368 of the 88th Congress.

LEGISLATION FOR THE GOOD OF ALL AMERICANS

THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, the vicious social and economic cycle that has been projected and threatens to be perpetuated by the combined problem of poverty and unemployment is very probably the most stirring challenge our generation faces and upon which this body has the awesome duty to legislate.

The chance for us to do something about this problem is before us now in the form of this measure, H.R. 11377, designed to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States.

The various provisions of this measure have already been carefully, technically, and exhaustively explained to this House by the managers of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, let us solemnly reflect upon the unquestioned fact that in this land of plenty we have some 35 million American citizens living in poverty.

To those who would question the costs of this program we must ask them to consider the cost of not adopting this program, in terms of direct public assistance payments alone, which amount to $4 billion per year. In addition to these direct payments, the indirect costs of poverty to this country which show up in juvenile delinquency, crime, health hazards, and higher police and fire protection costs, totals billions more.

To those who would fear the possibility of Federal intervention in local affairs let us unite in action against such a danger which no sensible person desires and accord the various governors the power of negating any local community program unless it were sponsored by local public authorities.

Let us vividly realize that a teenage jobless rate of 16 percent has explosive possibilities that are of potential fearful and frightful consequences.

It is not suggested here that a program of perpetual care is to be established. It is intended only that poverty-stricken people who need and will respond to help will be given such help so that they may help themselves and gradually the desperate need of such help will be reduced and the programs themselves will be accordingly restricted and eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, in the course of his historical and inspirational inaugural address, our late and beloved President John F. Kennedy spoke these memorable words:

"If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich."

With this sentiment and in his spirit let us enact this legislation because it is right and because it is good for all Americans.

May I say it offers us also, Mr. Chairman, an opportunity to demonstrate to our American taxpayers and fellow citizens that although we should have earnest interest in the rehabilitation of peoples in foreign lands our primary concern and obligation is and ought to be for our own people who are still making great sacrifices for the promotion of peace, progress, and prosperity throughout an uncertain world.

Mr. Speaker, this act is now Public Law 452 of the 88th Congress.

A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY, AUTOMATION, AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly hope that legislation, H.R. 11611, which I vigorously supported and which passed in the House, will be promptly approved in the Senate and thereafter signed by the President into law.

A brief review of the purposes of this measure obviously reveals its paramount importance to our sustained economic progress and necessity to begin, now, to deal with the complex effects, including serious unemployment, of this otherwise blessed automatic age.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of providing employment, encouraging retraining programs, making adjustments to the shift in the employment structure, including the displacement of workers through defense cutbacks and so many others arising out of the automatic age present one of the greatest challenges of our time. This challenge will require the fullest cooperation of all levels of government and demand the utmost concentration of all our intellectual resources to the planning of wise, constructive uses of the benefits of automation.

It is only too apparent the impact of automation and mechanization on our economy must inspire new economic thinking and the most comprehensive planning in protecting and projecting our general progress and continuing welfare. As an imperative step toward this patriotic objective I most earnestly hope that the provisions of H.R. 11611 will soon become the law of our land.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is now Public Law 444 of the 88th Congress.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly hope and urge that this bill, to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, will be overwhelmingly approved without extended debate and delay.

The history of this measure, in operation, clearly reveals that it has been an unqualified success since its origin. The authorities have presented substantiating evidence that the goal set by Congress, for the 3-year program of some 400,000 unemployed workers retrained and placed in productive work, will be attained.

Mr. Chairman, this bill offers us a chance to alleviate serious unemployment in the country. It also enables us to take a significant step toward meeting the problems generated by the ever-increasing technological revolution of American industry, especially as such revolution drastically threatens the economic security of our undereducated and unskilled youth. Without encouragement and opportunity this group of young Americans is practically doomed to a lifetime of joblessness and dependence upon public assistance. If they can be trained to become part of our productive force, at any reasonable cost, then the saving to society is incalculable.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is now Public Law 214 of the 88th Congress.

PRESERVING DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES AND EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Chairman, I have never been, nor am I now, opposed to the basic principles underlying our trade-agreements program. However, there appear to be very serious grounds upon which this bill in its present form should be patriotically questioned.

Certainly it does not completely conform with the sentiment expressed in the President's own statement on trade policy contained in his state of the Union message February 2, 1953, when he declared:

"This objective must not ignore legitimate safeguarding of domestic industries, agriculture and labor standards." Nor does it conform with the statement contained in the report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy that "American labor should not be subjected to unfair competition as a part of any program to expand our foreign trade."

Even the advocates of this bill admit it will inevitably visit great hardships upon great numbers of employees and many industries in certain sections of the country, such as New England, where textile manufacturing and innumerable other products will be hardest hit. Yet there are no provisions or proposals, nor are we permitted to offer any for adoption, in this measure to prevent the imposition of serious economic suffering upon such American workers and industries.

Therefore a great many of us here, trying to conscientiously represent our people, very deeply feel that the tariff cutting features of this bill should be wisely held in abeyance until, with Government assistance, new industries are encouraged and developed for areas that would be so disastrously affected and proper precautions are taken to safeguard the employment opportunities rightfully belonging to so many patriotic American working people. Toward that objective, labor, industry, and all levels of government should sincerely cooperate.

It is truly not a simple or easy problem to solve but it is just as truly our representative responsibility to work out a fair trade program that will be fair to Americans as well as our foreign friends. I earnestly hope the House will vote to recommit this bill for the sole purpose of writing in new provisions designed to prevent great hardships from falling upon many regional industries and

workers, not to mention other provisions to retain and preserve essential defense resources that we can ill afford to dissipate in the face of threatening Communist aggression.

SMALL BUSINESS MUST BE LEGISLATIVELY ENCOURAGED

Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly believe it is our very deep legislative obligation and the practically unanimous intention of the Congress to make every reasonable effort to preserve and encourage the life and activities of small business which is the foundation stone of our private enterprise system.

Because of my belief I advocated and supported the original legislation, in 1953, that led to the establishment of the Small Business Administration, the first comprehensive agency of the Federal Government devoted wholly to small business problems. Before and since that time I have supported every sound legislative proposal projected for the particular benefit of small business in this country.

While this Congress has perhaps not accomplished as much for the wider encouragement of small business as most of us would have liked, we have nevertheless recognized their needs on appropriate legislative occasions.

For instance, Congress has thus far approved legislation granting special consideration to small corporations, those with taxable incomes of $25,000 or less, by providing tax cuts of about 27 percent; broadening and liberalizing existing authority to extend disaster loans to small enterprises; establishing under the Economic Opportunity Act, a new program of loans over a 15-year period under greatly reduced collateral requirements; offering, under the new Housing Act, special FHA loan procedures for small business, in urban renewal areas, to improve and rehabilitate their property; authorizing SBA, under certain conditions, to increase the amount they can loan to small business investment companies, from $400,000 to $700,000; and, among others, expanding the set-aside program to assure small business a fairer share of Government contracts. I supported all of these legislative proposals.

OUR MORAL OBLIGATION TO THE VETERAN AND HIS FAMILY

Mr. Speaker, as we appear to be approaching the end of this session and this Congress I most earnestly hope we will not leave here without extending imperatively needed legislative consideration to our veterans and their families. This need has become even greater because of action on the social security amendments providing a 5-percent increase. Unless we take prompt action to prevent it this social security increase will unintentionally but adversely affect a great number of our veterans, veterans' widows, and veterans' dependents presently receiving pension payments.

The provisions contained in H.R. 1927 will insure among other features, that no veteran or dependent will lose pension payments because of any increase in social security allowances. The bill accomplishes this by providing that 10 percent of payments to an individual under any public or private retirement entitlement of any kind, including social security, will be excluded in determining income for pension purposes. This pending bill would improve the veterans' pension system in many other respects. For instance, it raises the pension amounts for veterans and widows with low income. Such changes in these limitations will make it possible for more veterans and their dependents, who are being hard pressed to meet today's basic living costs, to qualify for pensions and at the same time it will increase the monthly pensions of many now on the rolls by placing them in a different income limitation category.

Of special interest to World War I veterans is a provision in the measure designed to eliminate the present requirement of a 10-percent disability with resulting unemployability for a veteran of 65 years of age or over to qualify for a pension.

Mr. Speaker, on other occasions such as this I have expressed my very deep conviction that the best patriotic incentive and encouragement we can provide for those who may be called to future military service is the example of the equitable treatment we demonstrate of those loyal veterans and their dependents of our past wars.

The time is getting late, the economic needs of so many of our veterans and their dependents are urgent, the provisions of H.R. 1927 are equitable, the overall measure is reasonable, and its purpose is in the best interest of this Nation. I urge and hope, therefore, that H.R. 1927, on behalf of all our veterans and their dependents, will be brought before us and overwhelmingly approved in the immediate future.

EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN

Mr. Chairman, as our immediate inspiration to unanimously approve this legislation, the Equal Pay Act of 1963, we need only to look around us and observe the most competent, industrious, distinguished and gracious ladies whom we are privileged to call our colleagues.

For our background inspiration to promptly and favorably act on this bill, we need only to reflect that it is designed simply and solely to provide wage justice for workingwomen.

Under the legislative proposal before us now, we can accomplish this just objective without the creation of any new Government compliance unit and through procedures of the Fair Labor Standards Act, with which labor and industry have long been familiar.

We all realize that the origin of the wage rate differential for men and women performing comparable jobs is the false concept that a woman, because of her very nature, somehow or other should not be given as much money as a man for similar work.

This antiquated concept has been long and completely demonstrated to be false and it is indefensible from every standpoint.

Recognizing that the concept of wage payment discrimination against women is false; having before us the surprising but overwhelming evidence that such discrimination still continues to exist; and realizing that this measure represents the correction of basic injustice being visited upon women in many fields of endeavor, let us, I urge you, firmly reject any crippling amendments and proceed immediately and unanimously to the enactment of this bill extending simple wage justice to the increasing corps of America's workingwomen.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is now Public Law 38 of the 88th Congress.

LUXURY TAXES—A PLAGUE ON BUSINESS, BEAUTY, AND BABIES

Mr. Speaker, the problem of what to do about Federal wartime excise taxes continues to plague the Congress while it continues to penalize our people and our businesses. Surely it is time to deal with it forthrightly and realistically. Reductions made in a few areas have been too little and patchwork proposals, as recently made, have been and should be rejected because of discriminatory tendencies. The existing situation projects real hardships, contradicts the term "luxury" in this modern world, and it is economically unjustifiable. Piecemeal corrections should not be further tried; the cure should be overall and complete.

Who, in this atomic age, can really feel that cosmetics, furs, luggage, automobiles, television sets, long-distance telephone calls, washing machines, refrigerators, window air conditioners, and babies' things should be classed as luxuries and placed in the same category, for instance, as tobacco and alcohol for Federal tax purposes.

The repeal of these excise taxes would, according to expert economic testimony, eliminate elements of drag and discrimination in our fiscal system and inject a further factor of significant influence into our economy which must be encouraged to expand, especially during this period of unemployment adjustment to the challenging impact of automation.

IMMIGRATION WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION

Mr. Speaker, the boasted basic standards by which we Americans claim to measure a man are his integrity of character, his conscientious industry, and his personal ambition. In theory his place of birth has nothing to do with the kind of person he may be.

However and unfortunately, our current immigration laws openly contradict this theory. Under present laws, it is, for instance, clearly intimated that the Italian people are about one-thirteenth as acceptable for prospective American citizenship as the English and that the Greek people are about 200 times less desirable for American admittance than the English. There is similiar discrimination against many other nationalities under the present system.

Mr. Speaker, there is now pending before the Congress a bill, actually the first bill our late and beloved President John F. Kennedy sent to Congress, designed to remove the bias, the prejudice, the discrimination, and the injustices of our present immigration laws. This bill is known as H.R. 7700 and I myself have introduced a bill that is practically identical to it, H.R. 8883.

These bills, and many others of like nature, would, fundamentally, along with other revisions and reforms, eliminate the present inequitable discriminatory overall quota system and set up a new method, with no great increase, of quota allocations without regard to national origins; they would insure that an individual with special talents that could be used here would not be faced with inordinate delay in admittance because of his birthplace and they would halt the existing hardships on separated families from Italy or Greece or other countries who must now most often experience agonizing postponements of family unity while large quotas for England and Ireland remain unused.

Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly hope this Congress will not adjourn without taking action on these pending revisions in our immigration laws that will demonstrate, both to ourselves and the world, that we are really serious in desiring to eradicate discrimination based on race and national origin.

THE HOUSING ACT OF 1964

Mr. Chairman, because the evidence and expert testimony clearly show that slum clearance, urban renewal, housing for the elderly, low-cost public housing and similar programs are still urgently needed in almost every section of this country, I consider it a legislative obligation to urge support and prompt enactment of this bill, H.R. 12175, designed to extend and amend the present laws relating to housing, urban renewal, community facilities and other purposes.

Mr. Chairman, the record shows that in general, the program has been well administered and it has been exceptionally free from misuse of funds or authority.

Mr. Chairman, this housing bill is certainly a relatively modest one. It surely seems essential for the continuation of programs that are vital to our efforts and our obligations to encourage better housing in better surroundings for all of our people. Because it is clearly in accord with our national traditions, because it is designed to prudently meet a foundation national need and because it is obviously intended to promote the health, the safety, and the happi-

ness of all our citizens, I urge that it be promptly enacted.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is now Public Law 560 of the 88th Congress.

HONORABLE PEACE MUST BE PERSEVERINGLY PURSUED

Mr. Chairman, as one of the original sponsors of legislation that resulted in the creation, back in September of 1961, of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency within the executive department of our Government I earnestly urge my colleagues here to unanimously approve this measure authorizing an additional appropriation of $30 million for the Agency to continue its operations over the next 2 years.

Let me, please, remind you that the Congress is not, by this bill or through this Agency, relinquishing one whit of its constitutional, traditional, or legislative power over U.S. disarmament procedures or treaties. If it did I would not be in favor of it.

Let me further and respectfully observe than when few question an appropriation of some $50 billions for an arms race it is difficult to appreciate how anyone can hesitate over approving $30 million for the pursuit of honorable peace.

When we realize that the destructive power of one thermonuclear bomb surpasses that of all the bombs used in World War II it appears it would be just plain old-fashioned commonsense to encourage an agency of our Government to continue and expand its limited efforts of research and exploration to find ways and means to accomplish honorable peace through a guaranteed system of arms control and disarmament. Penny for penny it could well be the best investment the American taxpayer could make or that we can make for him and the civilized world. Let us then promptly approve this measure without further delay.

MUTUAL SECURITY—INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Speaker, I remain most deeply impressed with the foundation principle involved in our mutual security and foreign assistance programs. That principle is the prevention of the necessity for American fathers and sons to fight, and perhaps die, again, all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, over the past few years, when we have been debating this mutual security appropriations bill, I have emphasized my belief that the parts of the program which have proved of substantial worth by experience, such as technical assistance to underdeveloped countries and Development Loan Fund operations, should be adequately supported, and the most careful examination, in the interests of the American taxpayers, should be concentrated upon those phases of the program in which impressive evidence has been demonstrated in revelation of great waste and extravagance.

Let us strive to conscientiously enact a measure that will provide reasonable assistance to our allies, in the fields where such help is most needed, while we insure elimination of those parts of the program which have been proved wasteful and worthless.

THE COMMUNIST CAPTIVE NATIONS MUST NEVER BE ABANDONED

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this resolution, designed to influence the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and God-given rights of the subjugated peoples now existing in Communist captive nations, I most earnestly hope this House will promptly and unanimously approve it.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge prompt approval of this urgently needed measure before us, H.R. 3881, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963.

As you are aware this bill, already enacted by the Senate, proposes an expenditure of $500 million to provide a long-range program, of cooperation between the Federal Government and State and local units, to bring some order out of the increasingly chaotic condition of transportation facilities in so many urban and metropolitan centers throughout the Nation, including my own home State and area.

Mr. Chairman, any objective review of this transportation improvement challenge throughout the country proves the need for this legislation is imperative; the Federal participation proposed is reasonable; the projected program over a long-range period is prudent; that failure to act now could well precipitate a major crisis and the program proposed is beyond any doubt in accord with our traditions and legitimate concern for the national safety and welfare. Let us, therefore, approve this measure without extended delay.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is now Public Law 365 of the 88th Congress.

COORDINATING PLANNING, NOW, FOR THE PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF OUR WATER AND LAND RESOURCES IS IMPERATIVE FOR FUTURE NATIONAL WELFARE

Mr. Speaker, back on July 13, 1961, our late and beloved President John F. Kennedy recommended to Congress the original river basin planning bill whose fundamental objectives, to provide for development of comprehensive river basin plans, biennial assessments of regional water needs and supplies, aid to the States and encouragement of more efficient water development, management and use, are practically the same as S. 1111 that passed the Senate late last year and is now pending in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I very earnestly urge and hope the leadership of both sides and the distinguished chairman and members of this outstanding committee will cooperate in their efforts to present this vitally important measure to the House for action before this Congress concludes.

Mr. Speaker, the prominent provisions of S. 1111, which carry out the basic purposes recommended by President Kennedy, are briefly these: it will establish a Water Resources Council with the responsibility to make plans now for the conservation of our water resources; it will set up a pattern of operation for the Federal-State River Basin Planning Commissions; it will provide a program of aid to States for water resources planning by authorizing an annual appropriation of money for 10 years for apportionment to the States on a matching basis to develop their independent, intrastate and interstate water resource planning by whatever agencies with which the States work.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope and appeal that this Congress will approve legislation, which this House passed in the last Congress, creating a New England water and related land resources compact which would consider the whole of New England as an interdependent geographical unit for the development and managing of our regional natural land and water resources. Already four of our New England States, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island have ratified such a compact by State legislative action.

Mr. Speaker, this country has been struggling for 55 years to set up an intelligent, comprehensive, practical plan to adequately deal, throughout the Nation, with the desperately urgent problems of water supply, distribution, pollution, variability, and floods. Every recognized authority and conservation organization in the United States has recommended such action. The opportunity to take such action, in the national welfare, is contained in the excellent measure, S. 1111, and I again urge that appropriate steps be taken to promptly bring the bill before us for passage, in the near future, before the Congress ends.

ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL POLICY FOR WILDERNESS PRESERVATION

Mr. Speaker, I understand that this body may be very soon granted an opportunity, by approval of H.R. 9070, to establish a national wilderness preservation system and I most earnestly urge and hope the opportunity will be overwhelmingly grasped.

We have, Mr. Speaker, a legislative responsibility to establish guidelines for wise management of federally owned lands in order to assure that future generations will have the opportunity of enjoying the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness.

When we recently and overwhelmingly adopted the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act this House evidenced its interest and recognized its duty to provide adequate recreational opportunities for our expanding population that will be looking for better and healthier outlets for the greater leisure time that is anticipated. Prompt enactment of H.R. 9070 will add to that action by protecting certain designated federally owned acreage from unwarranted commercial intrusion.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9070 is designed to preserve, for current and future generations, Federal land in its original state for the healthy use and enjoyment of all Americans who are interested in outdoor life and conservation and I trust it will be unanimously adopted in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, the substance of this bill is now Public Law 577 of the 88th Congress.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT BE ADJOURNED WHILE VITAL PROBLEMS REMAIN UNSOLVED

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this point I desire to express my opposition to any early sine die adjournment of the House of Representatives while vitally important legislation remains pending.

BILLS INTRODUCED IN 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, limited as this summary necessarily is, it would be even more inadequate if a partial list of some of the measures I introduced in this Congress were not included; they follow:

H.R. 3933, to provide public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard.

H.R. 3934, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

H.R. 5182, to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Congress.

H.R. 5184, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax deduction for certain expenses of attending colleges and universities.

House Joint Resolution 373, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

House Resolution 347, establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

H.R. 8368, to amend section 401(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the issuance of certain certificates of public convenience and necessity.

H.R. 8883, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

House Concurrent Resolution 239, to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

H.R. 9329, to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States.

House Joint Resolution 826, to establish a commission to be known as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission.

H.R. 10942, to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes.

H.R. 11135, to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921.

H.R. 12144, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household.

CONCLUSION—TIMELY COUNSEL FROM A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the words of wise authority remain forever as comforting beacons of guidance in troubled, distressing hours. A counseling message to all Americans is contained in the following extract from a speech given at Harvard University graduation exercises on June 30, 1910, by the late great Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes:

"The most important agencies of democracy are, after all, not the organs of government, but the influences that shape public opinion. * * * Democracy must prize its public life. It has stripped it almost altogether of ceremonial and of meaningless and absurd forms. It has placed the public officer in a position of power, to be used for service. * * * Having surrounded him with none of the pomp which makes appeal to the thoughtless and ignorant, it must invest him with the higher honor which should be the reward of fidelity. Those who cultivate the true democratic spirit will be as earnest in their support of faithful officers as they are unsparing in their condemnation of the faithless."

Last Chance for Medicare?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an editorial with a most appropriate title appeared in the Sunday, September 6 edition of the Tribune publications, emphasizing the basic issues involved in the last-ditch, politically motivated kick for medicare.

The editorial entitled "Last Chance for Medicare" follows:

LAST CHANCE FOR MEDICARE?

Hospital care for the aged under social security has been approved by the U.S. Senate, but promises to fall by the wayside in the House. That is where it belongs.

The pretense that social security is a panacea for all man's ills is a dangerous one. Even without extending the tax to cover hospitalization, the tab is increasing periodically, taking a more substantial bite out of the workingman's pay check and the employer's resources. Yet the same administration that proposed an income tax reduction in order to spur the economy also supports an additional increase in social security taxes without acknowledging that this might return the economy to the point of beginning.

Even without the so-called medicare plan, advances in the social security tax rate appear to be needed as a means of increasing payments to keep pace with the high cost of living. Economically dubious and unfair to upcoming generations of workers as this might be, none of us wants the senior citizen to be penalized by inflation which is no fault of his.

But higher payments and increasing life expectancy in themselves are sufficient reason to wonder how soon the tax burden on payrolls will reach the breaking point.

Under the circumstances, extending hospital benefits to the aged, whether they need them or not, is a luxury we can scarcely afford. Worse yet, there can be no way of determining what the plan would cost, although you can safely bet that it would exceed estimates on which the initial tax increase is based.

Nor is there any assurance that hospitals could accommodate all who might be attracted by a free ride even though hospitalization was not essential.

This is not to say that we should begrudge medical and hospital care to those who need it and cannot afford it. There are programs to supply this; if necessary, they should be expanded. Help for the needy can be provided much more reasonably through programs applying only to them than by catch-all benefits to rich and poor alike.

Many observers believe this is the last chance for medicare—that it must be approved this year or never. Perhaps some of this reasoning stems from the fact that individuals in increasing numbers are making their own preparations through private insurance programs for future medical needs.

And unless the ballyhooed war on poverty has a built-in "no win" policy, the number of persons able to provide for their own needs should increase.

Address by Hon. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, to League of Women Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, a noteworthy address was delivered to the League of Women Voters National Convention in Pittsburgh, Pa., on April 24 of this year by the Honorable Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor.

Of particular interest in this address is the excellent data the Secretary gives as to how the purchasing power of this country could be increased if we could raise the income of a relatively small group of people at the bottom of the economic ladder to a decent income. I commend it to my colleagues and fellow citizens:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR W. WILLARD WIRTZ TO THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS NATIONAL CONVENTION, PITTSBURGH, PA., APRIL 24, 1964

Thank you very much, Mrs. Phillips and Mrs. Stuart. Ladies of the League of Women Voters, I come here ill prepared in some respects but well armed with advice. The advice was given me just a couple of days ago by a friend of mine and of yours in Washington who said to me very quickly as I talked to her in the hall, "I have a suggestion to make to you when you go to Pittsburgh, don't talk about 'women's rights.'"

I have no trouble accepting this advice at all. It seems to me perhaps the basic difference between men and women as citizens of this country is that men are too much preoccupied with "rights" and too little with "responsibilities," and that you ladies complement that interest by an emphasis on "responsibilities" and less concern with "rights."

I am reminded, though, by that advice of a statement of Mr. Dooley's about 60 years ago; some of you may not remember but may have seen Mr. Dooley's essay on "Women's Suffrage." That was back when that was a question, and I am not going to try the dialect, but you will perhaps remember that he said this:

"Women's rights? What does a woman want of rights when she has privileges? Rights is the last thing we get in this world. They are the next thing to wrongs. Rights are just wrongs turned inside out. All the rights I enjoy, I don't enjoy. I enjoy the right to get money, but I never have any money to spend. The Constitution guarantees me the right to life but I die. To liberty but if I try being too free, I am locked up, and 'to the pursuit of happiness' but happiness has the right to run when pursued, and I have never been able to tree her yet. Here I am at ever so many years of age, blown and exhausted by the chase, and happiness is still able to do her hundred yards in 10 seconds flat whenever I approach. I would give all the rights I read about for one privilege. If I could go to sleep the minute I go to bed, I wouldn't care who done me voting."

No, I am not going to talk with you about women's rights. I would like to say only this by way of subtle suggestion about my feelings toward the League of Women Voters. On the night of April 15, at about 11 o'clock I faced the question that comes to me every year as I go through my book of check stubs. I always put down when I am listing my deductions a contribution to the League of Women Voters. Now, I know that I am not going to be able to put it into the tax return, but it just seems to me that anybody or any organization whose interests are such as these ought to be someway tax deductible. I may add, at the risk of being misunderstood, that I am not quite clear yet why an interest in the past makes you tax deductible but an interest in the future does not.

I must say very frankly to you that I am unprepared today. This has been a very busy week. There was one night I didn't get to bed at all. There were other evenings and times during the day when I had to face squarely the issue of whether it would be more important to you to have a well-prepared speech this morning or to be able to take the train home tonight. It seemed to me that the latter was the controlling consideration, and in any event, I decided to shorten my speech so that you could take the train, which seemed to me to make you gainers on both counts.

I thought I would talk just a little about the railroad case, and take from it the principal lesson that I find in that experience and then, if you will, try to apply that lesson as it came up in that particular instance to this matter of your most recent agenda item, the development of human resources.

The railroad case is still too close to us to permit our assessing fully its significance, and yet I think it would be impossible to exaggerate the significance of that settlement, which was reached day before yesterday, as far as the railroad controversy was concerned.

Now the specific issues in the railroad case were of exceeding importance, particularly because they involved this problem of what is to happen when machines or new processes reduce the need for men. This agreement, as it was finally worked out by the parties, includes terms which reconcile the necessity of technological advance and the equal necessity of protecting the human interests and the rights of those whose jobs are made temporarily obsolete. But that was not the overriding issue in the railroad case.

The overriding issue in that case was whether collective bargaining was or was not to have any continuing influence in the railroad industry. Now, I know that collective

bargaining is not an overly popular phrase with the public at large. The phrase is equated with strikes, with waste, and with a history that includes some violence. Even the more understanding of people are inclined to view collective bargaining as one of the necessary evils, or at least, as one of the difficult or evil necessities along with such things as taxes, military service, policemen, housekeeping, and taking Latin in high school—that kind of thing. I sometimes wonder why it is that so many of the things that are good for us aren't very much fun. And yet, collective bargaining is the keystone in the arch of private industrial democracy. Collective bargaining is the difference between people making their own decisions, on the one hand, and on the other hand, having somebody else make those decisions for them. It's democracy with its shirtsleeves rolled up. It's democracy in a blue collar, and the significance of the settlement in the railroad case is that collective bargaining has been greatly strengthened as an instrument in the service of private democracy in this country.

Very briefly, this settlement followed 4 to 4½ years of futile attempts by a very great number of people to settle the case; those previous efforts had failed. I made a list which included 467 representatives of the public who, at one point or another, were interested in the settlement of the railroad case. They were not successful, but then 2 weeks ago last night an extraordinary thing happened. There was a meeting in the Cabinet room of the White House. These men met with the President of the United States, and in the course of 2 hours of discussion it was decided to go on and make a last try at settlement of this case.

That discussion was characterized by the President's reference to the Prophet Isaiah, "Come let us reason together." It was concluded with the President's statement to these people: "If this system isn't going to work, if you decide that it isn't going to work, before you make that decision, decide what system is better." And the same men who had worked for 4½ years without being able to reach an agreement went out and made an agreement in 13 days. By drawing upon the infinite human capacity which is within them and within us, these men settled the railroad dispute with no new laws being passed and with no new forces being brought to bear.

The assumption had been made for 4½ years that somebody else was going to have to assume responsibility for handling that matter, and that is the most dangerous assumption that can be made in a free society. Overnight that assumption was set aside, and within 2 weeks that case, which had defied settlement for so long, was settled.

I would now like to very briefly apply that same principle to the principle to the problem of "human resources." That problem, as you have very properly stated in your agenda item adopted yesterday, is not going to be settled by the Federal Government. It is going to be settled by enlisting that human capacity which was illustrated in the railroad case, and which can be brought to bear on this general problem too—that human capacity and desire which was reflected in the establishment of the Peace Corps; that human capacity and desire which was reflected in the Nation's response when a President said, "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country"; that capacity which was reflected in people's reactions to what happened almost 3 years later in Dallas, and the country's attempt to find something other than brutal irrelevancy in the assassination of a President; and in its attempt today in its declaration of a war on poverty to find, in the good of people, the answers to the problems which we face.

There isn't time to talk about the precise nature of the poverty problem as it exists today in this country. You have in your agenda item identified the two top roots of that problem: the need for more education, and the need for more jobs. The problem of poverty is becoming concentrated in two areas: one geographical in nature, the other among those who lack education. The most important right in this country today, as far as the approach to the problem of poverty is concerned, is the right to be ready. We won last year, to a substantial extent, the battle against discrimination. Now we face the battle against disadvantage, the disadvantage which results from 100 years of discrimination. It is not just a racial problem. You very properly point out that the problem is much broader than that and affects a whole group who have been disadvantaged over the years, over the decades. We know now that poverty and unemployment and lack of education are inextricably intertwined. We know that they are inherited characteristics, not through the human genes, but through the social genes of slums, lack of adequate schools and so forth.

I would question, if there were more time, your exclusion of consideration of the general education program from your consideration of this particular problem. I can see the reasons for doing that as a practical matter, but really, there will not be ultimate answers found in this area until there is full and complete educational opportunity for everybody. I applaud your identification of this problem in terms of human resources instead of in terms of a phrase that means different things to different people. Let's get the phrases out of the way and let's get down to work on the problem. I hope you will agree with me that there is the necessity of supporting the Civil Rights Act; I hope you will bring your support to the economic opportunities legislation which is before the Nation now. I hope you will support the proposition that we must do more about meeting poverty which centers its evils upon the older people in this country. I hope that all of these programs will have your support, but I hope, too, that the program of the League of Women Voters, the human resources program, will recognize that this job is going to be done in the local communities; it is going to be done more privately than it is by the public.

I think of Oliver Goldsmith's pregnant couplet: "How small of all that human hearts endure, that part which laws or kings can cause or cure."

This program is going to be done in the local communities. It is going to be done, as it is being done today in New Haven, in New York, and in a number of other cities, by people who realize the resources that lie in the human individual, and who bring to bear all that we hope for as far as the capacity of ourselves as individuals.

There would be more of a programatic nature to discuss if the circumstances and time were different, and yet I should like to take the moments which remain to me to assert what seems to me the central element as far as the accomplishment of this purpose is concerned. I rather think that we have become so "intellectualized" that we are making cynics of ourselves—at least to some degree. We are overawed by the fact that our scientific knowledge is increasing exponentially while our understanding of our human problems seems to advance very, very slowly.

Mrs. Phillips, you said to this group the other day that the second of two dangers is the extent to which we have tended to leave all mention of morality out of public discussion, and Barbara Ward spoke to you day before yesterday in similar terms.

I think it will be essential to the meeting of this problem that if we assert, along with our belief in reason, our belief in faith—faith in the future.

I see the future more clearly in the soft lanternlight of faith than in the glaring headlight of reason. Eternity is already shrunk and we know it, in the illumination of logic, to a matter of minutes: just that little time that can run while we live a single spark away from ultimate destruction, our knowledge of our power daily outstripping our wisdom about its use, with more and more democracy's decisionmakers knowing less and less of what they are deciding. To care and to care deeply about the future, only as it will see the ascendancy of human over material values is to watch with a fascination that fights against fear, a generation of machines maturing as no generation of human beings ever has—so that any moment now one of these clanking, idiotic robots is going to pull itself erect and announce in Descartes' terms, "cognito, ergo sum."—"I think, therefore I am."

And yet the facts are that we're still children of unfathomable mystery, surrounded still by secrets that dwarf to insignificance all that we know. We have no basis at all—unless the premise be taken as itself the conclusion—for asserting that only what can be proved is true. I think of Emerson when he said, "We think our civilization near its meridian, but we are as yet only at the cock crowing and the morning star." The only dangers we face, except for cataclysmic accident, are that we will build our syllogisms too much on experience, and too little on vision, that we will forget the inevitable is only what we don't resist and that we will forget that the unattainable is only what we don't attempt. The danger is that we will stumble and we will fall on the sword of our own stupidity. Not the stupidity of the ignorant, that isn't what threatens us so much as the stupidity of the successful. Those who seek to protect their petty conceits behind maginot lines of race, or religion, or geography, content with the little innovations of their own dubious piety, fighting change because the status quo has been good to them individually. The divine right of the successful is as false a notion as the divine right of kings.

The future is still infinite if we will stretch our minds far enough and fast enough to keep our ideals abreast of ideas; if we will reassess, under technology's pressure, the revolutionary new relationship between war and peace and between work and leisure; if we will seize the sense of the future that will let us stand on a clear night and look up at a heaven full of more stars that the number of all the men and women who ever lived, and realize that those stars are now very close to our reach and that they are part of our children's future.

If we are because we think, we will be because we believe—even if only in the grand mystery of it all and that's worth the eternal quest. We have got to push reason beyond reason to faith in a fuller future.

Barbara Ward said to you at the end of her remarks 2 days ago, "We must love each other or we must die." And I would add, we must believe and believe in each other. If we do, we will live, and we will prosper, and we will find our fullest meaning.

And now, the President will be here shortly and it is my part to speak to you just briefly on a kind of accordion basis until he does. I should warn you that the other day I was seized with this same situation at the White House. He was due at 4:58 on a very split-schedule basis. I was to start speaking at 4:55 and then speak until he came in. I was still speaking at 20 minutes of 6. That won't happen to you here.

I'd like to present, subject to momentary interruption, some of the fuller details of what I would have had in mind under other circumstances. I can apologize a little bit

in my own mind and to you for speaking of a program to fight poverty, to fight ignorance, and to achieve more jobs which is based on understanding and belief. I could apologize for that, and I would, if that is where it stopped. But there are so many things to be done by way of specific details in backing up this kind of belief. I spent a day about a month ago in New Haven. Some of you would know what's going on there. I saw in the course of that day people from that city, not government officials but volunteers, working with what turned out to be some 54 different programs in the community high schools that they are now building.

I saw a man sitting there working with 9 or 10 little children teaching them to paint. I saw a boy from Yale preparing another group of youngsters from the worst part of New Haven, the most disadvantaged part of the city, for the presentation of a play. It wasn't "peace, love and justice," or something like that. They had given the week before "The Mad Women of Chaillot" and they were working this week on "Antigone." That kind of thing is being done.

I've seen in Chicago students from the universities working with the dropouts. I've seen in New York the program which is being worked out there and in Philadelphia, in Syracuse. I recall what's happening in Flint, Mich., where 80,000 people are now involved in an adult education program. These things are going on all over the country. There is in the heart of America, to be applied to its own problems, all that was expressed in what was developed as the Peace Corps as far as the rest of the world is concerned. There are 750,000 dropouts in this country. I could find 750,000 college and university students who would be glad to take them one by one by the hand and bring them back to the area of opportunity. The country doesn't know the things that are being done in the communities in this country. I would urge upon you, as you continue your study of this problem, that you also make yourselves—this organization—a clearinghouse for all that's already being done. I'm tired of hearing about pilot programs in various parts of the country which are so much like the same programs in other parts of the country. We need a clearinghouse for information. Although there is a part of the proposed antipoverty bill which provides for community action, you can do it better than we can do it.

I would like to say a word, too, about the importance of this point which you have set to the side of this particular agenda item; I mean the point on education. I have spared you any statistics this morning, but let me give you one.

If you take the group who completed high school last year, graduated from high school in June of 1963, and lined them up on the basis not of their ability but on the income of their parents, you will find this: Among the upper 30 percent in terms of the income of their parents, 46 percent of those boys and girls are in college today, and if you take the bottom 30 percent in terms of the income of their parents, only 12 percent of them are in college today. That isn't fair. It isn't good sense, and it isn't good democracy. It means there is not a right to work, to be prepared to work—I almost said "opportunities" but in its broadest sense. There is not equality of the right to be ready. It was enough a hundred years ago to say, and importantly at that point, that all people are created equal. That was the point that had to be made first. It is equally imporant today to face the fact that all people are not created equal. Or at least, that when they are born into a family which is in the second generation of disadvantage, there must be special attention given to the problem of giving them the opportunity to be ready for work and for what lies ahead.

There is a great deal more to be done as far as the educational system is concerned. I wish the League of Women Voters would think through the question of whether—where a hundred years ago we decided that there ought to be 12 years of free education, that that is still the right answer. I am not at all sure it is. In fact, we were either wrong then or we are wrong now, because the world now demands a higher degree of education on the part of its boys and girls.

I believe in the essentiality of technology and automation to bring us the new quality of living to which we aspire. I know that, at the same time, the machines are driving out any need for untrained or uneducated people. The problem of poverty in this country is becoming more and more a concentrated problem on the part of a comparative few, but it is becoming a worse problem. The chasm between most of us and a few is becoming deeper and deeper every day. It is harder to move across the tracks today than it was some time ago.

I am concerned about those statistics which show that between 1935 and 1947 5 percent of those whom we would identify as being in poverty families moved across the line to prosperity every year. We were diminishing the number of people who we would identify as poverty stricken 5 percent a year from 1937 to 1947. From 1947 to 1953 that number dropped to an average of 3 percent, and since 1953 it has dropped to about 1 percent. Now that's partly because we have licked part of the problem so that the percentages are applied to a smaller base. It is partly because the machines now have a high school education or its equivalent, and the people who don't have a high school education aren't able to compete with the machines. And yet there will come into the work force in this country in the next 2½ years, 5½ million boys and girls who will not have high school diplomas, and employers simply aren't going to be hiring people without high school diplomas from here on.

I would wonder whether we can't find a way without diluting the quality of higher education to add at least 2 more years of education—of free education—for the boys and girls who now need more training than they did a hundred years ago. I would wonder whether there is any sense any longer in a law that provides that a boy or girl can drop out of school when he or she reaches the age of 16. If that was right when most States adopted it 50 years ago, it is wrong now. There are 6½ million teenagers in the work force today. Some of them employed, some of them unemployed, and even those who are employed are probably there without the training and education which they'll need to fill the jobs which will be present in the future.

I would wonder whether we shouldn't do something about reviewing the age for compulsory education. Now, don't misunderstand me, if anybody has the thought of sending the dropouts back into what they dropped out of, there is no point in that. None at all. The point is rather, and I speak with the license of 20 years of teaching school, that the school system is based on a standard of preparing for excellence. I was proud of that. I was proud as a high school teacher to be teaching Hamlet and the difficulties of the split infinitive to people who I knew were going into the local boiler works or into the glass factory. That was fine. They could have at least a vision of what excellence might be. We have got to face up to the fact that whereas it didn't do any good or didn't do any harm then, because they didn't need any special preparation, now they need special preparation and very badly.

You have on your Agenda Item emphasis upon the retraining program and I am glad you do because that's a program which we administer, and we need your help. You also have on it vocational education and I am very glad you do, although that falls in another department's responsibility, because there is a great deal to be done now about taking those people who will not go on to college and preparing them for a different kind of work which requires special preparation. There is a great deal to be done as far as a review of the educational situation is concerned.

Now, your Agenda Item, turning to its other aspect, is very vague on the question of what you are going to do about more jobs. You recognize, and very properly, that it will mean only frustration if we train and educate people—boys and girls—and then there are no jobs at the end of that preparation. This must not be permitted to happen. As long as we are at the point of statistics, let me give you one other, although I warn you about the danger of statistics. These percentages, these averages—they confuse us so. All the figures you see are in terms of averages, almost all of them. And yet I point out to you that the law of averages is only a law which establishes the fact that if a person is standing with one foot in the ice box and with the other foot on the stove, that person is "on the average" comfortable.

But let me give you another figure, that illustrates the problem as far as job opportunities are concerned. We must depend for the increased jobs on the private sector of the economy in this country. Between 1957 and 1963 the work force in this country increased by five million people. During that time the increase in the number of full-time jobs from the profit sector of the private economy was 200,000. It went up by only that number.

Now, employment went up very markedly in some other areas: government service, not Federal Government service—State and local government service, and most of those were school teachers which is all to the good, and it went up as far as nonprofit operations of one kind or another are concerned, and that's good. It went up as far as part-time work is concerned, and most women think that is good. I should make clear that the statistic I gave you before was in terms of full-time jobs. As far as the profit part of the operation of the economy during that 6-year period is concerned, the total of full-time jobs went up by only 200,000, while the work force was going up by 5 million. There has been a marked shift in that in the last year and there has been an increase of some 500,000 in that same statistic. That the figure, if I had given it to you a year ago, would have been a net loss instead of some increase. The situation is improving. That's why the tax reduction is so important. It ought to mean a difference of between a million and 2 million job opportunities.

But my point, in general, is that you are very right that the educational part of this program will have no sufficient significance unless there is the job opportunity for which these people are prepared. So I ask you to think as clearly as you can about that part of this job and to recognize again that the answers are not going to come from the Federal Government. The Federal Government, I think of, as a kind of catalytic for the work of the local governments, and the whole of the governmental program is only a kind of catalytic for the work of the private sector of the economy. It's got to be done privately; it is going to be done, I think, by a reassertion of the kind of faith and vision that we had before.

I think of Barbara Ward again, that most remarkable woman of whom I can say nothing to you that you did not know now firsthand, and I wish you would see her Williamsburg address of last year in which she pointed out the difference between 1776 and 1963. Her point was that in 1776 the people in this country had only one thing, that was

vision. They were completely without tools, but that didn't deter them. Today there is no shortage of tools. Our problem is an excess capacity of production. We have all the tools we could possibly use and nothing in the world lacking to achieve the kind of affluence of which she talked, but we are a little short on vision at the moment.

And so I say to you, that it seems to me that it is completely legitimate to emphasize this aspect in our thinking about the problem. It's a problem of ways and means it's also a problem of belief, a belief in the past, a belief in the future. I mentioned briefly in my more general remarks this problem of automation. Don't be scared of the machines. The machines are absolutely essential to the achievement of the standard of living which we want for ourselves in this country. Technology is the only possible way that we can maintain the standard of living above that of the other nations with which we compete more actively now every day. Technological development is absolutely essential, but it will be the worst kind of progress if we have to pay for it in human terms. We did in the industrial revolution.

I don't think anybody looks back with pride on the progress that we call the industrial revolution, because we had to pay too high a price for it in human terms. If you go back still further, you know how the pyramids were built and the story that the laying of every block cost the breaking of a human back. We did better than that in the industrial revolution. We are doing better than that in the technological revolution, but we have got to consider the fact that our understanding must be brought up even with our knowledge. I think it was Solomon who said, "Knowledge is a wonderful thing; therefore get knowledge but with all thy getting, get understanding." We must do that. We can't let the machines take away the human values from us.

I think of the most dangerous side of automation and technology in terms of the play of Karel Capek with which some of you may be familiar. Somebody should put it back on the boards. That was the story in 1923 or 1927, you remember, about universal robots, about the scientists who invent the machines, and how they improve them until finally one day the machines learn how to make other machines, and at that point the jig is up. You may remember the end of the third act. The curtains and the backdrop part, and these clanking robots come marching in and form in solid phalanxes on the stage. Then they start plodding stolidly toward the audience, and just as they reach the footlights, the lights go out and the play is over.

But it is act IV now, and our problem is to make use of technology and machines so that they will be the instruments not of man's destruction but rather of man's service, of the achievement of his purpose. I said "man's"—Esther Peterson has almost housebroken me but not quite. I am always impressed when I'm talking about technology that although machines may replace men, I know they will never replace women.

But there is so much to do as far as taking care of the human aspect of technology. A lot of it was done in the railroad case this week. What you will not read, because it is a part of the fine print of that settlement, is that there were great advances recognized as far as the use of new machines on the railroads is concerned. It was also provided in that settlement that if a person loses his job as a result of technological development, there will be provision made to take care of the human interests of that individual. He will be taken care of for a period of at least 3 or 4 years. The details of that have not yet been worked out. Technology will come faster if we recognize that we are not entitled to charge a price in human terms for the progress upon which we are so dependent.

And so I say to you that technology is not something about which to be concerned. It is rather a matter upon which we are wholly dependent, and there are ways and means of taking care of those human aspects of the problem.

I would like to return to the phrase with which I opened—the dichotomy between rights and responsibilities. I meant very sincerely the compliment that I think the political difference between men and women is that men are preoccupied with their rights, and women concerned about their responsibilities. I point out to you that this society has grown up and the law has developed around an emphasis on rights—the Declaration of Independence, the Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution. You can't find any comparable milestone documents in our literature, or in our legal history which talks about responsibility. And yet I suggest that at the present stage of the development of this complex society, it is going to be essential that we start doing our thinking in terms of responsibilities rather than rights.

Now that creates some dangers. Whenever you start talking about responsibilities, especially as they may be exercised not by but through the Government, people start getting concerned about planning. Well, it doesn't need the kind of planning that people get concerned about. I can testify to you bitterly on the basis of the last 2 weeks experience, that you don't have time for planning in Federal Government. You spend 99½ percent of your time completely on the defensive fighting the telephone, fighting the desk, and fighting the papers that have to be disposed of. Don't worry about the planning. There is too little of it, not too much. It is a dangerous situation when you can't think, or can't think enough about how we will make use of the possibilities of peace, because there will be concern on somebody's part about doing too much planning.

It leads people to wondering whether we could stand peace, economically in this country. Why of course, we can stand peace. Anybody who has any doubts about the capacity of this system to turn its productive powers from producing munitions to fighting poverty doesn't realize that democracy, like life itself, is an act of faith. There would be difficulties and dislocations but think of the things that there are left to do.

Think of what it would take to eliminate the slums in this country, to build the schools we need, to bring income up above the $3,000 level for almost everybody. To come through with the water resources which only the League has been aware of for the last 15 years. You started back before anybody else knew even what you were talking about.

You know, if we set out to eliminate the slums in the cities, to build the schools we need, to provide the water resources which we need so acutely now, and to bring the standard of living in the lowest fifth of the Nation up to $3,000, we would have the most terrible manpower shortage in this country that you can possibly imagine. And then somebody worries about whether we would have enough to do if peace came along? Well, it just isn't even an issue. I'd like you to believe and to know that there is the capacity, not only as a matter of economics but as a matter of political strength, in this country which would mean that we could make full use of the human and the economic capacity if peace should come to the world.

I welcome this opportunity to make another point. It is another aspect of an event that I mentioned very briefly before, and it has a bitter side to it. I think the country is still thinking very much in terms of the experience of 5 or 6 months ago. I don't believe this country is going to settle for letting the assassination of a President be a brutal irrelevancy. We started off by saying, you know, that this must be a reflection of an upsurge of hate and nonreason in the country. I don't believe that's right. You can't allow one or two maniacal minds to distort the reality of the great human mind of this country. We were wrong about that. We were going through a very difficult experience, and sometimes you don't realize at the moment how hard it is to have to live history. Let me simply say that I think there is still much to be done about realizing our capacity, but the one thing we have learned in the last 5 months is that there is, in the leadership of this country and in the capacity of our people, a power for continuity that has carried us through a period of crisis which would have destroyed almost every other nation in the world.

That is the contribution of all of us. It is the contribution of an unbelievably brave woman, and her family. It is the contribution of an individual of whom it is going to be our great privilege to meet in just a moment, but most of all, it seems to me to be the complete earnestness of the proposition that whatever it is that we have developed in the name of democracy, it is able to meet not just the problems of a railroad case, but the problems, too, of fighting ignorance, of fighting poverty, of fighting unemployment in this country, and then going on to the affirmative of finding that full meaning for which the human individual was certainly intended.

It is a heartwarming experience to have the feelings I have about the things that you and I believe in together, to have the opportunity I have to work for them as part of the Government, and also to come and talk with this organization about them.

The opportunity for this kind of communion, I suppose, would not be found in any other country in the world. I don't know anyplace else where you would have a situation in which a group of us could get together and talk this freely about things of this kind. That isn't maudlin. It is part of the strength that we honor; it is part of the strength that we have developed; it is part of the strength that we find in government; it's more a part of the strength that we find in ourselves. So I would just like to express what I know is also on your minds—the pride of being part of this country, the pride in having a past which is beyond parallel, and a pride in believing in a future which is going to be characterized by change, which is the order of things as a whole.

I hope you change your minds about a filibuster. Like so many things it can be an agent of good as well as of evil, which is not in defense of filibusters.

I'm terribly reminded at the moment, I think it was Josh Billings who said, "Silence is golden, but brevity is the child of silence, and a great credit to the old man."

Ladies of the League of Women Voters, the President of the United States.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Rabbi Karff's Sermon on Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been reading with interest and spiritual stimulation a booklet of 36 pages containing four of the sermons of Rabbi Samuel E. Karff preached during the past year from the pulpit of Chicago Sinai Congregation in the district I have the honor to represent. By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include one of the sermons from the booklet that I know will be appreciated by my colleagues:

THE ANATOMY OF COURAGE

If I should ask you to draw up a list of the virtues you admire, virtues you would wish your children or grandchildren to possess, I would expect many of you to include in your list that quality of mind and heart known simply as "courage." If I should follow this request by asking you to define the meaning of courage, it is quite likely that your answers would vary considerably. In this respect you would be keeping good company for numerous and diverse are man's attempts to define the essence of courage.

Webster's Unabridged Dictionary regards it as "that quality of mind which enables one to encounter danger and difficulties with firmness." Emerson opined that "the courageous man is no braver than any other ordinary man but he is braver 5 minutes longer." Somewhat facetiously, Channing Pollock offers this definition: "No man has more courage than the man who can stop after he has eaten one peanut." And the poet John Dunne suggests that a courageous man is one who performs a brave deed and does not tell anyone about it.

However we may choose to define it, courage is a virtue we greatly prize. It is a badge of honor we often wish we could claim for ourselves and always admire in others.

One way of understanding this precious quality is to exclude what it is not. Courage is not to be confused with a blustering bravado, an arrogant strutting upon the scene with stiffened back and open mouth. He who most vigorously proclaims his boldness is not to be mistaken for a man of courage. More often than not the mortal whose claims are most loudly pretentious is not the mortal most courageous. Remember the roaring lion in the Wizard of Oz?

Dorothy, the Tin Man, and his Scarecrow wend their way through the forest to see the Wizard. Suddenly they are confronted by a huge and terrifying lion. "Roar," say the lion. "Put 'em up, which one of you gonna fight? I'll fight you all. Oh, I'll fight you with one paw tied behind my back. Come on, who wants to fight? I'll fight you with my eyes closed."

Despite his bluster, the lion singles out for his attack the most vulnerable opponent of all—Dorothy's little dog, Toto. Quickly Dorothy strikes the lion on the nose. He cringes and falls. The hollowness of his roar is starkly revealed. A children's story with adult truth: courage is not to be confused with empty bluster.

Neither is it to be confused with fearlessness. Some of the bravest acts in history have been committed by men who experienced fear but refused to be overwhelmed by it. Fear uncontrolled spells terror; fear kept in check is fully compatible with courage. Most actors, speakers, prizefighters, admit to that controlled, creative fear we call "nervousness." Yet we cannot thereby call them cowards. Courage is not to be confused with fearlessness.

SHEER DARING

What then is courage? How is it manifest? What kind of courage is most devoutly to be cherished?

Sometime ago I read a story in the sports page of a daily newspaper which was particularly intriguing. It was the story of a 48-year-old forestry engineer who had just completed a very ambitious venture. He had just finished a sea voyage from Buenos Aires to Miami, a distance of 5,629 nautical miles. What is so unusual about that? Nothing—except that this voyage lasted 9 months and was taken, not on an ocean liner, but in an 18-foot folding boat. The hearty mariner reported that at one time during the voyage he paddled for 7 days and 7 nights and never touched shore. He had no radio and no compass; only a small battery light in order that (as he explained it) "some ship would not cut me in two." He reports having capsized more than 20 times and he was frequently attacked by tiger sharks.

Why did he submit himself to this harrowing adventure? He was, of course, asked this question. And this is the answer he gave. "I adore danger and love the unexpected. I like difficulties. I get no satisfaction on smooth roads. It is a challenge."

How shall we react to this saga of high adventure? We could simply decide: this man is a fool. As it is, life is so full of mortal danger, why go looking for more? Besides, what constructive purpose could such a venture possibly serve? On the other hand, this bold enterprise may engage our profound admiration. How can one help but be awed by a man willing to match wits with the majestic forces of nature? Here stands revealed a venturesome boldness; a readiness to face a grave challenge; a challenge fraught with great danger and the possibility of death.

This spirit of high adventure deserves the accolade of courage. It may be described as sheer daring and commands our respect. Such daring has many devotees. The novelist, Ernest Hemingway, found the very essence of courage in man's readiness to risk all against the raw and brutal forces of nature; the matador stalking the mad bull, the old man battling the giant marlin amid the raging torrents of the sea. This, says Hemingway, is true courage.

Such devotees of high adventure would claim that the moment of sheer daring is the moment of supreme fulfillment, yea, the moment of truth. Our Argentine sailor has expressed it thus. "I have the Bohemian soul that inspired me to touch this moment that gives contact with reality." Talk to the mountain climber, the auto racer, the deep sea diver, and you will find an almost mystical feeling that life's deepest meaning is revealed in the moment of great physical danger.

Well, just how valuable is this form of courage? How crucial for the fulfillment of human life? I think we must answer that the spirit of sheer daring is attractive and engaging but it hardly holds the key to life's deepest meaning. Here surely is a form of courage but not its quintessence.

Most often such courage is morally neutral. It bears no relation to the spiritual goals of society. Morality is concerned with the relations between man and his neighbor, yet many exponents of high adventure seek on the mountain peaks or the high seas that lonely fulfillment which they have despaired of finding in the arena of social living. Interestingly enough, the spirit of sheer daring is not to be found in the Bible. To my knowledge there is no instance of a Biblical hero exhibiting this form of courage.

True, the young David confronts the giant, Goliath (armed with nothing more than a slingshot) but remember, he does so in order to liberate his people from the oppressive yoke of the Philistines. His physical courage is an embodiment of the moral strivings of man.

I would suggest that sheer daring is absent from the Bible because our ancestors did not regard it as a vital aspect of a meaningful life. Must we not concur in this Biblical verdict?

THE COURAGE OF CONVICTION

One form of courage is plainly mirrored in the pages of Scripture. Do you recall the dramatic encounter of King David and Nathan? David's eyes have feasted on the voluptuous Bathsheba. His lust is aroused; he is determined to possess her. And what if she belongs to another man? Shall the desires of the King be denied? Ruthlessly the King plots his strategy. He dispatches her husband, Uriah. to the most dangerous frontline on the battlefield, fully expecting (and hoping) that he will be killed.

Into this dramatic setting steps the prophet, Nathan. Men such as Nathan were employed by kings for two reasons. First, they were skilled advisers, the kind clients and organizations of our day are willing to pay handsome sums to acquire. Secondly, in return for certain favors, these prophets could be counted upon to harness their talents to the goals of their masters even if it meant telling them only what they wanted to hear.

Nathan was David's adviser. He had learned of David's intrigue and was appalled by it. What shall he do? The King expects a "yes man," not a critic. Shall he leave well enough alone and hold his peace or shall he reprove the King for an act of treachery? This was Nathan's choice and if we revere him as a Biblical hero, it is because he chose to speak out. He willingly risked the loss of the King's good favor when he pointed an accusing finger at David and shouted, "Thou art the man."

This is not the spirit of high adventure but it is a form of courage, the courage of conviction, that readiness to endanger one's social position, one's economic status, and in some cases, even one's life by speaking out and acting in behalf of moral truth. Of this courage Jewish tradition speaks volumes. There are the stories of Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, whose souls were never for sale to the highest bidder; the countless tales of Jewish martyrs who risked death rather than abandon the faith of their fathers solemnly bears this trademark of courage.

The human story does not change that much. We know what it means to display the courage of convictions. We know its dangers. We know its rarity. We know how easily it can be compromised. We all feel dependent upon the good will of others. We all want to be accepted and liked. The more we acquire in social or economic benefits, the more we have to conserve; the more we stand to lose.

We may read of those remarkable individuals who are willing to take risks in behalf of moral conviction. I remember reading of a Jewish Viennese doctor of worldwide fame, who treated some of the Nazis including Hitler. When the Nazis invaded Austria, they offered him the special privilege of being saved from the brutalities of the conquerors. He refused and was later seen with other Austrian Jews scrubbing the sidewalks of Vienna with a brush dipped in lye while storm troopers stood around him and jeered.

Or consider the courage displayed by the young poet in Soviet Russia. His name is Yevtushenko. Sometime ago he published a poem entitled, "Babiyar." Babiyar is a ravine near Kiev where the Nazis murdered 40,000 Jews in 1944. In his poem, Yevtushenko implies that his own nation, the Soviet Union, is not innocent of anti-Semitism. In his poetic indictment he challenges the powers that be to explain why no gravestones stand on Babiyar, why the martyrdom of helpless Jews has not been memorialized?

For his moral challenge to the Soviet regime, Yevtushenko has been severely criticized. Some admirers have paid tribute to his uncommon audacity. Replying to the public response to his poem, Yevtushenko wrote a new poem called, A Talk.

Listen:

"They say to me
'You are a brave man.'
Not true.
Courage has never been my sin,
I simply considered it unworthy that
I should lower myself
Down to the cowardice of my fellows
I have never tried to shove the world out of its orbit
I wrote
So what
I never informed
I laughed at what was overblown
Falseness I turned to ridicule
And
Loud enough I sought to state my thoughts
Sometime
Posterity will remember
* * * and will burn with shame
When they shall have done with shame and lies,
Those strange times
When
Common honesty was called courage."

But common honesty does require courage and not only in the Soviet Union. Such courage exists in the contemporary world, but it is remarkable because it is rare—as rare perhaps as the courage of the mountain climber and the Argentine mariner.

But which is more to be admired? Which more highly to be cherished? Somehow that Austrian doctor and the Russian poet evoke in me a much deeper admiration than that Argentine sailor. The world can do without men of sheer daring, but without men of conviction life would be merely "a tale of sound and fury signifying nothing."

You and I are not prophets nor the sons of prophets. We may not be "moral martyrs" but we, too, need some measure of conviction—a readiness to stand for something good, or else we lose our identity as persons and forfeit our claim to self-respect. The life of the perpetual "yes man" is a subhuman existence. Once our jobs require a total surrender of conviction, they rob us of our identity and inflict a spiritual death. Once we purchase social acceptance by mimicking the minds of our hosts and patrons, we are no longer persons but commodities—to be sold to the highest bidder on the auction block of public opinion.

You and I and our children may, if necessary, forgo the courage of high adventure but for the fulfillment of our lives as persons we must be able to point to moments when we were willing to take risks in order to be ourselves.

QUIET COURAGE

If we stopped now, our anatomy of courage would not be complete, for we have failed to mention a form of courage whose absence would make life completely unbearable. It is the least dramatic, the least spectacular and yet the most essential, and our lives exhibit this "quiet courage" far more than we often realize. How shall we describe it?

Our daily lives contain elements of uncertainty, fearfulness, disappointment. It takes a measure of courage just to play the game of life. Each day we are called upon to make decisions in business and in family life, decisions which may be of great consequence. Often the alternatives seem almost equal, the evidence inconclusive or the choice between the lesser of two evils.

The difficulty of decision is increased by the presence of responsibility. With responsibility comes a measure of uneasiness and if you will, a tinge of fear. But we must decide—we must accept responsibility and we must hope for the best. This takes courage.

Each day we are confronted by the uncontrollable elements of life, by the mystery of an unknown tomorrow, by the possibility of great economic setbacks, of accident or grave illness. The closer these afflictions strike home, the more aware we become of their reality. We want to safeguard and properly guide the lives of our children, but we cannot completely shield them against the hazards and uncertainties of the future. So much is out of our hands.

The consciousness of our finitude also inspires a measure of fear. We know not when nor where nor how but we know that death awaits us all. Death is at one time or another a fearful prospect for all the children of men. Moreover, life is not only beclouded by imaginings of an unknown future but as well by the reality of present disappointment and grievous loss which sooner or later confronts us all. At such times also life requires a measure of quiet courage—courage to see us through the valley of shadows.

The Bible beautifully illustrates the meaning of quiet courage in its portrait of our father, Abraham. Abraham is found wandering with his beloved Sarah in a strange land. Suddenly without warning, his dear one is taken from him. The chain of companionship is abruptly shattered. Abraham is alone. His heart subdued by grief, his eyes welling up with tears, Abraham understands that he must face up to the reality of death and seek a burial place for his beloved. Plaintively he approaches the inhabitants of this strange land. The Bible records the scene in these words: "I am a stranger and a sojourner with you. Give me a possession of a burying place with you that I may bury my dead out of sight."

With this act, Abraham has faced death; he must now confront life. Sarah is with him no more but there are tasks to be done, responsibilities to be accepted. He knows not when his end will come. He must help select a wife for his son, Isaac. Sarah would expect him to fulfill this task. So in the very next episode in the Bible Abraham summons his trusted servant, Eleazer, and seeks his assistance in finding a helpmate for his son. Abraham turns from his own grief to fulfill the requirements of life.

Friends, there is nothing highly dramatic about this incident. But here is an illustration of quiet courage; the courage which enables us to carry on in the face of life's difficulties and bereavements, to carry on with a measure of composure and hope even when we are exposed to the somber shadows of the human adventure.

This "courage to be" is not the monopoly of a few hearty souls; it is much less rare than we might suppose. Headlines feed on the exploits of high adventure but life is sustained by the gift of quiet courage. As a rabbi I am often confronted by the inspiring and deeply personal saga of brave souls who manifest this precious gift.

In a congregation I served several years ago, one of them once tried to describe it. He would not call it quiet courage. I could not call it anything else. I speak of a man who was suddenly afflicted with a perilous illness, an illness whose very nature could not help but exert a shattering impact upon his life. He once described that shocking impact in words like these:

"Suddenly as the fact hits you, you find yourself spinning in air around and around, no point of reference, nothing to hold on to; all effort seems useless, all directions meaningless—round and round you spin in perpetual motion. Then in time, somehow the spinning slows down. You begin to see shapes and forms—you begin to see tasks and responsibilities—you begin to feel some ground under your feet. Somehow the gyroscope is working again. You find yourself able to carry on, you find things to do, persons to care about and you continue the journey with fear and with hope."

This, friends, was an unintended testimonial to quiet courage. Its description conjures up in my mind the image of many men and women who have felt life's hardest blows, whether in the guise of illness, serious economic setback, family discord, or tragic loss; and yet have summoned the strength necessary to carry on with love, with determination, with a sense of purpose, and with a measure of confidence.

God is the giver of many gifts. Often these gifts are bestowed upon us whether or not we formally acknowledge His presence in our lives. An atheist may possess a brilliant mind. A nonbeliever may be blessed with courage from a God he does not profess to know. But God's gifts are infinitely enriched and most deeply experienced as the fruit of our active relation to Him. God is the giver of courage and its deepest experience is derived from our prayerful communion with Him.

What courage shall we seek to find in His presence? The sheer daring which girds us for high adventure? * * * perhaps, but this is a luxury. It is expendable. The courage of conviction? Yes, we need such courage in order to preserve our self-respect and our very identity as human beings. But above all, we need that "quiet courage" which belonged to the Psalmist when he declared, "I shall fear no evil for Thou art with me." Amen.

The Challenge of Trade Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 21, 1964

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, throughout the legislative deliberations here, over the past several years, on the expansion of our Trade Agreements Act I have consistently stated I was not opposed to the basic principles under-

lying the long-range purposes of the overall program.

However, I have just as consistently maintained that the sentiment expressed by President Eisenhower in 1953 and the warning presented in the report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy should be rigidly observed.

President Eisenhower, in a statement on trade policy contained in his first state of the Union message declared:

> This (trade expansion) objective must not ignore legitimate safeguarding of industries, agriculture, and labor standards.

The report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy contains this admonition:

> American labor should not be subjected to unfair competition as a part of any program to expand our foreign trade.

The original legislative proposal to greatly expand trade agreements contained pledges to guard against the disintegration of American industries from accelerated and excessive foreign competition which could not possibly and immediately be met by any reasonable and practicable means; avenues of appeal to presidential relief authority, under these circumstances, were established. Unfortunately, they have mostly proved to be little more than expensive but idle gestures contrary to the general understanding of the intent of the Congress.

Considering the course, thus far, of progress of the European Common Market, the very serious unemployment problem facing us, the rather unfortunate tendencies of some of our friends abroad to take the fullest trade advantages of us, the dubious wisdom of the apparent overzealousness of some of our own representatives to too generously tender these foreign competitors even more advantages before appropriate adjustments can be made at home, it is little wonder that more and more Members of Congress are introducing more and more separate pieces of legislation to relieve particular situations and more and more responsible business leaders are becoming increasingly concerned over this complex problem.

As I have said before it is truly not a simple or easy problem to solve but it is just as truly our representative responsibility to try to insure the projection of a fair trade program that will be fair to Americans as well as our foreign friends.

On this score, it is my earnest hope that the legislative wisdom of the Congress, the Presidential prudence, our effective tariff negotiators, the understanding cooperation of our friends abroad and the alert attitudes of business and labor will all combine to sensibly project our international trade agreements while patriotically preventing the visitation of extreme hardships upon many of our regional industries and workers and preserving essential defense resources that we can ill afford to dissipate in the face of ever-threatening Communist expansion.

For the benefit of my colleagues and as evidence and example of the extreme concern with this subject existing in the national business communities, I am pleased to include, at this point, the authoritative views and recommendations of one of the most respected and esteemed industrial leaders in the Nation, Mr. Ralph F. Gow, president of the Norton Co., of Worcester, Mass. An extract from his recent communication to me in the matter follows:

NORTON CO.,
Worcester, Mass.

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DONOHUE: You are aware of the GATT negotiations for the general reduction of tariff barriers being conducted by the Honorable Christian A. Herter. This subject is of great importance to the continued health and vigorous growth of the machine tool industry of the United States.

U.S. machine tool industry trade associations have presented their views against reductions of the U.S. tariff before the Tariff Commission and the Office of Trade Information of the Department of Commerce, pointing out the essentiality of the American machine tool industry from the point of view of national defense and the importance of maintaining a vigorous machine tool industry in this country. We have presented figures showing the increase in imports of machine tools of foreign manufacture over the last few years and the importance of avoiding action which will accelerate this trend in the future.

The machine tool industry is not competitive with foreign manufacturers from the point of view of labor and material costs. The present tariff structure on imports of machine tools (approximately 12 percent ad valorem) serves in a small way to reduce the foreign cost advantages. This basic industry whose products have a very high labor content is vulnerable to competition from machines made in low-wage areas.

While world production of machine tools has grown rapidly since 1955, the U.S. share of world production has shrunk, and we are no longer the world leader in production volume. Unable to compete at U.S. prices in world markets, most important manufacturers (including Norton Co.) have established manufacturing sources overseas.

A further reduction in U.S. tariffs can only accelerate the trend to manufacture overseas with its consequent adverse effects on American labor and investment.

I know you are aware of the importance of the machine tool industry to New England and to Worcester in particular. The importance of the machine tool division of Norton Co. to the economic structure of the Worcester area is emphasized by the following facts:

In 1963 property taxes on Norton's machine tool division were paid to the city of Worcester in an amount of $165,480. Our tax bill for the machine tool plant for the year 1964 will be $181,494. This is a substantial contribution to the real estate tax income of the city of Worcester.

In 1963 we employed 850 employees of all categories, having a payroll of over $5,844,145. A major portion of this payroll was spent in the Worcester County area, contributing to the strength of the local economy. Loss of all or a part of the machine tool division payroll in Worcester obviously would have a depressing effect. Many machine tool parts and components are purchased from local manufacturers and suppliers, and the loss or reduction of this business locally would have an adverse effect on the local economy.

We feel that it is unfortunate the GATT negotiations for tariff reductions are being carried out in the face of many uncertainties as to foreign competition. We have not as yet experienced the full impact of the European Common Market on European machine tool production, but we can expect continued growth of European and Japanese manufacturing capacity, in which event we anticipate rapidly increasing imports of low-price machine tools into the United States, especially if the existing inadequate tariff is further reduced.

One positive step which can be taken is the removal of machine tools of all classifications from the bargaining list currently being negotiated by the Herter Committee. I ask that you take all possible action to achieve this end. The recommended action is believed to be fully justifiable as being in the national interest.

Sincerely yours,

R. F. GOW,
President.

The 50th Anniversary of SS. Peter and Paul Parish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the early summer and in response to a request from Alexander G. Kapocius, public relations director of SS. Peter and Paul Parish on the far South Side of Chicago, I penciled my message of congratulation, appreciation, and good wishes to the parish on the occasion of its 50th anniversary celebration.

The Reverend Stanley R. Petrauskas is the present and the seventh pastor to be assigned to serve the needs of SS. Peter and Paul Parish in West Pullman.

CONGRATULATIONS ON YOUR GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

BIOGRAPHY OF PASTOR

He was appointed to the position on January 11, 1957, by His Eminence, the late Samuel Cardinal Stritch.

Reverend Petrauskas was born in Lithuania on November 25, 1906. He attended the St. Bartholomew elementary school in Waukegon, and following his graduation from elementary school, attended the Quigley preparatory seminary in Chicago.

He entered the St. Mary of the Lake seminary in Mundelein, Ill., and was ordained a priest by His Eminence, the late George Cardinal Mundelein in 1932.

His first appointment was to serve as an assistant at the St. George parish in Bridgeport for an 8-year period.

He then was transferred to the Nativity BVM parish in Marquette Park for another 8-year term.

His third appointment sent him to the St. Anthony parish in Cicero, Ill., where he stayed for 8½ years.

He came to SS. Peter and Paul from St. Anthony.

Reverend Petrauskas celebrated his 25th anniversary of his ordination shortly after arriving at SS. Peter and Paul, on May 21, 1957.

His 30th year anniversary was celebrated in 1962 with a party in his honor.

Father Petrauskas has done an outstanding job at SS. Peter and Paul and through his untiring efforts, the parish has become one of the most progressive in the Archdiocese.

ASSISTANT PASTORS

Rev. Bruno M. Grinis was assigned to the parish in July 1960 to take the place of the

Reverend Anthony Bendziunas, who was transferred to the Province of God parish.

Reverend Grinis was born on January 27, 1916, the son of Walter and Mary Grinis. He attended the Nativity BVM parish elementary school.

Following his successful completion of the philosophy and theology courses at the St. Mary of the Lake seminary, Reverend Grinis was ordained a priest on May 18, 1940.

Rev. Fabian Kireilis was invited to serve the parish by the pastor on July 26, 1958. Previous to this he was an assistant in Troy, N.Y., and from May 1951 through September 1957, he served as an assistant at Ilion, N.Y.

Reverend Kirelis was born in Lithuania on April 6, 1912.

On August 2, 1944, he took refuge into Germany along with the other Lithuanians to escape the threat of Communism.

In 1951, at the end of the immigration period, he came to the United States.

Rev. John Figlewski, s.P. was born in Scranton, Pa., on August 29, 1896. He attended the Sacred Heart parochial school and the St. Thomas high school and college in Scranton, Pa.

He received his philosophy and theology education at the St. Francis seminary at Loretto, Pa.

He was ordained on June 14, 1919, and celebrated his 45th year as a priest this past June.

Mr. Speaker, here is the message of sincere congratulation that I penciled in my office on a Sunday in early June, leaving it for typing and mailing on the following Monday:

To all the good men and women who have contributed of their means and effort to the 50 golden years of SS. Peter and Paul Church go my warmest thoughts.

For half a century SS. Peter and Paul Church has been a bulwark of moral strength and of good neighborliness as well as a mighty force in the religious life of our community, to which SS. Peter and Paul has aided in giving a spiritual enrichment.

My prayer is that God's blessing will continue to shine and to be reflected in the good works of SS. Peter and Paul in the half century ahead to complete its centennial.

But, Mr. Speaker, this message does not appear in the golden anniversary book just issued, and I am in the unhappy position, I am afraid, of being thought not interested in the work of service for half a century of the pastors and the flock in this fine parish. The reason is that the message I penciled that Sunday in early June was never typed. Apparently it had got misplaced and overlooked in the process of typing. I found it after a search when I learned that it never had been received by Mr. Kapocius. I am sending my penciled copy to the pastor of SS. Peter and Paul as a bit of proof of my good intentions, perhaps also a bit of proof, if such were necessary, that the human frailty against which our Constitution warns us do creep up on us even in a congressional office.

Nikola Petkov

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the last war, the leaders of western democracies were in for some severe shocks and disappointments. As late as 1947 they still nursed the hope that the Communist leaders of the Kremlin would abide by certain basic international agreements and honor at least some of their contractual agreements. One of these was that the Communists were to allow free and unfettered elections in Communist-dominated countries, and that the non-Communist candidates to office were free to express their views. But these illusions and hopes were shattered, and the West learned that these Communist leaders were no better than the fanatical Fascists and Nazis. This was proved to them by the Communist treachery in Bulgaria.

There the Communists took steps to crush effectively all opposition groups and elements. Under the all-powerful steamroller policy of the Communist Party, all opposition was eliminated and their leaders liquidated. By 1947 there was left only the agrarian group led by its courageous leader Nikola Petkov. He with his group carried on the first against heavy odds, and while doing this he was arrested, condemned as an "enemy of the people," and executed on September 23, 1947. On the 17th anniversary of this heinous crime, this judicial murder of this upholder of democracy, we pay tribute to his blessed memory.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Soil and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1964

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, made an excellent address recently, August 27, to the annual meeting of the east central area of the Arkansas Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts at Stuttgart, Ark.

In his address, he reviewed the splendid progress being made in soil and water conservation, watershed protection, and river basin surveys, and he also made several recommendations for improvement in legislation pertaining to the watershed program administered by the Soil Conservation Service.

Because I am extremely proud that Arkansas leads all the States in several phases of soil and water conservation, and because I believe these recommendations for improvement merit serious consideration, I ask unanimous consent to have the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

TALK BY REPRESENTATIVE WILBUR D. MILLS, OF ARKANSAS, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE EAST CENTRAL AREA OF THE ARKANSAS ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS, STUTTGART, ARK., AUGUST 27, 1964

Once again it is my great pleasure to join with my friends in the annual meeting of the east central area of the Arkansas Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

It's always good to come home. And it is especially stimulating to participate in your affairs. You are the leaders in work that is bringing lasting benefits to our State, to each of our communities, and to our Nation.

Soil and water resources are the basis of our strength as a people and as a Nation. If these resources are abundant and strong, then the people and the Nation will be strong. If they are not strong, America will not realize her destiny but will join countless other civilizations lost in antiquity through neglect of their natural resources.

You are doing a job of tremendous significance for all of us, and you deserve the respect and admiration of all citizens for the manner in which you are doing it. You have my respect and admiration. And you have my support. You shall continue to have it.

As you know, your east central area and my congressional district cover about the same territory. It is a source of pride to me that the soil and water conservation districts in this area stand out in the State for their accomplishments, and that Arkanshas itself stands out in the Southeast and in the Nation as well. That puts your activities right near the top in the national picture.

I've been digging into the records a bit, thanks to Bill Davey at Little Rock and to our old friend Hollis Williams in Washington. I'd like to highlight some of my findings.

First, let's look at how Arkansas soil and water conservation districts stood in the Southeast and in the Nation in fiscal year 1963.

In average acres of soil surveys per man-year, Arkansas ranked second in the Southeast and 14th in the Nation. In basic conservation plans and revisions, both in average plans per man-year and cost per plan, Arkansas ranked first in the Southeast and first in the Nation.

In landowners and operators assisted per man-year and the cost per operator assisted, Arkansas ranked first in the Southeast and first in the Nation.

In services provided per man-year, Arkansas ranked second in both the Southeast and the Nation and first in both the Southeast and the Nation in average cost per service in this category.

In percent of landowners and operators assisted in applying practice, Arkansas ranked first in the Southeast and third in the Nation.

In the dollar value of watershed project agreements, Arkansas was first in the Southeast and third in the Nation.

Arkansas indeed is in the front line of accomplishments in both the Southeast and the Nation.

Arkansas is a frontrunner among the States also in its contributions of funds and services to the soil conservation districts program. In fiscal year 1963, for example, Arkansas contributed a total of $1,437,320 in funds and services to the districts program. Sources of the funds and contributions were local government, State government, private individuals, commercial companies, and institutions and organizations.

While we're on the financial end of your conservation work, let me point out that the east central area was second only to the Northeast area in quorum court appropriations and contributions to soil and water conservation districts in 1964. The east central areas appropriation from the counties was $6,000 and the county contributions totaled $1,200. Throughout the State, the quorum court appropriations totaled $32,835, and the contributions were $10,040. The contributions were mainly in office space, storage space, and utilities.

You should be proud, too, of the fact that in the east-central area 11,600 landowners and operators—about 68 percent of the total number of farms in the area—are cooperators with your local soil and water conservation districts and are developing conservation plans on their farms. More than 9,600 basic conservation plans have been prepared with the assistance of the Soil Conservation Service on more than 2 million acres.

In Arkansas as a whole, as of March 1964, 83,357 landowners and operators were district cooperators. This is 70 percent of the farms in the State. Of these 73,324 had basic conservation plans for their farms covering more than 14.8 million acres.

The Soil Conservation Service informs me that new standard soil surveys have been completed on about 8.5 million acres in Arkansas and that soil conservation type surveys are available for conservation planning on about 15.6 million acres.

In the east central area, standard soil surveys have been made on about 1.6 million acres, and soil conservation type surveys are available on 2.5 million acres.

I'm pleased to note, too, that Arkansas and east central area farmers have become interested in recreation for profit as a new farm enterprise.

In the past fiscal year 73 landowners and operators, 16 of them in the east central area, have established one or more recreation enterprises, and 179, including 34 in the east central area, planned to do so.

Your districts in the east central area are moving forward with watershed protection and flood prevention projects, too.

I understand that you have filed 20 project applications and that plans have been completed and approved on three of these: Flat Creek, Upper Cultoches Bay, and Mud Creek. The plan on a fourth project, Cooper Creek, is almost complete, and planning authorization has ben requested on the 212,000-acre tricounty project in Independence, Lawrence, and Sharp Counties.

Since watershed projects are initiated and carried out by local people, they inevitably stand or fall on the ability of the local participants to work together for solutions to their common problems. Ewell Ray Coleman, supervisor of Moorefield Soil Conservation District, says that in organizing for the tricounty projects their association levied a voluntary assessment on all lands to be benefited by the project. The funds will be used for organization purposes, including the creation of a taxing district under State laws for paying local costs. The fact that almost 100 percent of the landowners have paid this voluntary assessment is a good indication that the project will move forward.

This spirit of cooperation is exemplified by accomplishments in the Flat Creek watershed in Lawrence County. Here a multitude of people have joined forces to install a project that will protect hill land from erosion and good bottomland from flooding, provide drainage for wet land, water for fish and wildlife development, and facilities for recreational use by the general public.

Substantial help has come from the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, the Arkansas Highway Department, the Lawrence County government, the Craighead County Electrical Cooperative, the soil and water conservation district, and the benefited landowners themselves, represented by the Flat Creek watershed improvement district. The Federal Government has helped through assistance from the Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service, and the Farmers Home Administration.

Six dams have been completed in this project, including a 645-acre lake for flood protection, recreation, and fish and wildlife development. A contract has been awarded to complete the planned channel improvement, and work is in progress on the recreational facilities planned for the State park adjoining the lake. Of the 147 farmers in the watershed, 141 are district cooperators and have applied almost 80 percent of the planned land treatment measures.

I'm told that throughout the State, 89 watershed applications have been filed, and 35 of these have been authorized for planning. Plans have been completed and construction authorized on 22 projects. Plans for three additional projects are complete and subject to approval by House and Senate Agricultural Committees. Construction

has been completed in five of the watersheds, and contracts awarded that will complete four additional projects. Nationwide, I'm proud to say that Arkansas ranks fifth in the number of watershed project applications submitted and in number of operational projects.

During the past year, plans were completed on six projects. This is well above past production. The increase resulted from the action of the Arkansas General Assembly in increasing the State appropriation for watershed planning from $50,000 to $100,000, annually.

The success that has been attained in the State in soil and water conservation work is due in no small measure to the strong support of the State and county governments. In addition to the direct appropriation for watershed planning, the State legislature also voted over $2,000 annually for each of the 76 soil and water conservation districts in Arkansas. County quorum courts appropriate about $33,000, annually, as I have mentioned. These actions not only add to the district's resources—they also pay tribute to the services freely given by the district supervisors. And I might add that they also endorse congressional support for soil and water conservation appropriations.

The State has helped in other ways. State laws have been enacted that provide for the creation and operation of watershed improvement districts to cosponsor watershed projects, to enable water distribution districts to cooperate in Public Law 566 projects, and to provide for the formation of the Arkansas Soil and Water Conservation Commission to lend direct guidance and support to the supervisors of soil and water conservation districts.

There has been personal attention from Governor Faubus, who has supported and approved State appropriations and enabling legislation, encourage the cooperation of State agencies in the development of multiple-purpose watersheds, such as the Flat Creek project, counseled with sponsors and landowners in proposed watershed projects as to their willingness to assume local obligations, and participated in countless meetings of conservation groups.

I should like to comment also on another very important phase of resource conservation. I refer to comprehensive river basin surveys that are conducted cooperatively by the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Corps of Engineers, and Health, Education, and Welfare at the Federal level, and by agencies of the State.

Two of these surveys are in progress in this area—those on the red and the white—and two others participated in by the Department of Agriculture and the Corps of Engineers are underway elsewhere in our State—on the Arkansas and the Poteau.

These basin surveys tie into our overall resource program in several ways. One of the most important, certainly in communities needing watershed help, is that the surveys identify and recognize potential Public Law 566 projects.

I believe you district supervisors should associate yourselves with these river basin surveys in every possible way. They are worthy of your time and effort in much the same way as are regular district operations and watershed projects.

At my last meeting with you in October 1960, I discussed several legislative proposals with you—proposals that pertained to the small watershed program—proposals that would strengthen operation of that program and make it more useful to all groups.

I'm pleased that two of these proposals are now in effect. I refer to definite and specified cost sharing for agricultural water management structures in place of the former complicated, indefinite, and unworkable formulas. The other measure adopted is authority to provide storage for future water supply at Federal expense on guarantee that the cost will be repaid when use of the stored water begins.

But still to come are other desirable proposals that we should continue to fight for.

We need authority for the Federal Government to administer watershed construction contracts if requested by the local sponsoring organization to do so. Many local organizations are not equipped to let contracts and are being forced into an untenable and dangerous position by present requirements.

We need authority at the State level to provide assistance to local organizations in obtaining land, easements, and rights-of-way for watershed projects.

Some forms of such aid might be: giving local organizations condemnation authority; providing some degree of reimbursement from State funds; providing State financed legal aid to local organizations; having rights-of-way and easements purchased in the name of the State with State funds. I don't think it is fair to expect all easements to be either donated by private citizens or all such costs to be borne by small local organizations. The State governments benefit greatly from watershed projects.

As another aid in obtaining land, easements and rights-of-way, we should amend Public Law 566, the Small Watershed Act. Presently, this law prohibits the use of funds appropriated under the act to acquire land rights. Perhaps this is all right, but there is no reason why the act should not be amended to make it possible to use other Federal funds, obtained for community improvements and other purposes, to acquire land rights for watershed projects.

We need to substantially increase Federal appropriations for watershed planning. This is a point that we must get across to the Bureau of the Budget nad the Senate in particular.

The House of Representatives, I'm pleased to report, acted favorably on an amendment to raise the limitation on the size of watershed dams from 5,000 to 12,500 acre-feet. This amendment should be passed. The limitation should be lifted. It is hampering the program in many areas. Let us all continue to work for this change.

This year, I was one who made my wishes known to the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations concerning the 20 percent cut in planning funds in the budget. The House committee restored this cut and the House adopted the report. Unfortunately, the Senate did not go along and the matter is in conference between the House and the Senate.

More funds are needed for planning because each year the number of watershed applications filed by local sponsoring organizations exceeds the number the Soil Conservation Service is able to service with planning funds provided by the State and Federal Governments. The net result is the accumulation of a growing number of unserviced requests for assistance.

An additional major need in the watershed program is to accelerate the installation of land treatment measures.

The best possible way to accomplish this, in my opinion, is through cost-share contracts based on complete farm conservation plans similar to the provisions of the Great Plains conservation program.

This would get the land treatment job done on a planned, scheduled basis, and the entire cost-sharing would be guaranteed at the time the plan is developed and the contract signed.

Land treatment in watershed projects is proceeding haphazardly, as you know. This situation is particularly critical in the drainage areas above reservoirs where local organizations are required by law to carry out needed treatment measures on not less than 50 percent of the land.

These are recommendations that I think would strengthen the watershed program. I shall do all that I can to help bring about these desirable changes.

Indeed, I pledge you my support in all your ventures. You are engaged in a great work—noble work—the benefits of which are not for the present alone but will multiply manifold and accrue in even greater measure to future generations.

You are building for the future. You are investing in the future. You are giving of your time and your energy, not for pay, not for glory, but to serve your fellow men. This is the supreme gift of mankind. I salute you, and wish you well.

History of SS. Peter and Paul Parish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the story of SS. Peter and Paul Parish in Chicago, formed 50 years ago by a small group of Lithuanian immigrants, is so well told in the golden anniversary book that I am extending my remarks to include excerpts that I know will be of keen interest to many of my colleagues. It is the kind of success story, with its chapters of dedicated toil and sacrifice, that is Americana in its finest expression.

The above-mentioned follows:

OUR PARISH HISTORY

From a very humble beginning our parish has grown to become one of the largest parishes on the far South Side of Chicago. Its prosperity was largely due to the early parishioners, who worked together to establish the parish and then continued to support it with their donations. Their donations of nickels, dimes, and quarters helped the parish erect its buildings and purchase all of the necessary furnishings. These dedicated parishioners also helped with voluntary acts of physical labor whenever required.

The parish was formed in 1913 by a small group of Lithuanian immigrants who settled in the West Pullman area. They came to the local area because there were a large number of industries located in there and many manufacturing plants were situated in the area to the east. Here they found work and were able to support their families.

* * * * *

The Reverend Michael Krusas, pastor of Providence of God at the time and who eventually was to become a monsignor, aided the group in its formation and provided many helpful suggestions. He became involved through Kiupelis, his first cousin, who constantly sought his advice. On many different occasions the committee journeyed to the rectory at 18th and Union in order to work out the necessary arrangements associated with the formation of a parish.

After many more meetings of the entire group, a petition was circulated and signed by over 75 families. It was presented to the chancery office and permission was immediately granted to form the SS. Peter and Paul Parish. This was in the fall of 1913 and our parish became the 11th of 13 Lithuanian parishes established in the Chicago archdiocese.

* * * * *

The Reverend Norbert Lukosius was appointed the first pastor of SS. Peter and Paul and came to work with the organizers in late 1913.

He made arrangements with the pastor of Assumption BVM parish, which was made up of Polish speaking people, to have SS. Peter and Paul hold its services there until the church was erected. The pastor consented.

As a result, the Lithuanians began worshipping as parishioners of SS. Peter and Paul on February 15, 1914. They were able to use the church after the Polish services on Sunday mornings and, except for a $5 weekly rent payment, the entire collection was theirs.

* * * * *

The first financial account of the parish that appears in the ledgers is for the month of January 1914. It shows that the pastor received $74.35 form the treasurer of the organization committee and that a large number of donations were received when the pastor went from home to home soliciting contributions.

* * * * *

In March 1914, the ground was broken for the church and school building. A procession from All Saints parish marched to West Pullman to participate in the festivities and cheered when the Reverend Lukosius turned the first shovel of dirt.

It was requested by the chancery office that the parishioners build a church to hold at least 300 persons and that a school be incorporated.

* * * * *

The first parish picnic was staged in the West Pullman Grove, 123d and Union, which was to be the site of almost all of the parish picnics for the next 20 years, on Sunday, June 28, 1914.

A large crowd attended the picnic and the profits were used for the parish needs. Suits were raffled in order to raise money. The weather was inclement, but the spirits were brightened when the choir from Our Lady of Vilna parish made a surprise appearance and sang many selections throughout the afternoon.

Our final payment on the church lots amounted to $1,444.50 and it was paid on June 12. The deed was then issued to us.

At the cornerstone blessing on June 19, the collection amounted to $109.21.

* * * * *

Biggest day of the parish came on October 28, 1914, when the late Archbishop James Edward Quigley arrived in West Pullman to dedicate and bless the church and school building and the parish grounds. All of the organizations were well represented and a number of societies from the All Saints and Assumption parishes attended. This marked the formal beginning of our parish.

* * * * *

A small portion of the building expense was paid from the early revenues collected. However, a loan for $22,500 had to be obtained from Cremin and O'Connor at the usual 5-percent interest rate. It was held by the Catholic bishop of Chicago.

The initial interest payments of the loan were to be paid twice yearly and amounted to $562.50 each time.

* * * * *

Reverend Lukosius was very much interested in the parish. He labored very hard to help the parish and on many occasions his monthly salary of $66.66 was donated to the parish. Some of the small improvements were also financed by him.

He continued to visit the homes for donations. He stressed the fact that the church has to be supported and the parishioners should do their utmost to aid the parish.

Two collections were always taken up at the Sunday masses. One was for the church and the second was for pew rent. A parishioner had to buy a yearly pew card at a cost of $6 which was later increased to $10 or else make an appropriate donation in the second collection.

From 1915 through 1917, a few school furnishings were purchased and installed, such as school desks, but there were no teachers available. Finally, in February 1917, Miss M. Andzuliute was appointed to serve as a teacher for the school. She learned quickly that the job could not be handled properly by one teacher and asked for more help. A second teacher, Miss Ag. Kusleikint, was located and hired by the pastor.

Both teachers held out until June when the term ended and then tendered their resignations. The school again was vacant and the children had to attend the West Pullman public school.

* * * * *

The church bells were hung in October 1918 and a few weeks after that, the Reverend George Paskauskas was appointed as the second pastor of the parish. It marked the beginning of his 9-year residence in the parish.

Although over 75 families had signed the petition to have the church established, not all of these families became parishioners. Some had just signed so that the quota would be met. As a result, only some 60 families made up the parish roster in the very beginning. The same number of parishioners were still around when Father Paskauskas took over as pastor.

* * * * *

In January 1920, the parish was able to pay $1,000 toward its principal of the mortgage and in addition spent over $1,000 in redecorating the church.

Realizing that the backbone of the parish is in its children, Reverend Paskauskas started a program to have the elementary school formed so that the children could get a proper Catholic education.

Based on the previous experiences, the Reverend Paskauskas tried a new approach. Instead of looking for lay teachers, the pastor went to the motherhouse of the Sisters of St. Casimir and outlined his plan to Mother Maria Kaupas. After their discussion, Mother Maria arranged to have three sisters come to West Pullman to teach the youngsters. They were to live in the convent at All Saints until our convent was built.

In September 1921, our elementary school was formally opened.

* * * * *

In April 1922, three lots were purchased midway on the east side of Emerald Avenue between 122d and 123rd Streets for a total cost of $1,223. This land was to be used for the nuns' convent. By the end of the year, the bungalow structure was constructed on 1½ lots at a cost of $5,220.68.

In June 1823, an additional 1½ lots were purchased adjacent to the convent on the north side. This land was to be used for the hall, along with the 1½ lots that remained from the nuns' portion of the land.

In 1923 a sum of $1,028.11 was used to furnish the convent, which included an altar in its chapel.

The parishioners were very excited on March 24, 1924, when they learned that their archbishop, His Excellency George Mundelein was elevated to the sacred college of cardinals.

During both 1924 and 1925 two payments of $3,500 each were applied to our mortgage and our debt was reduced to a figure of $14,500.

* * * * *

In 1927, Rev. John J. Statkus replaced Father Paskauskas, who was sent to serve as pastor at All Saints.

While Father Statkus was in charge of our parish, there were many unfortunate happenings. The parish rectory caught fire on two occasions and the parish began falling into debt. By 1930, which was the early part of the great depression, the parish mortgage notes had to be renewed.

In 1931, the parish debt stood at $22,786.66 or over $200 more than the original debt which was incurred when the church was built 17 years previous.

The parish progress was at a standstill at this point.

On September 1, 1931, the Reverend Anicetus Linkus was appointed the fourth pastor to serve us. Father Linkus was sent to us from the Holy Cross Parish where he was an outstanding assistant.

Father Linkus had many talents; these included a good business head, ability to get the most from each parishioner and was a public relations expert. He had served as an editor or a reporter for many of the Lithuanian periodicals and daily newspapers.

He got into the middle of things immediately and began working with one aim: to reduce the debt and attract more parishioners.

Saints Peter and Paul was still primarily a parish for Lithuanians and the sermons were preached in this language.

In 1932, Father Linkus was in the midst of trouble. His parishioners, for the most part, were out of work. The donations were smaller than ever. Because of this, the various bills continued to mount up.

Father Linkus then began staging many parish affairs and kept the parish hall filled with some kind of an activity each weekend. This proved to be worthwhile financially. These activities attracted many local area residents.

* * * * *

In December 1932, Father Linkus managed to have the debt reduced to $20,880 despite the fact that the sacristy was built alongside of the church and the church was remodeled and repaired. The cost of the new sacristy was about $2,000.

Father Linkus, who always used new and revolutionary ideas, introduced the 12 noon mass on Sundays on April 23, 1933. Our parish was one of the first that attempted this move and after a slow start, it became the mass with the largest attendance.

In December 1933, Father Linkus trimmed the debt to $18,157.75. A further reduction was made in 1934 and in 1935 and the debt was chopped down to $15,000.

* * * * *

On April 16, 1939, Father Linkus was honored with the Cross of Gediminas from the Republic of Lithuania. He was named a Knight of the Order by Dr. Petras Daudzvardis, Lithuanian Consul General in Chicago.

* * * * *

When he made his trip to Lithuania in 1937, he was welcomed with open arms in the country in which he was born. When he returned to the United States he brought back a souvenir for each of our school-children.

When the parish celebrated its 25th anniversary in 1939, only 167 families were registered on the roster.

In January 1940, a sum of $8,000 was paid on the principal of our mortgage and left a meager indebtedness of $4,000. This huge payment came as a result of the campaign that Father Linkus started for the silver jubilee celebration. He encouraged every parishioner to donate at least $25 toward the parish debt. The campaign, as you can note, was very successful.

In December 1940, Father Linkus turned in a sum of $2,000 to clear the debt at the

Catholic bishop's office, but a $2,000 debt still remained with McMahon and Hoban.

* * * * *

Our first major building fund program was started in May 1955. An all-out effort was made to collect contributions for this program.

* * * * *

The construction of the addition and enlargement of the school and convent was originally proposed at $140,000, but the final figure amounted to $188,000.

His Eminence Samuel Cardinal Stritch blessed and dedicated the new buildings in September 1956 when the school was officially opened for use.

* * * * *

With the appointment of the Reverend Stanley R. Petrauskas as the seventh pastor of the parish in January 1957 the largest building program ever to be undertaken by the West Pullman parishioners had begun.

The rapid growth of the West Pullman, Colonial Village, and Calumet Park communities had increased the membership of the parish almost six times. Larger and more spacious quarters had to be erected to accommodate the parishioners.

The building boom of the single-family dwellings east of the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks to Michigan Avenue and from 124th to 127th Streets attracted many younger families of every nationality and descent. This area previously was nothing but farmland.

Although the Lithuanians were the majority group for the first 40 years, the picture began to change in the middle 1950's. At present, there really is no one single dominating group.

As a result, the sermons and Gospel were changed to English. Only the 8 a.m. and the 10 a.m. masses were reserved for the Lithuanian-speaking parishioners.

Currently, only the 8 a.m. mass is for the Lithuanians. The Gospel is read in both languages, but the sermon is in Lithuanian.

Additional masses were added on Sunday mornings to alleviate the crowded situation, but it did not help much. Eight masses were being said at the church and two more were said at the hall, which was converted into a chapel.

* * * * *

On April 23, 1958, the parish received permission to build another church. The debt of the parish was $197,000 and we were able to get a loan for another $235,000 for the construction of the church. The parish rectory, which was estimated at $130,000, had to be deferred until later.

Ground was broken on June 22, 1958, by Bishop Raymond P. Hillinger, auxiliary of Chicago. The building program was started immediately and the cornerstone was blessed by Msgr. Edward M. Burke, chancellor of Chicago's archdiocese, on October 12, 1958.

SS. Peter and Paul was the last church to be sanctioned by His Eminence, Samuel Cardinal Stritch.

His Eminence Albert Cardinal Meyer dedicated the church, located at 125th and Halsted, on May 31, 1959. The parishioners celebrated the festive occasion with a dedication banquet the same evening at the Martinique nightclub.

Also in 1958, some 200 feet of land on Halsted Street, across from the church, was purchased at a cost of $20,000. It was paved in 1960 for $3,500. This is our church parking lot.

After the church was built, the old church was converted into classrooms at an expense of $20,000 in 1961 and the sprinkling (fire prevention) system was added at a cost of $18,000.

* * * * *

During the period of 1959–64, the Reverend Petrauskas had paid a sum of $238,000 on the parish debt including the various land purchases.

* * * * *

Our church is of modernized Gothic architecture and is made up of brick and lanon stone. The 60-foot tower to the left of the entrance is now considered to be one of West Pullman's landmarks.

The two lifelike statues of the Apostles Peter and Paul, patrons of the parish, welcome the parishioners each time that they arrive to worship. They are located on the church's facade.

The Kennedy-Johnson Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Charles Bartlett's column published on August 20 contained an excellent summary of the success of the economic policies of President Kennedy and President Johnson.

The article follows:

THE KENNEDY-JOHNSON PROSPERITY

Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon and Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Committee of Economic Advisers, engaged in some justifiable crowing on the state of the economy as they appeared before the Democratic platform committee Tuesday.

"The story is so good," Mr. Heller said as he left the meeting, "that it is almost embarrassing to talk about it." Indeed, there is great irony in the fact that the economic area, in which the most informed people had the most reservations as John F. Kennedy took office, should prove 4 years later to be the strongest point in the record that Lyndon B. Johnson will take to the country.

The economy has run, as Messrs. Dillon and Heller pointed out, for 42 months of unchecked expansion, a record for peacetime. It has expanded more, in real dollar terms, in 4 years than it did in 8 years of the Eisenhower administration. It has largely escaped the wage-price instability of the Truman era.

The 1961 reservations on Mr. Kennedy's management of the economy had some merit. He had run on a platform and waged a campaign that implied a lively return to Keynesian policies. His background in economics was limited. When someone asked during one of his early days in the White House about a professor who once tutored him in the subject, Mr. Kennedy replied, "He has probably jumped off a cliff."

He wisely set out to surround himself with advisers who would reflect an intelligent spectrum of economic theory. He had met Mr. Heller on a campaign trip to Minneapolis and invited him to join the administration as a man who would distill liberal thinking. After a long search for a Secretary of the Treasury, he was attracted to Mr. Dillon as a moderate with banking experience and sound judgment.

Working with these two men and his chief staff aid, Theodore Sorensen, Mr. Kennedy picked his way among the alternatives. His advisers often differed, as he wanted them to, but their consensus enabled him to pay balanced respect to the conflicting problems posed by the outflow of gold and by economic stagnation.

After Mr. Kennedy had been at it for awhile, Arthur Burns, an economist who advised Dwight Eisenhower, warned that his fiddling with the economy would produce more inflation and another crisis in the balance of payments. Leon Keyserling, who had advised Mr. Truman, cautioned that Mr. Kennedy was doing too little to meet the problems and was courting another recession.

A second major irony is that in spite of the persistent hostility toward Mr. Kennedy by business, the statements to the Democratic platform committee suggest that industry has been better pleased than labor by the fruits of the past 4 years.

In fact the catalog of labor's economic complaints, in the AFL–CIO presentation to the platform committee, is far more extensive than that the National Association of Manufacturers. The latter declared in 1960 that "the time of testing for the United States is at hand." This week the NAM's statement to the Democratic platform committee began: "Our Nation has within its grasp the making of an abundant age."

However the AFL–CIO expressed concern at the signs that industry has benefited more than labor from the economy's upswing since 1961. "In the first quarter of 1964," the labor statement said, "corporate profits after taxes were running 42 percent above the year 1961. But the yearly rate of labor income was only 16 percent greater than the 1961 level."

This suspicion of imbalance has combined with an awareness of the need for more jobs to inspire demands for a $2 minimum wage, a 35-hour week, and double pay for overtime. Labor sought more than it received all through the Kennedy era and the denials will be more difficult with time and the accumulation of industry profits.

The prosperity has rolled with such force since Lyndon Johnson took office that he has not been required to make any critical economic decisions. If Messrs. Dillon and Heller leave Government, as they have indicated that they will after the election, and if Mr. Johnson is elected, he will be obliged to assemble his own team and develop his own approach to a political-economic consensus.

But the President will have the satisfaction, as he goes into the campaign, of being able to assert that the Democratic Party has lived up to most of the economic promises that it made in its 1960 platform.

The 88th Congress: Record of Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, before many more weeks have passed, it is to be hoped, we will have before us the complete appropriations record of the 2d session of the 88th Congress. It may be worth while, in this connection, to have at hand for reference a tabulation of the appropriations voted during the first session of this Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, therefore, I include such a tabulation prepared by the Coordinator of Information:

Departmental appropriations, 88th Cong., 1st sess.

[For regular activities]

Title	Budget estimates	Amount as passed (House)	Amount as passed (Senate)	Amount enacted	Public Law No.
Interior	$674,169,000	$597,860,200	$627,859,900	$612,061,750	88-79
Related agencies	354,340,000	330,765,500	357,833,500	346,394,750	
Treasury [1]	1,153,230,000	1,095,910,000	1,112,200,250	1,103,650,000	
U.S. Tax Court	1,893,000	1,890,000	1,890,000	1,890,000	88-39
Post office	4,976,964,000	4,885,000,000	4,940,750,000	4,925,500,000	
Executive Office of President	14,058,000	13,641,000	14,041,000	13,841,000	
Labor	427,220,000	384,844,000	384,844,000	350,078,000	
Related agencies [2]	30,950,000	29,550,000	29,550,000	30,105,000	88-136
Health, Education, Welfare	5,301,314,000	5,035,542,000	5,036,742,000	5,090,904,000	
Supplemental, 1963	1,641,507,106	1,438,691,506	1,488,683,841	1,467,430,491	88-25
Supplemental, 1963 (CCC)	508,172,000	508,172,000	508,172,000	508,172,000	88-190
Agriculture	1,582,417,000	1,530,934,000	1,564,207,340	1,548,973,315	88-250
Related agencies [3]	4,786,338,000	4,448,523,000	4,483,781,000	4,675,396,900	
Legislative [4]	182,218,450	140,038,919	168,273,069	168,273,069	88-248
State	350,721,000	305,051,000	325,033,000	322,696,000	
USIA	208,236,000	163,470,000	170,620,000	166,220,000	
Justice	355,506,000	343,799,000	344,477,000	343,899,000	88-245
Judiciary	59,084,900	58,127,900	58,127,000	58,127,000	
Commerce	996,572,000	833,818,000	798,300,100	804,500,000	
Related agencies [5]	172,716,000	139,204,000	116,985,000	116,850,000	
Defense	49,014,237,000	47,082,009,000	47,339,707,000	47,220,010,000	88-149
District of Columbia [6]	289,581,800	284,286,800	319,587,725	313,093,424	88-252
Independent offices [7]	14,658,588,000	13,102,718,700	13,300,214,650	13,224,518,000	88-215
Military construction	1,966,400,000	1,562,964,000	1,617,489,000	1,585,880,000	88-220
Public works [8]	4,561,747,000	4,276,116,400	4,500,963,200	4,406,272,700	88-257
Foreign aid [9]	4,525,325,000	2,801,700,000	3,273,203,000	3,000,000,000	88-258
Supplemental, 1964 [10]	41,886,000	41,886,000	258,090,000	289,688,000	88-268

[1] Does not include permanent and indefinite appropriations for debt service, tax refunds, trust funds payments, etc.
[2] Includes National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board, and Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.
[3] Includes credit agencies and corporations (Rural Electrification Administration, Farmers Home Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, etc.) and special programs and functions, including school lunch and foreign assistance.
[4] Figures include funds for Library of Congress, Government Printing Office, Architect of the Capitol, etc., in addition to House of Representatives and Senate.
[5] Includes Small Business Administration, Civil Rights Commission, Maritime Commission, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Tariff Commission, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
[6] Includes Federal contribution of $37,500,000; balance derived from District of Columbia revenues.
[7] Principal agencies provided for in this bill: Veterans' Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Federal Aviation Agency, Housing and Home Finance Administration, General Services Administration, FCC, FTC, ICC, SEC, and National Science Foundation.
[8] Includes funds for Atomic Energy Commission; Army Engineers' programs for navigation improvements and flood control; Tennessee Valley Authority; Bureau of Reclamation and power agencies of Department of Interior, etc.
[9] Above figures do not include unrelated items carried in this bill.
[10] Originally introduced to finance new programs to combat mental retardation, funds were later added for impacted school districts, National Defense Education Act scholarships, and for operation of Mexican farm labor program.

NOTE.—The Congress enacted Public Law 88-55, Public Law 88-109, Public Law 88-162, and Public Law 88-188, joint resolutions, continuing appropriations through Aug. 31, Oct. 31, and Nov. 30, 1963, and Jan. 31, 1964, respectively.

Foes of Poverty Should Not Allow ARA To Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 21, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Friday, September 11, issue of the New York Times carries a message for the Congress which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this time to make sure every one of us has an opportunity to read it.

It is entitled "Reviving Area Redevelopment," and it refers to legislation now pending in this House, legislation which would breathe new life into an agency of the Federal Government which is trying to provide new jobs in areas of the Nation where new jobs are most needed.

As the editorial says:

If Congress is sincere in its commitment to wage war on poverty, it makes no sense to let the area redevelopment program die now.

I say it makes no sense, either. If we are going to spend millions and millions to train and equip the underprivileged youth of this Nation so they will be ready to hold a job, I say we better make sure that jobs are available for them when they complete that training.

That is the primary assignment of the ARA—to create new and permanent jobs in the lagging economic areas of our country. It has been doing just that these past 3 years. It has approved projects which are expected to generate 116,000 new jobs thus far. When these business ventures get rolling, this is expected to add nearly a billion dollars a year to our gross national product. I do not see how anyone can object to such a worthy effort, and I want to insert this editorial in the RECORD to call our attention once more to an unfinished task still pending in this House—passage of the ARA bill (S. 1165).

The editorial follows:

REVIVING AREA REDEVELOPMENT

Area redevelopment is in danger of getting lost in the shuffle as Congress hurries toward adjournment. This would be an ironic fate for the program in a Democratic-controlled Congress, in view of the party's long struggle on its behalf. Twice vetoed by President Eisenhower, the area redevelopment bill became a lively isue in the 1960 campaign. It was the first major piece of legislation which President Kennedy signed into law.

Inevitably the program has encountered administrative difficulties and been the target of criticism. It is not easy to devise workable criteria for loans and grants to revive economically depressed communities, since, by definition, if such communities could meet normal banking standards they would not need special Government help.

Despite these inherent problems, the Area Redevelopment Administration over the past 3 years has retrained 35,000 workers and helped create 110,000 new jobs, mostly in rural areas and small towns. It has stimulated fresh economic activity in several long-stagnant localities across the country such as southern Illinois, the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, and the abandoned coal towns of Kentucky and West Virginia. For the first time, scores of communities have learned the techniques of identifying their economic problems and of working out solutions through local and regional planning.

For more than a year the Area Redevelopment Administration's various activities have been limping to a halt for lack of money. In June 1963 the House refused a new authorization of funds by a vote of 209 to 204, which reflected in large part an unthinking southern retaliation against the Kennedy administration, for proposing civil rights legislation. Now that tempers have cooled, the prospects for a second attempt in the House are improved, but time is running out. If Congress is sincere in its commitment to wage war on poverty, it makes no sense to let the area redevelopment program die now.

Pesticides and the Scare Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, not one of us in the Congress is unaware of the vast publicity being given pesticides. Several committees have conducted hearings on one phase or another and I can not help but wonder whether we are the unsuspecting victims of a scare campaign.

Recently a friend sent me an article which appeared in the July issue of the publication, Farm Chemicals. It is entitled "Pesticides and the Scare Campaigns." Written by Lea S. Hitchner, a consulting editor of the publication, he traces the various campaigns against pesticides dating back to 1900—he reminds us of the cranberry scare which has cost the Federal Government over $10 million. Now we have a similar situation confronting the dairy industry and again the American taxpayer is digging into his pockets to indemnify the dairy farmers who have been wronged by their Government.

I realize we are a wealthy nation. I also realize that our Nation has the largest debt any nation has ever known. Should we add to it by our own foolishness? By what manner of judgment do our various agencies reach the conclusion that just because they can find something in milk it therefore must be destroyed? All agencies concede that there is no health hazard. I cannot help but wonder of the nightmares a dairy farmer has, for even I who have witnessed many Government blunders cannot understand the present situation.

Perhaps the answer is in Mr. Hitchner's article when he points the finger at

"the interdepartmental rivalries of the Federal Government. Apparently Public Health desires the regulatory powers now in FDA. The Department of the Interior's wildlife group would like to supersede USDA." He continues by pointing out the winner "gets the public funds for buildings, much wasted research, larger staffs, more bureaucratic control."

I commend this article to my colleagues and hope they will find time in their busy schedules to read it:

PESTICIDES AND THE SCARE CAMPAIGNS

(By Lea S. Hitchner)

The scare campaign on pesticides continues. One scare after another, each expertly publicized and promoted by minority groups of faddists, authors, and publishers, segments of the tax supported publicity and promotion departments of the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Interior and some of the congressional committees.

During early May the press carried from coast to coast the scare story of the fish kill in the Mississippi River. National radio and television, including the Huntley-Brinkley Report, carried the story which was based on meager scientific data questioned by competent scientists.

Last year there was a massive fish kill in the Chesapeake. My own beach was strewn with dead fish. Unconfirmed reports of the cause included "pesticides." Careful scientific investigation by State officials found the cause to be a bacterial disease. The fish population this year appears normal, although a further kill may be anticipated due to the large population.

In many cases, on meager and questionable research, on opinion only, and without due process of law pesticides—of great value to our economy, necessary for the production of safe and adequate food supplies and the protection of the public health—have been questioned.

It should be remembered that pesticides—before sale and use—are evaluated by competent scientists in industry, at State colleges, and private research institutions, and when used as directed approved by equally competent scientists of FDA, USDA, and many State colleges.

The cranberry scare, promoted by FDA, proved to be a farce and to make good USDA paid to growers a fabulous amount—at the taxpayers' expense. The scare publicity given the poultry industry was costly both to the industry and the Federal Government. Doubt has been cast on the safety of such food crops as potatoes and cauliflower.

The promotion of fear also extends to other chemical products. Recently press and radio broadcasts created in our home a fear of a certain cosmetic. Fortunately page advertisements by the manufacturers in leading papers emphasizing safety minimized the adverse publicity.

The scare publicity by the extreme nature lover and food faddist, while serious, does not compare to the fear being created by the interdepartmental rivalries of the Federal Government. Apparently, Public Health desires the regulatory powers now in FDA. The Department of Interior's wildlife group would like to supersede USDA. The agencies now responsible for pesticide regulation must defend themselves.

While over a period of time interagency agreements are reported, the conflict of interest apparently continues.

The winner gets the public funds for buildings, much wasted research, larger staffs, more bureaucratic control.

The scare techniques have had, however, both a beneficial and an adverse effect, but in a reverse manner.

They have been profitable and beneficial to: (1) Publicity seeking legislators, (2) nature groups who have increased membership and income; (3) some public administrators, anxious for more funds, more unnecessary research—which by law in the case of pesticides is the responsibility of the manufacturer; (4) among others, authors and publishers who have made fortunes by publishing scare material.

Those who have been injured are:

1. The general public who must use pesticides on the farm, in the home, and in public health programs.

2. Segments of the chemical industry, responsible by law to prove safety to Government agencies before sale. (Already all small and medium manufacturers of basic products have been eliminated due to extreme technical requirements.)

3. Large companies consider seriously the investment of huge sums of money for research which after approval by Government can be destroyed by fear programs based on meager or no research findings.

4. Competent scientists in FDA, USDA, and the land-grant colleges have been injured or discredited as their judgments and decisions have been, without substantial scientific information, questioned.

5. Segments of the food industry have been forced at great expense to reassure the public both here and abroad of the safety of American food products.

INDUSTRY NOT CONSULTED

New regulations and interpretations, some under pressure of minority groups, have been the cause of undue fear. "No residue in milk" creates an impossible situation, known to anyone acquainted with modern analytical procedures.

The procedure of establishing tolerances on an analytical method instead of determining safety on toxicity and medical research also is a source of confusion.

For many years, beginning at the time of World War I until the development of the scare campaigns about 1960, the production and use of pesticides was a cooperative effort in the public interest.

In my opinion today industry is not being adequately consulted on anticipated Government actions, has little or no representation on or before the numerous committees of the Federal agencies investigating the pesticide problem (e.g., the Weisner Committee), although by law it is their responsibility to provide a pesticide safe for use as directed.

To develop a pesticide, millions must be spent on research. To destroy a product, a few statements with little or no research is all that is required.

The 150th Anniversary of "The Star-Spangled Banner"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, 150 years ago today Francis Scott Key penned the immortal words which have become our national anthem. His inspiration came as he watched the bombardment of Fort McHenry, Baltimore, Md., and were written in praise of the American flag flying over the fort.

As we commemorate the writing of "The Star-Spangled Banner" on this 150th anniversary, I think it fitting that all four stanzas of Francis Scott Key's original poem be included here in the RECORD:

THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER

(By Francis Scott Key)

O say can you see, by the dawn's early light,
What so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleaming,
Whose broad stripes and bright stars through the perilous fight
O'er the ramparts we watched, were so gallantly streaming?
And the rocket's red glare, the bomb bursting in air,
Gave proof through the night that our flag was still there,
O say does that star-spangled banner yet wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?

On the shore dimly seen through the mists of the deep,
Where the foe's haughty host in dread silence reposes,
What is that which the breeze, o'er the towering steep,
As it fitfully blows, half conceals, half discloses?
Now it catches the gleam of the morning's first beam,
In full glory reflected now shines in the stream,
'Tis the star-spangled banner—O long may it wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave!

And where is that band who so vauntingly swore,
That the havoc of war and the battle's confusion
A home and a Country should leave us no more?
Their blood has washed out their foul footsteps' pollution.
No refuge could save the hireling and slave
From the terror of flight or the gloom of the grave,
And the star-spangled banner in triumph doth wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

O thus be it ever when freemen shall stand
Between their loved home and the war's desolation!
Blest with vict'ry and peace may the heaven rescued land
Praise the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation!
Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just,
And this be our motto "In God is our trust."
And the star-spangled banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Weymouth GI Saves Refugee at Berlin Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members the heroic action of Pfc. Hans Puhl, of Weymouth, Mass., which is in my congressional district. Hans' courage in assisting East German refugees across the Berlin wall is a fine example of the spirit of freedom and determination of our young people today.

I would also like to bring the entire story to the attention of the Members as it appeared in two of our fine Boston daily papers, the Boston Globe and the Boston Herald.

The articles follow:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Sept. 14, 1964]

WEYMOUTH GI SAVES BERLIN WALL REFUGEE—THROWS TEAR GAS AT REDS

BERLIN.—A young and handsome U.S. soldier Sunday saved the life of a refugee at the Berlin wall while West Berlin police and Communist East German border guards fought a dramatic 40-minute gun battle.

No one was killed, but the refugee was hit by five Red submachinegun bullets before the American pulled him across the wall to safety. A West Berlin woman and a man were hit by flying glass and splinters as the Communist bullets smashed into a West Berlin apartment house.

An East German guard also may have been wounded, but this could not be confirmed. Eyewitnesses said they saw an East German guard being carried off on a stretcher.

The hero of the fight, longest since the wall was built 3 years ago, was Sp4c. Hans Puhl, 22, an immigrant from Germany who last lived at 1530 Commercial Street in East Weymouth.

Puhl was on military police patrol, riding in a car with a West Berlin policeman.

At a news conference later Sunday, Puhl said he went to the second story window of an apartment house near the wall and saw the refugee on the ground.

"Two East German guards were pulling on him and I pointed my rifle at them and told them to let him go.

"When they did not let him go, I threw a tear gas grenade across the wall in the hope that they would stop bothering the refugee and they did," Puhl said. He spoke with a slight German accent and in a clipped manner as if he were giving a military report.

Puhl said he then ran back to the wall, about 10 feet from the apartment house, gave his rifle to a West Berlin policeman and pulled out his pistol.

"Two West Berliners boosted me up so that I could see across the wall and I called to the refugee not to move and that we were going to cut the wire."

The wall at that point is about 7 feet high, topped with a thick layer of barbed wire.

The Communist guards opened fire when Puhl looked over the wall.

At that point, West Berlin police opened fire with their automatic carbines from windows on each floor of the nearby four-story apartment house.

An eyewitness said two East Germans had reached the refugee, one pulling him and the other pointing a pistol at Puhl.

"The American pulled his own pistol from the holster, aimed at the East German and said in German: 'Drop him and get away from here.'"

However, Puhl himself gave a different version of this, saying he saw no weapons on the East Germans and that his own pistol was not actually pointed at them.

"The American was a real hero to sit up there on the wall under fire," a woman eyewitness said. "I even heard a West Berlin policeman say to the American: 'Hans get down, you also have only one life.'"

Puhl again denied this, saying he was not sitting atop the wall but "looking over." He said, however, bullets were smashing into the concrete near him "and showered me with debris."

Meanwhile, two West Berliners had gotten a stepladder and wirecutters. They stood on the ladder and cut the wire, which took about 10 minutes. Firing continued sporadically.

Firemen, who had also arrived at the scene, handed Puhl a rope. He made a loop and dropped it over the refugee who had dragged himself to the wall.

"We got the rope on him and pulled him across. He passed out when we got him over," the tall, blond soldier said.

The refugee was identified as Michael Meyer, 21, from the East German town of Fredersdorf near Berlin. He was hit twice in one thigh, once in the shoulder, and two bullets grazed one hand and a foot. He was described as recovering satisfactorily.

Helping to pull the refugee over the wall were two West Berliners and a U.S. Army sergeant, who by then had arrived with three other soldiers.

Asked what he was thinking when he was at the wall, Puhl replied:

"I don't think I thought much about anything other than to get the refugee across."

Puhl said he was adopted by an American soldier—S. Sgt. Vaslo Makarevicz now stationed at Fort Knox, Ky.—and came to the United States in 1961. He entered the Army in 1961 and has been stationed in West Berlin for 3½ months.

PUHL RAISED IN WAR, NO STRANGER IN DANGER

WEYMOUTH.—Hans-Werner Puhl, 22, is no stranger to traits of discipline and self-preservation.

The German-born soldier who became a hero at the Berlin wall Sunday grew up in war-ravaged portions of Germany and France and has been in an Army family since.

His spontaneous outburst of courage in the face of gunfire came as no surprise to his aunt, Mrs. Nunzie Daniele of 577 Ralph Talbot Street, South Weymouth, who has watched the young man grow since he came to America in 1956.

Described by Mrs. Daniele as quiet, more mature acting than his American contemporaries, and aggressive, Sp4c. Puhl has kept his aunt informed of his moves with the Army and impressions of military life.

Born in Bremen, Germany, in 1942, Puhl enlisted in the Army as soon as he became 18, imitating his stepfather, Sgt. S. Valso Makarawic, who has been in 24 years. His divorced father is now a factory foreman in Austria. Puhl has visited him several times while on leave.

Puhl became a U.S. citizen after returning to Fort Dix, N.J., with his Army family following 6 years in France.

He finished high school while in the Army and reported to his South Weymouth relatives his pleasure at being named company interpreter during their tour in Germany. He also escaped kitchen duty in the process.

Puhl recently reenlisted for another tour with the Army, on condition that he be able to remain in Germany.

The tall blond soldier wrote Mrs. Daniele when he was transferred to Berlin. "I have read about the Berlin wall, but until you see it you can't imagine how much of a wall of shame it really is."

Puhl discovered disappointment while at Fort Dix when an unnamed benefactor died shortly before making final arrangements for the schooling and support of the young man.

But he also had survived the war years in Germany and the hunger-ridden postwar period following Germany's defeat.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald, Sept. 14, 1964]

WEYMOUTH GI HERO IN BERLIN—SAVES REFUGEE IN GUNFIGHT

(By John Koehler)

BERLIN.—A young and handsome U.S. soldier from South Weymouth, Mass., climbed the Berlin wall and saved the life of a refugee Sunday while West Berlin police and Communist East German border guards fought a dramatic 40-minute gun battle.

No one was killed but the refugee was hit by five Red submachinegun bullets before the American pulled him across the wall to safety. A West Berlin woman and a man were hit by flying glass and splinters as Communist bullets smashed into a West Berlin apartment house.

LONGEST BATTLE

An East German guard also may have been wounded but this could not be confirmed. Eyewitnesses said they saw an East German guard being carried off on a stretcher.

Hero of the fight, longest since the wall was built 3 years ago, was Sp4c. Hans Puhl, 22, an immigrant from Germany who lived at 577 Ralph Talbot Street, South Weymouth, with his aunt, Mrs. Nunzie Daniele.

POINTED RIFLE

Puhl was on military police patrol, riding in a car with a West Berlin policeman.

At a news conference later Puhl said he went to the second story window of an apartment house near the wall and saw the refugee on the ground.

"Two East German guards were pulling on him and I pointed my rifle at them and told them to let him go.

"When they did not let him go, I threw a tear gas grenade across the wall in the hope that they would stop bothering the refugee and they did," Puhl, said. He spoke with a

slight German accent and in a clipped manner as if he were giving a military report.

CLIMBED WALL

Puhl said he then ran back to the wall, about 10 feet from the apartment house, gave his rifle to a West Berlin policeman and pulled out his pistol.

"Two West Berliners boosted me up so that I could see across the wall and I called to the refugee not to move and that we were going to cut the wire."

The wall at that point is about 7 feet high, topped with a thick layer of barbed wire.

The Communist guards opened fire when Puhl looked over the wall.

West Berlin police responded with their automatic carbines from windows of each floor of the nearby four-story apartment house.

An eyewitness said two East Germans had reached the refugee, one pulling him and the other pointing a pistol at Puhl.

"The American pulled his own pistol from the holster, aimed at the East German and said in German: 'Drop him and get away from here.'"

However, Puhl himself gave a different version of this, saying he saw no weapons on the East Germans and that his own pistol was not actually pointed at them.

A REAL HERO

"The American was a real hero to sit up there on the wall under fire," a woman eyewitness said. "I even heard a West Berlin policeman say to the American: 'Hans, get down, you also have only one life.'"

Puhl again denied this, saying he was not sitting atop the wall but "looking over." He said, however, bullets were smashing into the concrete near him "and showered me with debris."

Meanwhile, two West Berliners had gotten a stepladder and wirecutters. They stood on the ladder and cut the wire, which took about 10 minutes. Firing continued sporadically.

Firemen, who had also arrived at the scene, handed Puhl a rope. He made a loop and dropped it over the refugee who had dragged himself to the wall.

PULLED HIM ACROSS

"We got the rope on him and pulled him across. He passed out when we got him over," the tall, blond soldier said.

The refugee was identified as Michael Meyer, 21, from the East German town of Fredersdorf, near Berlin. He was hit twice in one thigh, once in the shoulder, and two bullets grazed one hand and foot. He was described as recovering satisfactorily.

Helping to pull the refugee over the wall were two West Berliners and a U.S. Army sergeant, who by then had arrived with three other soldiers.

Asked what he was thinking when he was at the wall, Puhl replied:

"I don't think I thought much about anything other than to get the refugee across."

"If it had not been for the Americans," an eyewitness said, "the refugee never would have reached the West."

Puhl said the rescue would not have been possible without the West Berlin police, the fire department, and two civilians.

An ambulance, which had arrived at the scene shortly after the first shots were fired, took Meyer to a nearby hospital.

WITNESS REPORTS

The woman witness told this story of the fire fight:

"I woke up when the shooting started and roused my 19-year-old son. I ran into the hall and up to the first-floor window.

"I saw a man lying in front of the barbed wire fence which is about 10 meters (30 feet) from the wall. I thought he was dead. Then he raised his head and the border guards fired again.

"The man then crawled slowly underneath the wire. He pulled himself up and again there were shots. I suddenly heard a funny noise near me and my son shouted bullets were hitting the house.

"Then, two guards ran to the man and pulled him toward the wall—I guess they did this so they would not be seen from the western side.

"It was a terrible scene. That man—no that boy—never uttered a sound. I could see when he was hit and he never screamed. It was eerie.

"I heard them dragging the man along the wall and at that moment the American got up to the wall."

The incident occurred in the Kreuzberg district of the U.S. sector, about 900 yards east of Checkpoint Charlie.

Before reaching the wall on the East side, there is a 300-foot "security zone" broken by two barbed wire barricades. East German police are posted in towers and bunkers in such a way that they have a clear field of vision of the entire area.

HERO WAS BORN IN GERMANY: STEPSON OF U.S. ARMY SERGEANT

Pfc. Hans Puhl, 22, who held East German border guards off at gunpoint and aided an escaping German refugee, is a South Weymouth resident who immigrated to this country from Germany with his parents in 1956.

The stepson of an Army sergeant, Puhl established his legal residence with an aunt, Mrs. Veronina Daniel, of 577 Ralph Talbot Street, South Weymouth. Yesterday, she said Puhl's action was something "it would be just exactly like him to do."

His mother, Wilma, who lives with her second husband, Sgt. Vaslo E. Makarewicz, a career Army man, in Fort Knox, Ky., asked "He isn't hurt, is he?" when told of her son's actions.

Speaking in broken English, Mrs. Makarewicz said "I'm proud of him. I feel very excited." She was assured that her son escaped unscathed from the gun battle and said, "I'm shocked, I'm surprised."

Puhl joined the Army 4 years ago.

MADE AN MP

After completing basic training at Fort Jackson, S.C., he was sent to Germany. Because of his knowledge of German he was transferred from the infantry to the military police where he served as an interpreter.

He attended school at Fort Dix where his stepfather was stationed. Mrs. Daniels, who lives at the South Weymouth address with her husband, Nunzie, said Puhl considered the Berlin wall a "shame."

"He told me in letters that the Russians should never have been allowed to build it," Mrs. Daniels said.

Puhl's parents were divorced several years ago. His father now lives in Austria.

For a time Puhl lived with his mother and stepfather at Fort Jackson, where his stepfather was stationed.

Ukrainian-American Resolution in Tribute to Senator Scott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the executive officers of the Ukrainian-American Republican Association of Philadelphia, Pa., have presented a resolution praising the efforts and service of our colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania, HUGH SCOTT. I was most impressed with this fine resolution and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE UKRAINIAN AMERICAN REPUBLICAN ASSOCIATION OF PHILADELPHIA

(Presented by the executive officers of the organization on behalf of the Honorable HUGH SCOTT for his meritorious work on behalf of the Ukrainian community of Pennsylvania and the Ukrainian cause.)

Whereas Senator HUGH SCOTT has diligently supported the erection of the statue of Taras Shevchenko in Washington, D.C., the Ukrainian poet who believed and fought for liberty and freedom for all nations; and

Whereas Senator HUGH SCOTT had supported the Captive Nations Week resolution passed by the U.S. Congress in July 1959, Ukraine being one of the largest enslaved nations; and

Whereas Senator HUGH SCOTT has intervened on behalf of Ukrainians desiring to immigrate to the United States;

Whereas Senator HUGH SCOTT has in the past attended and supported many of the Ukrainian civic affairs throughout the State of Pennsylvania: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Ukrainian American Republican Association of Pennsylvania, That in order to vitalize the Senate in the fight against communism and Russian imperialism the enemy of Ukraine and the entire free world including the United States every American citizen of Ukrainian descent take cognizance of Senator HUGH SCOTT's strong stand against communism and his sympathetic understanding of the flight of the captive nations and support of the cause of their eventual liberation.

That all American citizens of Ukrainian descent regardless of party affiliation support Senator HUGH SCOTT in the November 1964 election; and

That all Ukrainian American organizations conduct a mail campaign supporting Senator HUGH SCOTT; and finally

That all American citizens of Ukrainian descent conduct a telephone campaign and remind their friends of the support given Ukrainians by Senator HUGH SCOTT.

Signed.

PAUL PANAMARENKO,
Chairman.
IGNATIUS M. BILLINSKY,
Executive Vice Chairman.
WILLIAM NEZOWY, Jr.
Executive Secretary.
MICHAEL SMYLIE,
Director.

States and Cities Withholding Taxes Not Actually Payable From Truckdrivers, Railroad Employees, and Airline Pilots

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the unfinished items of the business of this Congress is the enactment of my bill, H.R. 10743, which would relieve truckdrivers, railroad employees, and airline pilots of the burden of having

taxes withheld from their paychecks by cities and States where they actually do not owe taxes to those cities and States.

The problems of the cities and States withholding on employees who are engaged in interstate commerce, such as interstate truckdrivers, came to my attention because of the fact that I have a great many such drivers living in my district. The problem is that a number of cities and States are insisting on withholding on a pro rata basis the men's wages on what is in my opinion a tenuous basis.

For example, in the case of one State, the taxing authorities will withhold a pro rata share of the driver's wages if he just drives his truck through a corner of the State in the middle of the night.

The second point to be made is that all employee and employer associations and organizations are in agreement on the necessity for some kind of legislation in this field and the benefits that will come from it, and the inequities that will be corrected by the enactment of this bill.

And the third point to be made is that this legislation has no effect whatsoever on the States rights or powers to tax. That is a completely separate question. My bill goes only to their right to withhold taxes. It appears from the record that some cities and States are taking advantage of the withholding device to get taxes from truckdrivers and others when, really, they do not have a basic right to levy a tax.

Once again, I urge the Congress to give its immediate attention to this matter.

The Too-Skillful President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial entitled "The Too-Skillful President," which appeared in the Tulsa World, on September 6, 1964:

THE TOO-SKILLFUL PRESIDENT

The more we see of Lyndon B. Johnson in action around Washington, the more we are inclined to view him with apprehension. And the reason—ridiculous as it may seem—is that he simply is too efficient at what he sets out to do.

Are we saying, then, that he is a great President but we just don't care for him personally? Not at all. We see him as a man of surpassing skill in the political phase of his job. That particular talent can lead to dangers as well as to benefits.

The President is a masterful politician; there can be no doubt about that. He knows how to get things done in the political world—and he doesn't hesitate to get them done. Our quarrel comes over the kind of goals he sets.

Specifically, L.B.J. shines with floodlight brilliance at the business—or is it a game?—of pushing legislation through Congress. He has been at it so long, his skill is so great and his drive so persistent, that he has become an irresistible force. Apparently he can pass almost any bill he wants to sponsor.

The late President Kennedy was a tremendously popular man of high intellect—even though we disagreed with most of his philosophy. But he was never especially adept in the congressional batter's box. Quite a few proposals with his imprint foundered in Congress or had to ride out long delays. Neither in Congress nor as President was he a whiz at passing bills.

Although L.B.J. had to stand in the Kennedy shadow in the early New Frontier years, when he finally emerged as the boss he quickly demonstrated he was far superior to J.F.K. at getting Congress to act.

In the 10 months since moving into the White House his administration has brought a number of major Kennedy bills through Congress—including civil rights, the income tax cut, the urban transit bill, and the Federal pay raise. Pushing onward, he has steered through the Johnson antipoverty bill and has even managed to win Senate approval of the old Kennedy nemesis, medicare through social security.

No doubt these accomplishments mark him with greatness to those who share his philosophy. But to Americans who distrust the ever-growing Federal powerhouse and who do not believe it is possible to spend our country into riches, peace, or Utopia, this is a man to be feared.

There appears to be no legislation he cannot pass. He seems to mesmerize Congress—but not with magic. It is simply that he understands and uses power politics so well that he dominates both the executive and legislative branches.

In this phase of his work, paradoxically, he is much too experienced, much too gifted for the Nation's good. Our regret is that he does not have less talent for passing liberal legislation and a great deal more for handling problems like those in South Vietnam.

Dies Supports Goldwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note in the September 3, 1964, issue of the Lufkin, Tex., News that former Congressman Martin Dies, Sr., Texas Democrat, has announced his support of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican candidate for President.

Martin Dies is one of the most able and distinguished men ever to serve in the House of Representatives. He was the chairman of what was originally known as the Dies committee, later to become the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Through the years Dies fought to stop the Communist infiltration of this Nation and its Government. Often he was compelled to fight members of his own party in order to continue the committee and the investigation of Communist activities. His book, "The Martin Dies Story," reveals in detail the efforts, often underhanded, of those who should have cooperated but instead tried in every way possible to scuttle his investigations.

This is one Texan of unquestioned integrity and courage, and the citizens of the United States owe him a far greater debt of gratitude than they will ever know.

Following is the article from the Lufkin, Tex., News:

Former Congressman Martin Dies, Sr., of Lufkin has announced his support of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, the Republican nominee for President.

In announcing his decision to support GOLDWATER over President Lyndon B. Johnson, Congressman Dies declared, "I feel that if I vote my approval of the means by which Lyndon Johnson reached the White House, I would make a mockery of the great principles of honesty and sincerity which most Americans profess and which are the cornerstone of free governments."

He told the Lufkin News he not only referred specifically to the disputed 1948 election when Johnson first won a seat in the Senate over Coke Stevenson but "to other happenings since Johnson came to Washington penniless as a Congressman in 1937."

Johnson was elected over Stevenson by 87 votes in the 1948 Democratic primary. Returns from Jim Wells County, a part of the political empire of George Parr of Duval County, were challenged by Stevenson, who won a district court injunction pending a court of inquiry into charges of fraud.

Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black summarily dissolved the injunction, ended the district court's investigation, and paved the way for Johnson to get the Democratic nomination.

In referring to this and other events, Dies' prepared statement continued: "Those means are matters of public record so that no citizen can plead ignorance or deception. This election is a supreme test of this country's sincerity in its lofty professions. Therefore, it is my intention to support Senator BARRY GOLDWATER."

Congressman Dies first was elected to Congress from the old Second District in 1930 and served through 1944. He later served as Congressman at Large from Texas from 1953 through 1956.

During his first terms in office, he won international fame as chairman of the Dies Committee, now the Committee on Un-American Activities. He warned the Nation of dangers from communism that were proven correct in ensuing years, although at the time he and his committee were bitterly opposed by the Democratic administration.

Since retiring as Congressman at Large, Dies has maintained law offices in Lufkin.

Dr. Norman A. Welch: A Great Man of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my sad experience to attend the funeral of Dr. Norman A. Welch, an outstanding physician, teacher, and leader who, throughout his life, made many significant contributions both to his profession and to his country. It was my privilege to know Dr. Welch for a number of years, first in connection with his many activities in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and more recently through his leadership of the American Medical Association, which frequently brought him to testify in Washington be-

fore the Ways and Means and other committees. In all of these years Dr. Welch has always represented the highest standards of diligence and devotion to his profession and to the health of the American people. He was an excellent citizen and a fine person, and he will be greatly missed.

Dr. Welch's medical career was marked from the beginning with many honors and accomplishments. He served as president of his class at Tufts during all 4 years of medical school and graduated summa cum laude. For nearly 25 years he taught at both Tufts and Boston University School of Medicine while continuing to practice his specialty, internal medicine. In addition to these responsibilities Dr. Welch also assumed the duties of president and physician in chief of Carney Hospital in Boston and at the time of his death was a consultant physician to five Massachusetts hospitals. He also had held office in the Massachusetts Medical Society, had served as president of the Council of New England Medical Societies, and had been both a member and chairman of the Massachusetts Approving Authority for Nurses and Attendant Nurses Training Schools.

Impressive as it is, this is only the beginning of the list of Dr. Norman Welch's contributions to his profession. The Members of the House will be interested to know that Dr. Welch was one of the founding members of Blue Shield, the nonprofit prepayment insurance program which covers medical services. Dr. Welch had served as president of the Massachusetts Blue Shield plan since 1950 and from 1955 to 1958 was chairman of the National Blue Shield Commission.

Dr. Welch began his service to the American Medical Association in 1951 when he was elected to the house of delegates. After 8 years as a member of that body, he was elected speaker of the house of delegates and held that position for 4 years until his election as president-elect by acclamation in 1963. In June of this year Dr. Welch was formally installed as the 118th president of the American Medical Association at its convention in San Francisco. On that occasion he stated, "I am aware of the responsibilities of my new position, and I pledge all the dedication at my command in discharging these responsibilities." Unfortunately, Dr. Welch had only a few months in which to serve the American Medical Association as its president, but while he served, he served well and did indeed discharge his responsibilities "with all the dedication at his command."

In his inaugural address for which he chose the theme, "Unity in Medicine," Dr. Welch told his audience:

I need not remind you that the professional responsibilities of a physician encompass three major areas: the science, the art, and the socioeconomic and political aspects of medicine.

Proficiency in the science of medicine is not enough; medical knowledge must be skillfully and sympathetically applied to each patient. Moreover, every physician should be cognizant of, and interested in, the socioeconomic impact of illness upon his patient and the community in which he lives, as well as the potential effect of Government-sponsored programs on the practice of medicine.

This statement of professional ideals coming so close to the end of his life was really a summation of the code by which Dr. Norman Welch had conducted his own long and distinguished career. He was interested and active in all the facets of his profession; he carried enormous organizational responsibilities without forgetting his patients, and always his concern was for the health and well-being of all the American people. He was truly a great man of medicine.

An article from the Brockton, Mass., Daily Enterprise of September 4, 1964, follows:

DR. NORMAN WELCH, AMA HEAD, BROCKTON NATIVE, DIES AT 63—BROCKTON HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE IN CLASS OF 1920; WIDELY TRAVELED

A native Brocktonian, Dr. Norman A. Welch, 63, president of the American Medical Association, died Thursday night at Jackson, Wyo., after being stricken with a cerebral hemorrhage Wednesday night.

Dr. Welch died at 9:30 p.m. in St. John's Hospital after emergency surgery performed by Dr. Frank Soroosh, of Casper, Wyo. Dr. Soroosh, a brain surgeon, performed the 1½-hour operation assisted by a team of doctors led by Dr. Brendan P. Phibbs, of Casper.

Dr. Welch was stricken at Jackson Lake Lodge, where he was about to address the Wyoming Medical Association at their annual banquet. Dr. Welch was stricken in his room, shortly before he was to leave for the banquet.

The AMA leader had complained earlier in the evening of feeling ill, it was reported. Doctors believed at first that he had suffered a heart attack.

At the doctor's bedside when he died was his wife, Katherine, who had flown to Jackson Wednesday to attend the banquet with her husband.

Dr. Welch had served the cause of medicine faithfully for more than 30 years. He was a practicing physician, official of medical associations, including the Blue Cross and Blue Shield, and was elected president of the 200,000-member AMA in 1963. He was the eighth doctor from the Commonwealth to be elected AMA president.

He was chairman of the AMA's house of delegates, the association's policymaking body, from 1959 to 1963 before becoming AMA president.

During his term as president he sought to unite medicine by bringing the various specialty groups into closer contact through the association.

Dr. Welch, who graduated from Brockton High School in 1920, began his medical career at Tufts University where he was president of his class at the school of medicine, graduating summa cum laude in 1926.

He served his internship and residency at Carney Hospital. Later he was clinical professor of medicine at Tufts and from 1933–43, served as an instructor in medicine at Boston University School of Medicine.

At the time of his death he was consulting physician to six hospitals: Carney, Leominster, Metropolitan State, Community, Winthrop, and Marlboro Hospitals.

He served as president of the Carney Hospital staff and was president of the Council of New England Medical Societies.

The New England Journal of Medicine said Dr. Welch "guides with a quiet persuasiveness, backed by sound judgment and reason," in describing his administrative technique.

Besides his AMA duties he served as assistant treasurer of the Massachusetts Medical Society, 3 years as president of the National Association of Blue Shield plans and resigned as president of the Massachusetts Blue Shield when elected AMA president.

He traveled more than 100,000 miles during the past year fulfilling his functions as AMA president.

While engaging in private practice, Dr. Welch specialized in internal medicine.

He was married in 1928 to the former Katherine Hayes, of Brockton. They had four daughters, Katherine Jane, Mary, and Sarah, and a son, Norman A., Jr. The Welch family lives at 644 Weld Street, West Roxbury.

Dr. Welch was a communicant of St. Theresa's Church, West Roxbury, and was a member of Boston's famed Clover Club. He also served as former chief of Clan MacDonald, OSC, of Brockton.

Not Goldwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the following article speaks for itself. No further comment is necessary:

NOT GOLDWATER

Following is part of the text of a speech prepared for Democratic vice-presidential nominee HUBERT HUMPHREY by a ghostwriter in Indianapolis, but which Senator HUMPHREY for some reason did not deliver:

"This Democratic administration presided over the Bay of Pigs fiasco, pulling back crucial air cover and allowing Cuban freedom fighters to be slaughtered by Fidel Castro.

"But not Senator GOLDWATER.

"This Democratic administration has cracked down still further on exile forces trying to combat Castro and allowed allied trade with the Cuban dictator to increase by hundreds of millions of dollars.

"But not Senator GOLDWATER.

"This Democratic administration by its own confession lied to the American people about the Cuban missile buildup in the summer and fall of 1962, bringing grave danger to our Nation.

"But not Senator GOLDWATER.

"This Democratic administration has presided over the disarray and collapse of the NATO Alliance.

"But not Senator GOLDWATER.

"This administration stood by idly while the East German Communists built the Berlin Wall in violation of the postwar treaties and imprisoned freemen and murdered those who attempted to escape.

"But not Senator GOLDWATER.

"This administration violated its pledge to defend Laos against communism and helped topple the anti-Red government of Prince Boun Oum by withholding promised grants-in-aid.

"But not Senator GOLDWATER.

"This Democratic administration financed and supplied confessed acts of aggression and brutality against the anti-Red African state of Katanga, subjugating it to the anti-Western Central Government of the Congo.

"But not Senator GOLDWATER.

"This administration connived in the overthrow of the anti-Communist Diem government of South Vietnam which led to the murder of the ousted President.

"But not Senator GOLDWATER.

"This Democratic administration has phased out American manned bombers and pulled back intermediate-range missile bases in order to 'ease Soviet anxieties.'

"But not Senator GOLDWATER.

"This administration believes the Communists are mellowing and that they will stop bothering us if only we are nice to them and show them we are willing to make concessions.

"But not Senator GOLDWATER.

"This Democratic administration has supplied a haven for con men and grafters like Billie Sol Estes and Bobby Baker, the last named being described by President Lyndon Johnson as 'my strong right arm.'

"But not Senator GOLDWATER.

"This Democratic administration has set new records for distortion and manipulation of news, openly announced its willingness to lie to the American people, censored and muzzled military officers, leaked confidential information to discredit private citizens, engaged in wiretapping and harassment of dissenters.

"But not Senator GOLDWATER.

"This Democratic administration has bestowed a $50,000 award on Physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer, declared a security risk by the Atomic Energy Commission in 1954, and has moved to dismantle the security apparatus of the American State Department.

"But not Senator GOLDWATER.

"This administration has publicly embraced the radical Americans for Democratic Action, symbolized by my own candidacy, which is the American counterpart of the Fabian Socialists in Great Britain, dedicated to collectivism at home and appeasement abroad.

"But not Senator GOLDWATER.

"This Democratic administration has racked up multibillioned deficits in the past 4 years, injecting immense inflationary pressure into the economy and bringing the cost of living to a new alltime high.

"But not Senator GOLDWATER.

"This Democratic administration in short, has plugged steadfastly toward calamity and chaos in the world struggle with communism. It has worked unremittingly toward the centralization of power and the destruction of American constitutional checks and balances.

"But not, needless to say, Senator GOLDWATER."

Legislative Research Team of Congressman Fred Schwengel, of Iowa, Compiles Impressive Record of Legislative Studies

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, few Members of Congress call upon the talent of the colleges in their districts with the same success as Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of the First District of Iowa, does.

Ever since he came to Congress in 1955, SCHWENGEL has looked to the campus for constructive ideas and significant research. His legislative research team at the State University of Iowa has compiled an impressive record of legislative studies and I feel it appropriate to present a summary of this activity as an example of a resource which is available to all Members if an effort is made to develop it.

The summary follows:

SUMMARY OF CONGRESSMAN FRED SCHWENGEL'S LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH TEAM AT STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Students have always been given top priority in the office of Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL. Besides entertaining over 100 college students and professors in his home under his "Week in Washington" program during his first 10 years in Congress, SCHWENGEL has also maintained a research team of college students at the State University of Iowa.

Dr. Russell Ross, of the political science department, supervised the program from the beginning and was later joined by Dr. Dell Wright, also of the political science department, as the activity grew. Fifteen college students have been members of SCHWENGEL's research team during the years it has been in operation.

Beginning in 1955 with just one team member, SCHWENGEL expanded the team to three members and now has three researchers on a regular basis. They are supplemented by two other researchers who are on Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER's staff.

Projects developed and researched by the team have been varied and cover a wide range of materials.

From the beginning the team has worked on the problems of financing higher education. Surveys were made to determine who bears the major expense of a student's college education. Different plans were explored and legislation was considered, introduced, and later refined. Finally the Iowa plan for growth and progress in higher education evolved out of the years of work and study. Taking the tax credit approach to financing the costs of a college education, the Iowa plan consists of three phases. The first two are in bill form, H.R. 22 in the 88th Congress. The team is still working on phase III, hoping to get it into bill form soon.

Problems confronted by the small businessman have been another major concern of the research team. Interviews were conducted, questionnaires sent out, meetings held, in an attempt to pinpoint the problems of the main street businessman and to develop answers to them.

A number of bills to help small business were introduced by Congressman SCHWENGEL as a result of the work of the research team. One of them, a bill to allow independent oil jobbers to pay their Federal gasoline tax after they sold the gas instead of before they sold it, was included as an amendment to a more inclusive tax measure. The efforts of the team and Congressman SCHWENGEL were primarily responsible for its inclusion in the broader tax bill. This provision has solved to a great extent the problems of enough working capital for the small oil jobber.

Three other bills were introduced by Congressman SCHWENGEL on behalf of the small businessman. During the summer of 1958 three members of the Congressman's research team—William O'Connell, Arthur Kudart, and Lloyd Courter, along with team adviser Prof. Russell Ross—appeared before the House Select Committee on Small Business to present their findings and recommendations. While in Washington, the team members also consulted with the then Secretary of the Treasury, Robert Anderson, and one of the President's economic advisers, Gabriel Hauge.

The team was well received in Washington and got wide acclaim for their knowledgability of the problems of small business and the solutions they proposed.

But the team did not stop there. After the Small Business Administration was established, a survey was conducted to see what use small businessmen were making of SBA and how it could be improved. Questionnaires were used again on the reaction to quality-stabilization legislation and research was continued on the capital gains tax.

Through the years the team at different times has worked on and researched various other areas, including proposals to revise the electoral college, bill concerning Presidential disability and succession, revision of the food for peace law, Public Law 480, water pollution, minority staffing, and statistical sampling.

A more efficient method of collecting the Federal gasoline tax was also thoroughly researched by the team. Proposals to have the States collect that tax were carefully studied and evaluated.

One of the team's current projects is Mission 76, a proposal to complete all the major watersheds in this country by 1976. As a result, the entire field of soil conservation has been under study by the team. They have become intimately acquainted with the problem and the causes and effects of soil erosion and the procedures needed to combat it.

In the fall of 1962, Congressman SCHWENGEL along with his legislative assistant, Dave Ibsen, and various members of the team, held meetings with soil conservation leaders throughout the First District to get a better insight into the problems and to elicit suggestions as to possible solutions. Records were kept and every participant received a summary of all the meetings held during that fall.

Members of the team have also put on programs on soil conservation for various groups and organizations in the district.

This year the team prepared and distributed a soil conservation kit. It was sent to every newspaper, weekly and daily, in the First District to coincide with Iowa Soil and Water Conservation Week in June (14–20).

The contributions made by the research team and their advisers have been extremely helpful and valuable to Congressman SCHWENGEL. They have enabled him to better serve the people of the First Congressional District. These college students have made and continue to make a significant contribution and to perform a great public service.

RESEARCH TEAM ACTIVITIES

Years 1956–57

1. Survey of parents of State University of Iowa students on educational costs.

2. Oil jobbers interview-research problem on prepayment of independent oil jobbers of Federal tax on gasoline.

3. Problems of small business taxes:

a. Must work under same tax codes as big business.

b. Needed definition of small business.

4. Work and research on loan help to farms.

5. Tax credit research—first bill introduced.

Year 1958

1. Poll of oil jobbers.

2. Testimony before Select Committee on Small Business:

a. Increase in surtax exemption from $25,000 to $100,000.

b. Provide for rapid amortization for depreciable assets over 5 years.

c. Provide additional $30,000 deduction for depreciable assets over 5 years.

3. Held meetings with small businessmen.

Year 1959

1. Did research on which agency or group should administer small business grant.

2. Questionnaires to small business about services of SBA use of those services. Extensive research on feasibility of small business extension service.

3. Research on education cost and possible drafts for bills. Analyzed cost expenditure of education—who pays for the student's education.

4. Did research work on quality stabilization.
5. Did research on capital gains tax.

Year 1960

1. Conducted extensive item veto study.

Year 1961

1. Continuing work on tax credit bills.
2. Research on proposals to revise the electoral college.
3. Research on tax collection of Federal gas tax by States.
4. Started work on Mission 76.

Year 1962

1. More research on fair trade legislation.
2. Continued study of Federal gasoline tax.
3. Continued study of watersheds.
4. Study of problems of small business.
a. Fair trade questionnaire.
b. Polled druggists and hardware dealers.
5. Water pollution.

Year 1963

1. Continuing work on soil conservation Mission 76.
a. Work on farm unemployment.
2. Continuing work on State collection of Federal gas tax.
3. Extension work on soil conservation.
a. Explored avenues to fulfill Mission 76 under State and Federal Governments.
4. Supplemented research on minority staffing.
5. Presented soil conservation program to county committees.

MEMBERS OF SCHWENGEL'S RESEARCH TEAM

Members of Representative SCHWENGEL'S research team are: Carl Zimmerman, Waterloo; Beth Howard, Imogene; Martha Putney, Gladbrook; William J. O'Connell, Oelwein; Arthur Kudart, Cedar Rapids; Rodney Miller, Des Moines; James Hootman, Davenport; Lloyd Courter, Boone; D. T. Doan, Ainsworth; Bob Downer, Newton; Ivan Ackerman, Allison; Tom Scheuerman, Iowa City; William Burger, Fairfield; Lee Theisen, Sioux City; Richard Winga, Washington; Gene Krekel, Burlington; John Shors, Pocahontas; Charles O. Campbell, Clarion; and Janet Ackerman, Allison.

A Joint Resolution To Settle the Ryukyu Islands Pretreaty Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury of persons, and for use or damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952.

This is the same joint resolution—with a minor change in the recitals—that was recommended to the Congress by the Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the Department of State by letters dated August 26, 1964, and which was thereupon introduced in the Senate by Senator FULBRIGHT and others on September 8, 1964, as Senate Joint Resolution 199.

I am gratified that this proposal has finally been sent to the Congress by the administration, because I have been concerned about this subject since I came to the Congress and have refrained until now from introducing a bill pending receipt of the administration's official recommendation. The joint resolution serves the same objectives as the bills introduced by the then Representative from Hawaii, Senator INOUYE, and others in the 87th Congress, and that was introduced by Senator INOUYE in the present Congress as S. 270.

The purpose of this resolution is to rectify a serious omission in the U.S. administration of the Ryukyu Islands and to do justice to hundreds of thousands of the inhabitants whose relatives were killed, or who were injured, or who suffered deprivation of property through the acts of our Armed Forces during the period following the termination of hostilities and prior to the Treaty of Peace with Japan. The United States exercised direct and exclusive governmental authority at that time, and we had substantial forces in Okinawa in the strategic interest of the United States, not simply as a consequence of the war against Japan.

The claims of the people affected have been analyzed and reviewed by a joint committee established by our High Commissioner in the Ryukyus, in consequence of which they were scaled down from $43 million, as originally submitted, to approximately $22 million. This includes claims for personal injury and death, for land rentals for the years 1947–50, for restoration of lands released to their owners in damaged condition, for appropriation of water rights, and for damage to buildings and growing crops and trees. Land use claims are not included for the year 1946 because this was a period of postwar adjustment in which owners had generally not yet returned to their lands and produced crops. No interest is included, although the claims have gone uncompensated for 12 years and more.

As a matter of international law, it is unquestioned that the people of Okinawa are entitled to be compensated for these various acts on the part of the U.S. forces. In the main islands, this was done by the Japanese Government under the supervision of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers. In the Ryukyu Islands, there was no financially responsible local government that was able to do this, and the Japanese Government was cut off from all participation. The people of Okinawa have repeatedly presented their claims to the U.S. Government as the administering authority. Since the United States exercised direct and exclusive control during the entire period, there can be no doubt of U.S. responsibility to assure that compensation is effected.

Action on the part of the U.S. Government was delayed by a question with respect to U.S. responsibility in international law to pay the claims, in view of the fact that in the Japanese Peace Treaty, Japan waived all claims of Japanese nationals aginst the United States arising from the war and the occupation of Japanese territory. The executive branch has recommended that without accepting legal responsibility, compensation nevertheless be made by the United States in the recognition of the facts that the individual claimants were, through no fault of their own, left uncompensated during the 7 years of the occupation, contrary to the practice followed in other occupied areas; that the United States, as the administering authority for the Ryukyus is concerned with the well-being of the people; that such payment would promote the security interests of the United States; and that it would foster respect for the spirit of fairplay and equity of the U.S. Government.

In introducing this bill, I should like to stress just two facts: that these sums have been due to the individual claimants now for many years, and that payment by the United States is an act of simple justice in view of our complete responsibility for what occurred in the Ryukyu Islands since 1945.

I realize that it is too late in this Congress for action to be taken upon this bill, but I assume that the proposal will be made again soon afer the 89th Congress convenes, and that it will receive prompt and serious attention in that Congress.

GOP Chairman Files Official Protest About Democrats' Commercial With Fair Campaign Practices Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am submitting herewith the recent release incorporating the protest lodged by the chairman of the Republican National Committee with the Fair Campaign Practices Committee in regard to the low level of Democratic campaign commercials:

WASHINGTON, D.C., September 15.—Dean Burch, chairman of the Republican National Committee, has filed a formal complaint about the low level of Democratic campaign commercials, approved by President Johnson, with Charles P. Taft, chairman of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee.

In a letter yesterday to Mr. Taft, Chairman Burch charged the Democrats' commercial showing a little girl picking daisies, then an atomic bomb explosion, and a voice persuading voters to support Lyndon Johnson "is designed to arouse basic emotions and has no place in this campaign."

The text of Mr. Burch's letter follows:

"Mr. CHARLES P. TAFT,
"Chairman, Fair Campaign Practices Committee, Inc.,
"New York, N.Y.

"DEAR MR. TAFT: As I promised at the September 11 signing of the Fair Campaign Practices Code, I am entering a formal complaint in regard to the low level television campaign begun by the Democrats with the full approval of Lyndon Johnson.

"As a result of the political commercial shown on the National Broadcasting Co. network at 10 p.m., September 7, in the Wash-

ington, D.C., area and elsewhere, we have learned there have been thousands of complaints throughout the country.

"The vignette in question depicts a small girl pulling daisy petals, an atomic bomb explosion, and then a voice persuading voters to support President Johnson. This horror-type commercial is designed to arouse basic emotions and has no place in this campaign.

"In keeping with the spirit and pledge of high ethical standard adopted by your Committee and now endorsed by the Democratic National Chairman and myself, I demand that you call on the President to halt this smear attack on a United States Senator and the candidate of the Republican Party for the Presidency.

"The following appeared in an August 8, 1964, article from the Wall Street Journal which refers to another television spot:

"'The "call from Khrushchev" may—or may not become a staple of paid network spots this fall. It and similar advertising assaults upon Republicans are among the costly devices Democrats are cranking up for potential use in the coming political campaign. Sometimes the preparations proceed slowly, in part because President Johnson likes to delve deep into details. And in the end only those salvos which he personally approves will be fired off.'

"We feel sure that these tactics will do the President more damage than good, but Senator GOLDWATER has no desire to benefit from a public revulsion. The dignity of democracy must not be permitted to suffer unduly in the heat of a political campaign.

"The fear and scare technique is not new in politics. But its use in the extreme sense to avoid an honest discussion of the issues should not be tolerated.

"I understand that, reprehensible as this Democrat TV spot is, it is only one in a series intended to smear the Republican candidate. The campaign represents a new low in American politics and violates the American sense of fair play and good taste.

"I know of one case where a child watching this Johnson spot was so violently upset that she cried and had nausea all night I am asking the three networks to take this spot off the air as a matter of common decency.

"I am also asking the Advertising Council and the NARTB to look into this matter. This scurrilous road must be abandoned and I urgently request your intercession with Mr. Johnson.

"Sincerely,

"DEAN BURCH, *Chairman.*"

Has Word Come Down From on High To Again Bury Bobby Baker Mess?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, could it be true, as Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS has suggested, that word has come down from on high to again bury the Bobby Baker mess in the Rules Committee of the other body?

The answer to that question will have to be in the affirmative unless the committee acts promptly and all the facts are made known to the American people before November 3.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial on this scandalous business which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of September 13:

NO CONFIDENCE

There is little or no reason why anyone should have any confidence in the Senate's revived "investigation" of the Bobby Baker case. For despite the significant new evidence which has been produced, the Senate apparently is determined to spread a second coat of whitewash on this already-whitewashed political scandal. For our part, we think what the Senate has done is nothing short of disgraceful.

Some weeks ago the Senate Rules Committee hopefully "buried" the Baker case, scrubbed its hands and offered up a small prayer to the effect that all would be forgotten. But there was one man—Delaware's Senator WILLIAMS—who is not the forgetful type.

Had it not been for this Republican there might not have been any investigation of Bobby Baker. Senator WILLIAMS was the moving spirit behind the Democratic majority's hasty peek into the closet where the skeletons were hidden. And it was he who advised the Rules Committee to ascertain, before signing off, the exact amount of the check which Matthew H. McCloskey wrote for the premium on a bond required in connection with the construction of the District of Columbia Stadium. Instead, the committee, for reasons best known to the Democratic majority, accepted the version given in a transatlantic phone call by Mr. McCloskey, who was then Ambassador to Ireland. Mr. McCloskey said the fee was about $73,000. But Senator WILLIAMS has produced a check which indicates that it was approximately $109,000. And the accusation is that part of the difference was a "kickback" which, through Bobby Baker, found its way into Democratic campaign funds.

The Rules Committee had ample reason to call Mr. McCloskey and Don Reynolds, the insurance broker to whom the fee was paid, and to compel them to testify under oath and in public. But the committee, on a straight party-line vote, didn't do so. One of the majority members, Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, offered this fascinating observation: "I think it is really looking for needles in a haystack to seriously suggest, in view of the very candid statement which Mr. McCloskey has made, that he should be called to testify before this committee."

Well, where do we stand today? The Senate on Thursday, again largely on party-line votes, decided to refer the new investigation, not to a tough investigating committee, but of all things to the Rules Committee. Perhaps the reasoning was that having once whitewashed this squalid business, the Rules Committee at least had the benefit of the experience.

Two things stand out. One is the unwillingness of Senator JORDAN, chairman of the Rules Committee, to give firm assurance that even Mr. McCloskey will be called as a witness in the new investigation. The other is the vote by the Democratic majority in the Senate to deny Republican members of the committee the right to call witnesses.

To us, this smells to high heaven. It has every hallmark of another coverup. Perhaps, as Senator WILLIAMS suggested, the word has come down from on high to bury this malodorous business in the Rules Committee—at least until after the election. At any rate, the Senate's performance last week tends to support the charge by Senator SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, that this revived investigation will be another "fraud on the public." If so, there can be but one proper public reaction—a loud, clear vote of "no confidence" in the Senate of the United States.

A Great Moral Issue: Bobby Baker and the Stero-Taker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you have heard the nursery rhyme which is currently titillating the country—the rhyme about Bobby Baker and the stereo-taker. It really is more of a bedtime story because the explanation which comes from Bobby Baker and his friend, mentor, and close associate, Lyndon Johnson, is believable only to simple-minded people.

The result of the stereo farce is that the stereo set now has become the national symbol for the easy virtue and uneasy morals which seem to abound in Washington today. The most discouraging part of the matter is that the majority party expresses no interest in clearing up the mess. They defy their constitutents to do something about it.

The stereo case epitomizes the ugliest concept in our political life—the kickback. This obviously was standard operating procedure during the reign of Bobby Baker, the follower, disciple and close associate of Lyndon Johnson.

Several characteristics marked Mr. Baker's dealings. One was that he always seemed to make more money than anyone else from his deals; the second was that a kickback nearly always was involved, and the third was that he shared his windfalls with his friends and associates.

It is not surprising, therefore, that an expensive stereo set became the price which Silver Spring Insurance Agent Don Reynolds had to pay in order to write several large life insurance policies on Lyndon Johnson.

The fact of the kickback is indelibly imprinted on the record. At the suggestion of Mr. Baker, Mr. Reynolds purchased a $542.25 stereo set and paid another $42.50 to have the set installed in Mr. Johnson's home.

Mr. Johnson's explanation of the kickback stretches the imagination beyond bounds. He said he assumed it was a gift from Bobby Baker. We are asked to believe this explanation in the face of an invoice—introduced into the record—which shows the bill went to Don Reynolds. Mr. Johnson reads the polls well enough; it is difficult to believe that his eyes failed to record the origin of the kickback.

Over the years we have seen many cases of influence peddling and under-the-table deals. But they pale into insignificance alongside the manipulations of Bobby Baker, a $19,000 clerk who managed to accumulate a fortune valued at nearly $2 million while he was on the public payroll.

Granted that he was an astute young man, it is impossible to believe that Mr. Baker accumulated his fortune without

the knowledge of his close associates, such as Lyndon Johnson.

It is difficult to believe that many bosses would accept $542.25 stereo sets from a $19,000 employee without at least casually wondering what was behind it.

It is difficult to believe that there were not many other kickbacks.

It is difficult to believe that this was not an acceptable procedure as far as Lyndon Johnson and Mr. Baker's other close associates were concerned. If it was not acceptable, one wonders why they made no effort to stop it.

One wonders still further why Mr. Johnson to this day has not publicly deplored the activities of his friend, disciple, and close associate.

In the face of this sordid picture, it is unbelievable to me that the majority party cannot wish to clean up the doubts and the entire mess surrounding Mr. Baker's operations. What a cynical attitude toward Government—to believe that the voter has no right to know about stereo kickbacks and similar deals.

I think the picture presented by the stereo is a miniature of a much larger picture—a picture of the moral decay which has beset our Government. If we value our Government, we had better do something about ridding ourselves of this infestation; otherwise it will destroy us.

Negroes Object to Democrat Bossism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following article from the Washington Star, which is self-explanatory:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 14, 1964]

NEGRO BACKS GOLDWATER DESPITE PHONE THREATS

A 29-year-old Negro claims his life was threatended over the weekend because he supports BARRY GOLDWATER, for President.

Telephone calls began Saturday. Unidentified voices continued to warn Ben Brown Saturday night that he was a "traitor to the Negro people," the Republican precinct chairman said.

By Sunday morning, he was willing to give up local politics. He called newsmen to say he was withdrawing. When the word reached Republican Chairman Carl L. Shipley, Mr. Shipley phoned Mr. Brown.

Shortly afterwards, Mr. Brown said he'd stay with the GOP, with Senator GOLDWATER, and with his precinct organization, regardless of threats.

WELCOMED AS HERO

Police escorted him to a strategy session of Republican precinct chairmen on upper northwest Georgia Avenue, where he was given a hero's welcome. His fellow Republicans stood to applaud him as he came in the door.

"My life has been threatened for supporting BARRY GOLDWATER," he said. "But I am standing firm. I am not a turncoat to any race nor to any minority group. I want to work for all the people."

Mr. Brown, still registered as a Democrat, was a deputy precinct chairman for the Democrats before the May primary election of district party officers. He said he was "100 percent" for Frank Reeves, former national committeeman defeated by the Reverend Franklin Jackson. Most of the Democratic incumbents withdrew their support of Mr. Reeves, and worked instead for Mr. Jackson.

DRIVEN OUT BY BOSSISM

The vote for Mr. Jackson was acceptance of "bossism," Mr. Brown, a mail and baggage clerk said. And "bossism" was the issue that drove him out of the Democratic Party.

"I am for equal, not special, treatment for the Negro," he said.

Mr. Brown explained that he believed a Negro could elevate himself by supporting Senator GOLDWATER. The Johnson administration tries to boss and "take care" of the Negro.

"I will not stand to be bossed," he said.

Mr. Brown, whose wife is a Democrat, is the father of four children between the ages of 2 and 12, and lives in southeast Washington. Police are investigating the reported threats to bomb his apartment and to harm his family.

A Bankrupt Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the current political campaign we are hearing a great deal about the status of States rights in the American political system. The theory of States rights advocated by Senator GOLDWATER is nothing more than a negative doctrine designed to cover the abdication of a State's responsibilities to its citizens.

The San Fernando Sun, a newspaper in my district, points this out very well in the following editorial from its issue of September 6:

STATES RIGHTS A BANKRUPT DOCTRINE

The core of the domestic side of Goldwaterism is the unflinching belief in the doctrine of States rights, wherein each individual State has sovereignty in all matters not purely national in scope such as defense of the country.

It is a nice theory and is guaranteed to receive a rousing reception at rallies of, say, the Young Republicans. But matching practice with theory is quite another matter.

In civil rights, for example, States like New York, Pennsylvania, and California assumed their responsibilities (or rights), without Federal prodding, to insure equal rights for all citizens. But these States and others in the North and West do not make a Nation. It is in States like Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia that the doctrine of States rights suffers a complete breakdown. There, as in many other States, the theory of States rights is distorted to mean that the State has the right to deny its citizens civil rights.

Taking Goldwaterism at its word, then, would mean that a State could literally get away with murder.

On another issue, medical care for the aged, the States rights doctrine is proved equally bankrupt. The Kerr-Mills bill, a law filled with many loopholes but above all embodying the States rights approach to medical care, is an abysmal failure.

Where does the citizen turn when the State declines to match sovereignty with responsibility? Nowhere, according to Goldwaterism.

Fortunately, the majority of the Nation's representatives have recognized the weakness of Goldwaterism and voted to fill the vacuum between States rights and State responsibility. The Civil Rights Act is now law, and medicare, passed by the Senate, now awaits the butcher in the House of Representatives.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, the oracle of Goldwaterism, had a noteworthy comment on his "no" vote on medicare. Said he, "They (senior citizens) want to make the decision as to how their own money shall be spent; they do not want it made for them by government."

Sounds vaguely familiar. Like making social security voluntary?

Tribute to Dr. Norman Welch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Norman Welch, president of the American Medical Association, died suddenly on September 3, 1964, in Wyoming. I would like to add my voice to the numerous well-deserved tributes this fine gentleman received, and to add my expression of wholehearted sorrow at learning of his passing.

In recent years I have had the occasion to meet Dr. Welch when he testified before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety and at various meetings across the country. To all of us in the House who knew him, and there are many, I know I express our united sentiment that the medical profession has lost an eminent and devoted practitioner and spokesman, and that we have lost a friend.

We can share to some extent in the deep grief of his widow and five children and offer them our heartfelt sympathy.

Dr. Welch was a man of quiet dignity. He was amiable and had the wit of his Irish ancestry. He was forceful in his opinions, but never clamorous. He was a devoted parent, a devoted physician, and a devoted exponent of the principles of the American Medical Association. Those who knew him liked and respected him. His deep, calm voice, rich with Boston accent, presided over many meetings of the AMA's house of delegates when he served as speaker of the house and became an expert parliamentarian whom nothing fazed. This is the memory of him that thousands of fellow physicians undoubtedly will carry.

But many others in the Boston area where he was raised and practiced knew Dr. Welch primarily in another role—that of one of the best-liked and capable physicians in New England.

He took his medical degree at Tufts in 1926 and later served as clinical professor of medicine at that college. He served as president of the Massachusetts Blue Shield, which he was instrumental in founding, and was chairman of the Na-

tional Blue Shield Commission from 1955 through 1958. At the time of his death, Dr. Welch was consultant physician to five Massachusetts hospitals—Carney, Leominster, Winthrop Community, Marlboro, and Metropolitan State. He was also a president of the Council of the New England Medical Society.

Dr. Welch was born in 1902 in Brockton, Mass., the son of parents of Irish descent who had emigrated to the United States from Canada. He considered himself to be a friend of labor, since his father, John J. Welch, was engaged in road construction and was president of a local of the bricklayers' and stonemasons' union. It was not a wealthy upbringing, but Dr. Welch and his family somehow saw him through medical school.

This New Englander was a vigorous advocate of his profession. Once he told a group of reporters that too often newspapers "give publicity to the things that, admittedly, catch the eye but are done by men who do not stand for what we stand for. The doctor who never sends a bill because he knows the patient is in difficulties, the man who works all night with no hope of reward—you don't hear about this."

Dr. Welch was describing the type of physician he was and that most physicians are.

Dr. Welch was a stout believer in the AMA's stands. He was a registered Democrat an da member of a physicians committee for John F. Kennedy when the late President ran for the Senate against Henry Cabot Lodge. He disagreed with the party's platform in 1960 on the issue of financing medical care for the aged, but stated later that in doing so "I still have tremendous respect for President Kennedy."

Dr. Welch was a courteous and gentle man. I mourn his death. But the true mark of this man's greatness is the sorrow and sense of loss of those thousands upon thousands of patients that he treated and who came to love him as a friend and a healer of the sick and injured. A physician could wish no better epitaph.

Tips and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of Thursday, September 3, 1964:

TIPS AND SECURITY

The Internal Revenue Service has long held that tips received by waiters, taxi drivers, and other service workers must be reported as income. Yet under present law, they can receive social security credit only for their regular wages—and not for their income in tips.

This is unfair. It penalizes the honest worker who reports his tips and pays taxes on them but gets no credit from them toward support for his old age. It encourages employers to force their employees to rely more heavily on tips than on wages—since the employers save money that way.

Recently the House moved to correct this injustice. One provision of the social security revision it has approved calls for withholding of social security taxes on tips reported by the employee. The employer would have to match them, just as he matches social security taxes on other employee income. Result would be larger tax payments by both—but considerably fatter retirement checks for the employee.

The Senate should approve the change and give workers who depend on tips the same social security status as other employees.

Bulgaria as a Captive Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, all captive nations in Europe share one unenviable lot in common; they all suffer under the unrelenting Communist totalitarianism, devised and imposed upon them by the Soviet Union. The Bulgarians, as one of the captive nations, share that fate. Their case is somewhat different in that they were one of the first, even before the end of the war, to be brought under communism. During the war it was agreed among Western leaders and the Soviet authorities that Bulgaria was to become a Soviet sphere at the conclusion of the war. But the leaders of the West never thought that this would eventually mean the isolation of the country from the West, and the enslavement of its people by the Soviet system. Unfortunately, since the Bulgarians were not masters of their own fate at the time, Soviet authorities took full advantage of the situation and quickly established their hegemony over the country with the aid of the Red army and local Communists. And so it came to pass that, at the end of the war the governments of the West were faced with a sad and appalling situation in Bulgaria. They soon learned that the country was under the complete control of the Soviet Union, and they were in no position to alter this situation.

Since then, for nearly 20 years, these brave fighters of the Balkan Peninsula, who are also among the most industrious peasants of the whole region and who in the past had defied many a powerful foe, have now been enslaved and held down in their historic homeland by ruthless Communist totalitarianism. To be sure, they did not submit to their overlords without a struggle; to the end, until 1947, they fought hard to maintain at least a part of their internal political freedom. Before the Soviet-backed local Communist Party emerged as the only party in the country, numerous other parties had large followers—the peasant or the agrarian party alone was more powerful than all Communists and leftwingers combined. The agrarian leaders, headed by the inimitable Nikola Petkov, fought the Communists with all their might. But in the end their efforts were doomed. Though they could have coped with opposing Bulgarian elements, they were no match for the Soviet authorities in the country, supported by the mighty Red Army. And the Communists were determined to have it all their way; they wanted to bury the agrarian party and do away with its leader. This they did by mid-1947, when they arrested Nikola Petkov, put him on trial on charges of conspiring against the people, and then executed him on Sepetmber 23. With Petkov's death all opposition to Communist rule was crushed, but Petkov's memory lives on in the hearts and minds of his loyal followers who fervently cling to their ideals of freedom and independence.

Military in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting article, entitled "Military In Space," from the pen of Mr. James J. Haggerty, Jr., appeared in the September 12 issue of the Journal of the Armed Forces. It tells of the important work being done at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., on the military space program.

Under permission granted, I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MILITARY IN SPACE

(By James J. Haggerty, Jr.)

EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLA.—Sandwiched between an engine test stand and a gun testing range here at Eglin is an unprepossessing building which houses an Air Force space research laboratory. Shabby by comparison with the many modern multimillion-dollar space facilities that have cropped up all over the Nation, this lab is nonetheless doing an important, unduplicated and hitherto unrecorded job of work with minimal staff and budget.

It is the Terminal Ballistic Vacuum Range, a facility of Air Force Systems Command's Air Proving Ground Center, commanded by Maj. Gen. J. E. Roberts. Its job is to study the damaging effect of high-velocity projectiles impacting on materials of the type that will be used in spacecraft construction in an effort to devise methods of protecting spacecraft crews against the explosive decompression that could be caused by a hull puncture by such projectiles.

An example of a high-velocity projectile is a meteorite. Traveling at terrific velocities ranging from 40,000 feet per second up to more than 200,000 feet per second, a meteorite can zip right through the strongest metals used in current spacecraft fabrication. It could cripple a spacecraft by causing loss of pressure or by knocking out some element of the craft's internal equipment. The frequency of meteorites is such that it has not been a major problem in the initial series of manned spacecraft, because they are relatively small and their duration in space has been limited.

In future spacecraft, puncture damage will become more of a hazard as the probability of

a meteorite hit increases in, for instance, a large manned space station which will remain in orbit for a year or more. The damage potential is not confined to natural projectiles. Similar or far greater damage can be induced by man-made particles produced by antispace nonnuclear weapons. Weapons effect on both spacecraft and missile warheads is also part of the APGC study.

In order to provide protection against particle damage, the first assignment is to study the behavior of high-velocity projectiles in the space environment. APGC initiated this study last year by converting an old, out-of-use gun test facility into a projectile test chamber. The conversion cost less than $100,000, which qualifies the Terminal Ballistic Vacuum Range as one of the least expensive space research facilities in the Nation.

The heart of the range is the target chamber in which space-equivalent near-vacuum conditions of 245,000 feet altitude can be duplicated. The chamber currently in use is a cylinder 19 feet 5 inches long and just under 12 feet in diameter. The target—a sheet of aluminum, titanium, plastic or other aerospace material of varying thickness—is placed within the chamber and bombarded by projectiles. To impart high velocity to the projectiles, APGC researchers use a high-explosive shaped charge containing a metallic core. When the charge is electrically detonated, the core is shattered into small particles which hurtle into the target.

Researchers can fire projectiles with a mass of one-half gram—about the size of a "beebee" shot—at a velocity of 40,000 feet per second and larger particles (up to 4 grams) at 13,500 feet per second. These velocities, of course, do not duplicate the speeds of meteorites, but test results serve as a base point for "scaling up," mathematically computing the greater damage which would be caused by the higher velocity. In addition to assessing damage potential, APGC researchers are studying detonation physics by means of an ultra-high-speed Kercell framing camera which can shoot thousands of frames in a fraction of a second. This permits photographic observation of the pellets from the time of detonation until they strike the target.

For a complete study of high velocity particle phenomena, APGC needs improvements to its facility. First step, to come within a month, is enlargement of the chamber door to permit introduction of bigger targets, such as a full-scale reentry vehicle. Next step is to put into service a second chamber now on stand-by status. This chamber is rectangular in shape, 11 feet, 7 inches high, 11 feet, 3 inches wide, and slightly more than 19 feet long; the entire end section can be removed to allow installation of still larger targets. APGC is also contracting for new type explosive charges which will provide velocities of 50,000 to 100,000 feet per second.

The studies are not far enough along to have produced a clear developmental line toward providing protection against high-velocity particles, but they are checking out one possible solution offered by a number of theoreticians—the "bumper" approach. This would involve building a second, outer hull. A large particle striking the bumper would break up into a number of smaller particles capable of inflicting less damage; they might only dent, instead of penetrate, the inner hull.

Although the primary purpose of this research is to develop methods of protection, it would appear that there is a corollary benefit. One of the current military aims is to find a method of disabling a potentially hostile satellite. APGC researchers won't talk about it, but it would seem that complete data on particle behavior and detonation physics would be helpful in this area.

Defense Department Cost-Effectiveness Formulas Espoused by Johnson and McNamara Sweep to Another Smashing Victory Over Military Duplication and Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Armed Forces Management magazine for September patriotically reports to a gratefull nation the current progress of Secretary McNamara and his brilliant team of civilian aids in forging our new look Defense Establishment. This enterprising magazine takes us directly into the fabulous Pentagon's exclusive E-ring offices manned by the Secretary's wizard-like young assistants. It reports, verbatim, an actual application of the magical cost/effectiveness formulas which are doing so much to alter our stocks of military hardware and to adjust to new levels the morale of our men in uniform. Particular attention is drawn to General Batt's concluding tribute to his interviewers. Here is the magazine's report, faithfully recorded by Writer Frank Walker:

WHO'S ON FIRST?

(NOTE.—A tongue-in-cheek tale relating the memorable day that a DOD cost/effectiveness study group invaded the baseball diamond.)

(By Frank Walker)

(Scene: An E-ring office of Disneyland East. Seated before a highly polished conference table General Batt is engaged in justifying in utilization of 23 servicemen on the servicewide championship baseball team. His audience of three intent, two-button youngsters (identified nominally as Messrs. "A," "B," and "C") are busily manipulating a slide rule, double matrix computer, and an ouija board, respectively.)

Mr. A. General, you say that there are nine men on a basebal team?

General BATT. Well technically speaking, only nine players play at any one time, sir. But because of the need for substitutes, base line coaches * * *.

Mr. A. I see, General. You are requesting authorization for built-in redundancy, and * * *.

General BATT. I didn't think I was asking for anything, sir. I thought I was called here to explain to you the manpower utilization of * * *.

Mr. B. Uh, General. We are really not concerned with manpower utilization for the purposes of this study. We are interested in a time-motion analysis of baseball, and in order for us to understand the transitional parameters, we are simply trying to ascertain the current state of the art.

General BATT. Well, in the equipment field, the state of the art provides bats, gloves, uniforms, underwear, spiked shoes, a cap, three canvas covered bases, a home plate, and a pitcher's rubber. There is some variation in the gloves, basically found in three categories called a catcher's mitt, a first baseman's mitt, and a fielder's glove.

Mr. A. Right there, General, why can't we standardize here and save a considerable amount of money? What parameters does a catcher's uh, did you say "mitt?" require as opposed to the other two equipments?

General BATT. Well, you see, sir, in baseball, one of the players is called the pitcher. He throws the ball very hard at the catcher, and the ball might be a fast ball, a slow ball, a curve ball, a slider, a sinker, or a knuckle ball.

Mr. B. Well, I think right here we can certainly cut down on the number of different kinds of balls. You not only seem to have a lot of different kinds of mitts, but balls, too.

General BATT. Sir, it's the same ball, just thrown differently.

Mr. B. That in itself would seem to indicate a redundancy in training the thrower. It would be obviously more efficient if the man were trained to throw only one kind of ball.

General BATT. Yes, sir. As I was saying, the pitcher throws the ball very hard at the catcher. Hence, we provide him with a very large mitt not only to protect his hands more, but to give him some leeway in case the different kinds of balls don't follow the desired and planned trajectory.

Mr. B. Doesn't somebody hit the ball before the catcher catches it?

General BATT. Well, of course, they try, but most of the time they either do not hit it, or the ball is a ball.

Mr. C. I thought it was always a ball.

Mr. B. It is. Isn't it, General?

General BATT. Yes and no. As I was saying, the catchers' mitts are even made larger in case of a knuckle ball * * *. Oh, excuse me, maybe we might strike that from the record. I believe that it is too minor for this level to consider.

Mr. C. The ouija board says "OK." We'll strike it. But what happens if the ball is hit?

General BATT. If the ball is hit, it assumes a trajectory in accordance with the mechanics of the swing used by the batter and the point of the bat which hits the ball.

Mr. A. Ah, I see. KE=½mv squared, huh?

General BATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. A. Then I think we've solved one problem already. Obviously, every player should have a catcher's mitt to protect his hands from the kinetic energy imparted to the ball through the combination of the strength of the pitcher and the impetus imparted by the batter. After all, General, we have a great responsibility to protect our wonderful fighting men, and must consider all of the facets of military operations. Hence, let the record show that for the sake of (1) economy of procurement and (2) safety of enlisted personnel that our cost/effectiveness decision No. 1 is that everyone playing service baseball shall wear only catchers' mitts. I would like to spend more time on this subject, General, because you don't look very happy but we still have interservice football, basketball, and chess to analyze for the Chief * * * and you know what deadlines he places on us. Let us now return to why you need 23 players.

General BATT. Well, sir, as I explained, there are nine active players on the field at any one time. Then the pitcher, because he works so hard, cannot play every day, so we need substitute pitchers. In addition, sometimes even a fresh pitcher is having a bad day, so we must be prepared to replace him. Now, the other players who aren't pitchers * * *.

Mr. C. Let's take this thing logically, now, General. Even though we have fine computers for this work, we still must place the logic within them in a logical manner. So let's stop at the pitcher. You say he works hard?

General BATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. B. Does he work any harder than the other eight players?

General BATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. A. Well, this is just another reason why you are so fortunate to have us in the Department of Defense. The solution to this one is painfully obvious to anyone educated in logic matrix theory. We will simply issue an order that the work will be shared by all players, plus or minus 5 percent, of course. We don't want to deprive you of your decisionmaking powers, you understand.

General BATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. B. I'm sorry, Mr. A, I feel that maybe we are approaching this wrong. General, how often does a pitcher pitch?

General BATT. About every fourth day is considered proper.

Mr. B. Ah, then, by sharing the burden as suggested by Mr. A, you could really rotate the other eight men, using a different one every day, and having one standing by. Isn't that correct?

General BATT. Well, sir, you see the skills of the individual * * *.

Mr. B. General, come now, haven't you read the directive on all-purpose personnel? Individuals no longer are allowed to have individual skills not possessed by all others. It is not American, democratic, nor efficient.

Mr. C. Besides, we have issued an order on this; DOD instruction 5500.-7B, third revision, dated January 17, 1964. I assume you have read this, General?

General BATT. I did, sir, but I thought it applied only to the General Purpose Forces under the general purpose program planning management study for the fiscal year 1965 budget.

Mr. C. You should read more carefully, General.

General BATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. B. I think we can do a lot of good here. First, since we have decided to rotate the 9 active players, we can now cut out the other 14, hence saving about 60 percent in manpower * * *.

Mr. A. My slide rule says 60.87 percent, so let the record reflect this.

General BATT. But, sir, suppose there is an injury?

Mr. A. General, we cannot even attempt to try to compute remote contingencies of this nature. We deal only in finite figures, and finite facts. The trouble with all you service people is that you always come up here and try to snow us with a lot of ands, ifs, buts, maybes, and perhapses. Frankly, General, we're getting a little fed up with this. What do you think we are, children?

General BATT. Oh, no sir. The thought never entered my head.

Mr. A. Fine; then, hereafter, all service baseball teams are limited to nine men. Be sure this is in the report; the chief will be proud to present this to Congress. Cost savings * * * ah.

General BATT. But, if you limit the teams like this, you'll kill off baseball.

Mr. B. Nonsense, General. You already have admitted that the pitcher works harder than anybody else, only works once every 4 days, and you still have eight other men. In fact, the thought has been going through my mind that if these other eight men aren't working as hard as they could during a game, perhaps we can cut a little more. Full manpower utilization is a definite factor in cost effectiveness, you know, General.

Mr. A. I think you have a point there, Mr. B. What does the ouija board say?

Mr. C. The ouija board says, "Yes."

Mr. B. Well then, I think we can take an initial arbitrary cut of * * * let's say four men right now, and we will restudy the matter next year. OK, General?

General BATT. Sir. * * *.

Mr. A. Fine, then the next point is the uniforms. You said that the players wear a cap, a uniform, and shoes. Are these all uniform?

General BATT. Yes, sir. The only differences are in the sizes and the numbers on the players' backs.

Mr. B. Numbers on the players' backs? What for?

General BATT. To identify the players, sir.

Mr. A. Well, with only five players, I don't see why anyone would have trouble remembering who was who. This is an easy decision, get rid of the numbers.

General BATT. But, sir * * *.

Mr. C. If the General objects, why don't we just insist that all the numbers be the same. We can then purchase them in quantities and save lots of money. Remind me to ask the Defense Supply Agency to present justifying figures on this. I'll bet the services have spent hundreds of dollars over the past 50 years on numbers. Tell the DSA only to go back 40 years. We don't want to impose unreasonable burdens on them.

Mr. B. I think I saw a picture of a baseball player once. Isn't his cap like a helmet and his shoulders all padded out * * *.

General BATT. No sir, that's a football uniform. Baseball uniforms are made of flannel, the cap of cloth. They fit loosely, and * * *.

Mr. A. Aha, if they fit loosely, General, how do you justify the fact that you have placed on the record that you need different sizes? Don't bother to answer. Your statement clarifies the waste on its face. We shall put out the order to standardize the size of baseball uniforms.

General BATT. Yes, sir. On behalf of the soldiers, I thank you.

Mr. C. That's fine, General. We like to see cooperation and cordial support. You know, we often feel as we do our duty to the country, that many armed services witnesses are determined not to be cooperative. It does make our tasks so much easier when they are like you.

General BATT. Thank you, sir. I think I can readily understand your concern for the game, and the services, and can save you some time with some other economies that have been going through my mind. I will immediately order all home plates replaced with standard bases. How's that?

Mr. C. Goody. Now we are getting somewhere.

General BATT. We have also been using far too many balls, and it is obvious that we have deluded ourselves by self-centered greed and empire building into providing too many bats. I will certainly take the initiative which your leadership and guidance have taught me to take, and order no more than one ball and one bat for each two teams. I see no reason why we need more.

Mr. B. Possibly we could save a little more here by scheduling what I think you call "two header," then, four teams could use the same bat and ball.

General BATT. Sir, you are a genius. I have to take my hat off to you. You also have inspired me to suggest that we could share uniforms because with only two teams playing at one time, we could switch between games.

Mr. C. Wouldn't it be better to play all four teams at the same time and save much on the motion expenditure, plus the time of the spectators?

General BATT. A capital idea.

Mr. A. General, we want to thank you for your assistance in this study. My slide rule shows that we have cut a lot of fat out of the baseball program and I am certain that the Chief and the Congress will be most pleased. We only wish the rest of the admirals and the generals were as loyal and devoted to the whole cause as you, and not so parochially involved in their own empires.

General BATT. Thank you, gentlemen. I am sure that your astute judgments today will place baseball on a par with the rest of the Department of Defense since you undertook your studies.

Yes, Lyndon, There Is a Davy Crockett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 10, 1964]

FIELD GENERALS AND NUCLEAR ARMS

(By David Lawrence)

President Johnson says that "there is no such thing as a conventional nuclear weapon." But it is unfortunately true that, if a conventional war is started in Europe, it cannot be won by the West without the use of some of the smaller nuclear weapons.

The real issue in the debate is being avoided by the use of campaign hyperboles. It is supposed to be good politics to tell the American people that any man, when elected President, might have a nervous finger on the nuclear trigger. This assumes that military operations are going to be directed hereafter by a President in the White House and not by a supreme military commander of experience who faces the enemy directly on the battlefield.

The discussion concerning the kind of weapons to use in a conventional war—that is, a possible invasion across the Continent of Europe—has been going on for the last 3 years. It has led to a momentous decision by President de Gaulle of France that he can no longer depend upon the United States to protect his country against attack and that he must have a nuclear arsenal of his own. The French fully understand the reluctance of the United States to put its nuclear weapons at the disposal of other governments. But at the same time, France is willing to have the American military commander of NATO forces in Europe given such control.

Military men generally point out that, in the event of a land attack in Europe, it might take too much time to get proper instructions from the White House, and that a Soviet invasion would by then have reached such proportions that only a massive nuclear response would be able to prevent defeat. Once such a massive retaliation does occur, of course, a nuclear war of mammoth proportions will have been started. It is precisely to avoid such a nuclear holocaust that the military men have advocated the use of small tactical nuclear weapons, some of which have not much more firepower than conventional weapons of the past but a longer range. These could be used to frustrate the offensive operations of a land army.

What the military men fear most is that they may not be able to get a decision from the President of the United States promptly enough to rearrange their troops, and also that the frontline situation may be mistakenly assessed by the President and his advisers, far removed from the battle area.

One of the tactical nuclear weapons is similar in appearance to a large recoilless rifle. It carries a very low-yield nuclear warhead, designed to knock out a bridge, for instance, but not a city. This is known as the "Davy Crocket."

There are other nuclear weapons—among them two rockets known as the "Honest John" and the "Little John"—which are essentially artillery pieces for the aid of ground armies and are tailored to special battlefield

conditions. This is one reason why Senator GOLDWATER says these could really be called "conventional" weapons, as they take the place of artillery. They are confined to ground operations and not to longrange strategic attack such as is envisaged for the big nuclear bombs.

One of the most interesting phases of the problem was recently emphasized by General of the Army Ailleret, chief of staff of the armed forces of France, in a lecture delivered before the annual assembly of the NATO college in Europe. He said:

"If aggression occurred without any warning—that is, without very important measures of concentration on the part of the enemy—the ratio of forces would be about three to two in favor of the Soviets in big land units, and the imbalance would be even greater in the realm of supporting and pursuit planes. Moreover, the effect of surprise would come into full play because the Soviet attack force would find itself faced with a defense force only in process of being put in place."

General Ailleret declared that the expedient moment to use tactical nuclear weapons must be found as soon as possible after the enemy forces cross the Iron Curtain. He added:

"If it comes only after the Soviets have invaded half of Europe, the destruction from this will be added to the invasion, which would only mean for her double disasters, of different kinds but each one immense."

Senator GOLDWATER's suggestion that the NATO supreme commander be authorized to use certain kinds of tactical nuclear weapons of the smaller range of firepower in case of attack in Europe is in line with the thinking of many American as well as European military men of high rank.

Some day, when the campaign is over, it seems likely that, no matter who is elected President, some arrangement will have to be made which will give discretionary authority to the supreme commander of NATO forces in Europe—an American—so that he can take prompt action whenever the enemy starts an invasion. The mere fact that such instructions would be known to have been given in advance could prove to be a deterrent of far-reaching significance.

The Late Honorable William F. Green, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was truly mortified when the bound volume containing the memorial addresses on the passing of the late Honorable William F. Green, Jr., was issued to find that I was not included among those paying a tribute of respect to him. I regret this very much inasmuch as Bill Green was one of my dearest and closest friends here in the House of Representatives. I was a member of the congressional funeral committee and accompanied President Johnson to his funeral in Philadelphia.

At the time of his passing, Bill Green was one of our outstanding party leaders, serving with distinction since 1953 as chairman of the Philadelphia Democratic City Committee. He was a competent member of the Committee on Ways and Means and a respected Member of the House of Representatives. I have greatly missed him.

The GI Bill at 20

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 20th anniversary of a historic example of Federal aid to education—the GI bill. Many Members of both Houses of the Congress, including myself, completed our education on the GI bill after our World War II service. In a recent issue of the George Washington University magazine Mr. John S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, wrote an article pointing out the long-range results of the GI bill.

I wish to bring this thoughful article to the attention of Members of the House:

TWENTY YEARS LATER

Immediately after the guns stopped shooting, the bombs stopped raining down, and the lights went on again all over the world, the United States emerged from World War II to confront a serious domestic crisis.

The largest military force in U.S. history was encamped all over the world hoping for quick discharges, and jobs, houses, and education on their return. Mindful of the upheaval, unemployment, and bonus marches that followed the relatively short and smaller First World War, there was widespread fear about the potentially explosive reaction of 15.3 million World War II veterans whose lives had been uprooted in a longer, more far-flung, and disruptive war.

One economist predicted a whopping 19 million unemployed if the postwar economy dropped back to its 1940 level of output. More conservative estimates placed the figure at a staggering 8 million. A sociologist, recalling that Hitler and Mussolini had recruited idle veterans, wrote gloomily: "Veterans have written many a bloody page of history and those pages have stood forever as a record of their days of anger."

That the United States won victory in this great peacetime battle is a tribute to a unique piece of legislation—the GI bill of rights.

Exactly 16 days after D-Day, when U.S. Armed Forces made history with the sword, President Roosevelt made another kind of history with the stroke of his pen. He signed the GI bill of rights on June 22, 1944.

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the birth of this historic example of long-range planning, which has been compared with the Morrill Act creating land-grant colleges, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Marshall plan.

What was the GI bill of rights, actually titled "The Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944"? It provided for loans, education, readjustment allowances for veterans, and expanded veterans hospitals and employment service.

There were those who scoffed at the proposal for the GI bill. They called it an "all time gravy train," aiming particularly heavy fire at the readjustment allowances. Yet only 10 percent exhausted this benefit. Some opponents claimed that veterans returning to school under the GI bill would breed "educational hobo jungles" on college campuses. Instead, they raised the intellectual level of the entire country.

Gloomy prophets dourly predicted that GI homes would be a haven for "dead beats," that veterans would move in when housing was scarce and then walk out from their obligations. On the contrary, veterans have proved to be excellent credit risks.

But the opposition faded away along with their dire predictions. "With the signing of this bill," said President Roosevelt at a White House ceremony, "a well-rounded program of special veterans' benefits is nearly completed. It gives emphatic notice to the men and women of our armed forces that the American people do not intend to let them down."

The feeling was mutual. Veterans certainly did not intend to let America down. "They would be a potent force for good or evil in the years to come," as one veterans' leader predicted at the time. "They could make or break our country. But given the opportunity provided by the GI bill of rights, there was only one alternative—veterans would be a tremendous force for good, and help build a better America, after they had destroyed Nazi, Fascist, and Nipponese totalitarianism."

The words could not have been more prophetic. There's a rundown on their GI bill record after 20 years:

1. Under the education and training provisions of the bill, 7,800,000 veterans—nearly half of all who served during the war—received training. With well over 2 million in college and another 3,500,000 in other schools, veterans filled every nook and corner of the dormitories, laboratories, and classrooms. They attended classes at 19,000 trade and technical schools, and Quonset huts dotted 2,600 campuses from the University of Maine to the University of Southern California.

About 1,400,000 veterans increased their skills in on-the-job training, and about 700,000 learned the newest agricultural techniques in on-the-farm training.

Today we are a far stronger Nation for the infusion of the skills manpower gained through the GI bill: 450,000 engineers, 180,000 doctors, dentists, and nurses, 360,000 schoolteachers, 150,000 scientists, 243,000 accountants, 107,000 lawyers, 36,000 clergymen, 17,000 writers, 711,000 mechanics, 383,000 construction workers, 288,000 metalworkers, 138,000 electricians, and the almost 700,000 who trained for business and executive careers.

Altogether, it was the largest program of mass adult education ever undertaken at bargain rates. The $14.5 billion cost has been more than recouped.

The GI bill continues to pay for itself at close to $1 billion a year. The return comes from additional income tax paid by better educated, higher earning GI bill veterans.

2. Equally beneficial has been the long-range effects of the GI bill loan program. Structural evidence of it dots the countryside. One out of every 5 homes built since the end of World War II was financed with a GI loan. As someone said, the landscape architect of postwar America has been the VA loan guaranty officer.

More than 5,268,000 World War II veterans were granted Veterans' Administration home, farm or business loans totaling more than $43 billion. The almost 5 million home loans in this total helped touch off a postwar housing boom that turned Americans into a Nation of homeowners. This infusion of credit, of course, resulted in an enormous stimulus to our national economy. For purchases of new housing dilate the economic arteries. Purchases of new furniture, new appliances, new cars follows; and school construction and other public works are not far behind as new suburban communities mushroom. (These are communities with good credit

ratings, it might be said, for more than a third of the GI loans are paid in full.)

3. Often under fire, the GI bill readjustment allowance program helped tide nearly 9 million veterans through the initial period while they looked for jobs. The average stay on the rolls was only 19 weeks, and some $3.8 billion was expended in this program, only 900,000 veterans, or about 1 out of 10, exhausted their full rights to unemployment benefits. Most veterans just weren't content with $20 a week, when they could be bringing home $100 from a job, or improving their skills and education.

It was an underappreciated bulwark against adversity for unemployed veterans. In most instances, the payments were not strung together. They were spread over periods when veterans were changing jobs, trying to find themselves in a new world.

4. Millions of veterans skipped school; most of the older, married and previously employed veterans, headed back to their old jobs, or better ones, if they could land them. One of the lessons that World War I demobilization drove home was that a strong, well-financed, public employment service is indispensable to a smooth readjustment process.

One Government official evaluated the GI bill by paraphrasing Winston Churchill. "Never before," he said, "has so much been done for so many for so little."

A leading industrialist, who knew a good investment when he saw one agreed. Said Henry Ford II: "Millions of veterans who otherwise might not have had the opportunity, have been enabled to enter college or to complete specialized training. The Nation gains by having created a great new source from which to draw its leaders."

Leaders they are and leaders they will be, for years to come according to Dr. Amos Yoder, who made a survey of the GI bill's impact on men listed in the 1960–61 "Who's Who." He found approximately 1,000 who had benefited. "All were under 46 years which," he said, "is a sizable number when it is realized that almost all of the men who make 'Who's Who' are older."

Since the past is also prologue, the lessons of the GI bill have great value on the contemporary scene. In his message to Congress outling plans for a war on poverty, President Johnson pointed out that if annual earnings of 10 million among the poor could be raised by only $1,000, it will add $14 billion a year to the national output; reduce the $4 billion in public assistance payments; and lower the costs of fighting crime, delinquency, disease, and hunger.

"Our history has proved," President Johnson said, "that each time we broaden the base of abundance, giving more people the chance to produce and consume, we create new industry, higher production, increased earnings and better income for all." The GI bill is an excellent example of the wisdom of his words.

A Kennedy Hegemony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, the sentiments expressed in an editorial article by Raymond Moley in Newsweek of September 7, have been less clearly expressed, hinted at, discussed, and considered in many quarters. These sentiments raise an issue. Because Mr. Moley's expression is particularly apt, I submit it for republication:

A KENNEDY HEGEMONY
(By Raymond Moley)

There is much to suggest the maneuvers of the young, preimperial Bonaparte to gain the mastery of France in the designs of Robert F. Kennedy to dominate the Democratic Party and, through that powerful agency, to elevate himself to you know where.

It must have been clear to this extraordinarily perceptive young man, even in December, that Lyndon B. Johnson, if he felt sufficiently strong in his own right, would reject any member of the Kennedy clan as a candidate for Vice President. For he had ample reason to distrust and dislike the Attorney General.

Kennedy was too young to contemplate retirement from politics; too ambitious, too imbued with the virus of power to remain a subordinate of the President; and too resourceful to fail to formulate another avenue for his ambitions.

His assets were—and are—large wealth, the Kennedy family including the in-laws, time to execute his plans (he is 17 years L.B.J.'s junior), close political ties with the big urban Democratic machines and with many minorities including labor, and scores of Federal officeholders including U.S. district attorneys who are his de facto appointees. He is also the heir to the love and devotion of millions to the memory of his martyred brother. Finally, as a hard, realistic politician he realizes that he can count upon the cynicism of political leaders, who would recognize a rising power in contrast with that of a President whose personal power would decline somewhat after a possible election and completely after a possible reelection.

POWER THROUGH THE SENATE

The Senate offers the most favorable means for Kennedy's purpose. Senators see Presidents come and go. In 1908 Woodrow Wilson commented that established Senators regard a President as "at most, an ephemeral phenomenon."

Senators have actual control of the Federal patronage in their States through the time tested custom of senatorial courtesy. And when one of the Senators is, as now, in California and Massachusetts, a member of the party out of power, that control is absolute. In the event of Mr. Johnson's election, a defeat of Senator KEATING in New York would make Democratic control of patronage absolute there.

But to build a Kennedy hegemony, more than one Senator is needed. And so a faithful associate, PIERRE SALINGER, sought and obtained the nomination in California and then an interim appointment by the obedient Governor. Massachusetts was already accounted for by brother EDWARD'S seat. If the elections prove favorable, there will be the nucleus of great power—the two largest States and Massachusetts—as beachheads. With the tradition of a Senator's citizenship in the State for which he is chosen broken, State lines can be crossed as opportunity offers in 1966 and later—by family members, retainers, and trusted lieutenants. Thus, a new and strange carpetbagger power can thrust itself into the traditional pattern of party affairs.

THE TRADITION

Although at the time when the American Republic was in gestation there were some fears of adventurers crossing State lines to seek office, the Constitution provided no bar except to require that a Senator "when elected" be an "inhabitant" of the State for which he is chosen. With constitutional precedents falling every Monday morning when the Supreme Court speaks, and with liberal philosophy claiming successfully that States must become mere varicolored spots on the map, it may be useless to argue that the pretensions of Kennedy and SALINGER violate tradition.

But the tradition is there, and it has firm principle to support it. The Senate as originally conceived was to be a council of ambassadors from semisovereign States. A Senator should have firm ties with his State. He carries with him the responsibility to protect the integrity of his State in the Federal system, especially to make sure that his State is not engulfed in a centralized authority.

Even brother EDWARD voiced that principle when he said he could do more for Massachusetts. Brother Robert, on the contrary, is saying in effect that New York can do more for him.

Anniversary of Our National Anthem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the anniversary of a day in history, the birthday of our national anthem. I know of no better way to observe this occasion than by reading a letter that Joe Martin sent to the Chicago Tribune and which is printed in the "Voice of the People" column of that newspaper in its issue of September 14, 1964.

The Chicago Tribune, founded in 1847 and with an illustrious historical background, surely is a newspaper of editorial maturity. It speaks well for the quality of Joe Martin's contributions that the Chicago Tribune is according it almost a column of space, about the most space of any article on its editorial page, on this anniversary occasion.

Joe Martin was the public relations director of the recent national encampment of the Veterans of World War I U.S.A. He is past president of Illinois American Legion Historical Association, is the present executive secretary of the American Veterans Press Association, and is a regular contributor on veteran and patriotic affairs to the Southwest Messenger Press newspapers in metropolitan Chicago.

Here is the timely patriotic message of Joe Martin:

BIRTH OF OUR ANTHEM

The "Star-Spangled Banner" was composed in the month of September, 150 years ago. How many Americans know of the events which led to the creation of our national anthem?

Toward the end of the War of 1812 with England, British troops entered Washington, our Nation's Capital, and burned the President's residence and many Government buildings. Retreating they passed through the town of Upper Marlboro, became embroiled in an altercation with a local physician, Dr. William Bean, seized him and carried him off to their ship, which sailed down Chesapeake Bay toward Baltimore, 40 miles away.

There the inhabitants were hastily preparing defenses in Fort McHenry, which guarded the city against attack from the ocean. A large flag with 15 stars and 15 stripes—8 red and 7 white representing the 15 States of

the Union—was raised on a flagpole on the fort grounds.

On September 14, Francis Scott Key, a lawyer and poet from Georgetown, appointed by the President, boarded the British flagship *Tonnant* to negotiate for the release of Dr. Bean. The British agreed to free him after their attack on Fort McHenry the next morning. Through a telescope on the *Tonnant*, Key watched the shells and rockets pouring into American emplacements.

The battle went on "all through the night." At "the twilight's last gleaming," the "star-spangled banner" still floated "proudly o'er the ramparts" of Fort McHenry. When darkness set in, Key could see the flag still flying only when "the rockets' red glare" and the "bombs bursting in the air" lit up the scene.

Torn between agonizing uncertainty and pride in the splendid resistance of his countrymen, he wrote about his feelings as he waited for the "dawn's early light." At last "on the shore dimly seen thru the mists of the deep," he made out the fort and the flag hanging limply in the still air. Suddenly a gust of wind caught the folds and revealed those "broad stripes and bright stars" as the flag waved in the breeze. The battle was over; the Americans had won.

Within hours, Francis Scott Key and Dr. Bean were returned to Baltimore. Key fitted together notes he had written into a poem which he titled, "The Defense of Fort McHenry."

The poem was published by a local newspaper and received wide approval. Soon, everyone was reciting it wherever people gathered. It was discovered that a tune called "Anacreon in Heaven" could be fitted to the words. The song was published by a man named Carr in Baltimore, and retitled the "Star-Spangled Banner." In 1931, the Congress of the United States adopted the "Star-Spangled Banner" as our country's national anthem.

Old Glory should be flown on September 15 and on all patriotic occasions.—JOE MARTIN.

Letter to Representative Beckworth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter that was written to me recently. I will continue to try to help our cattle people:

AMERICAN NATIONAL
CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Denver, Colo., August 26, 1964.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The cattle industry represented by the American National Cattlemen's Association, wishes to express to you on behalf of their 38 State affiliates and thousands of individual members their deep appreciation and thanks for your affirmative vote on H.R. 1839.

This legislation will add much needed stability to the cattle industry. As enacted by the House and Senate, H.R. 1839 will more clearly define the future levels of imports which will come to this market. No longer will the consumer or any cattleman be faced with the erratic effects of dumping of the world's surpluses of beef, veal, and mutton on this market. This legislation provides reasonable access by exporting countries to the U.S. market, yet will insist upon restraint in the foreign country's export policies.

Knowing of your interest in this legislation, as expressed by your assistance during its evolution, as well as your affirmative vote on the floor of the House, we are enclosing for your review and files an analysis we have put together on the mechanics of the bill.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

BROOKS J. KEOGH.

Lyndon Johnson for President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Port Arthur News, one of the most responsible papers in Texas, has joined a growing number of the Nation's leading newspapers in endorsing the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson for President.

The News' front-page editorial of September 6, 1964, endorsing the President includes some thoughtful and well-reasoned comments. I believe the endorsement and the comments it contains will be interest to all Americans.

LYNDON JOHNSON FOR PRESIDENT

Certainly not because he is a Texan, or even a Democrat, but solely because we believe he is more qualified for the high office than is his adversary, the News supports Lyndon B. Johnson for election as President of the United States.

Without undertaking to espouse all of the policies and practices of his long and distinguished career, we believe that overall he has better demonstrated—in native talent, stability of temperament, and maturity of judgment—a capacity to lead the American people during the ensuing 4 years.

As the most notable chapter of his national service thus far, we point to the statesmanlike maner in which he has guided the country during this critical period of administrative transition.

Few men in U.S. history have been abruptly summoned to the Presidency under as tragic and awesome circumstances as was Lyndon Johnson, on November 22, 1963. Within a few dreadful hours of the moment when he saw John F. Kennedy assassinated, Mr. Johnson manfully took hold of the offical reins of Government with a firm and confident grasp.

There was never a letdown, no fumbling or stumbling, no indecision on confusion, in the orderly management of affairs of state. The sturdy caliber of the man was tested and proved in this fiery crucible of destiny. Further proof of his staunchness marked the 9 months preceding his nomination as Mr. Kennedy's successor. It has all added up to overwhelming evidence of his unique qualification for the office of Chief Executive.

Depreciate it as coincidence as some do, American prosperity at home and American stature abroad has climbed to new heights under the adroit guidance of President Johnson.

No indeed, he has not solved all our ills at home or our troubles overseas, and he won't do so if he is kept in the White House until 1969. But he has made a valiant start and he is better prepared to devise further solutions than anybody else seeking the Presidency.

We think the Nation owes it to itself, not to him, to give him a chance to keep up the masterful job he is doing.

We have high personal respect for the Republican nominee, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, whose zeal and courage and integrity are beyond all question.

But those attributes—commendable as they are—don't alone assure that he would make a competent President.

In all candor, we must make the point that the Senator lacks the depth of perception and the consistence of evaluation that Mr. Johnson is equipped with.

It is no reflection on his motives to say that the Senator is inclined toward rashness—that he is prone to take an impetuous stand in the flush of ardor, and then when he cools off, to back away and spend much time "explaining" what his position really was—or is.

Even for a presidential candidate, this irresolution is disturbing, but it commits the Government to nothing and may be written off as politics.

There is no national involvement at stake.

But is there any guarantee that—put at the helm of our ship of state—Mr. GOLDWATER would handle the tiller with a less impulsive hand? As the Nation's pilot, especially in international waters, an unthoughted utterance or decision or order wouldn't be mere campaign oratory. It could well nail us all to a reckless course leading to unhappy—and unwanted—consequences.

We would feel far safer in relying on a skilled and seasoned skipper like Lyndon Johnson, who thinks first and then acts.

"Hold What You Have"—The Farley Law of Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James A. Farley is an old friend of mine and whom I consider to be one of the most sagacious and brilliant political strategists for over three decades. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to insert in today's RECORD a feature article by Mr. Thomas O'Neill, which appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on Monday, August 31, 1964, entitled, "The 'Farley Law' of Elections."

The aforementioned article follows:

"HOLD WHAT YOU HAVE"—THE FARLEY LAW OF ELECTIONS

(By Thomas O'Neill)

ATLANTIC CITY.—James A. Farley, political analyst without a peer, holds it to be a firm rule that the bulk of voters make their choice between presidential candidates as soon as the nominees are known, and thereafter are unlikely to be influenced in any significant measure by anything the candidates say and do short of the scandalous.

Quite clearly, the patriarch of the New York delegates to the Democratic National Convention has limited faith in such instant experts as Richard Nixon and their theories that the campaign is the thing, and can be so manipulated as to sweep up votes toward an election day peak.

It can hardly be disputed that Mr. Farley has the superior credentials. Unapproached in electoral forecasting is his precise pinpointing of the only two States, Maine and

Vermont, that would be lost to his candidate, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"HOLDING" OPERATION

The application of Farley's law to the current contest is that from last week onward, with the Democratic ticket as well as the Republican unveiled, the aim of each side ought to be to hold the voters it begins with and do its best to attract the wavering minority.

It is Mr. Farley's conviction that his law holds good under the unusual conditions governing the 1964 election. His long experience has witnessed an unbroken string of elections in which the conditions seemed unusual to those involved.

Out of the ordinary in the current year, nevertheless, is the preponderance of the electorate that by the testimony of the pollsters took sides without waiting for the Democrats to name their ticket.

GALLUP FINDINGS

Soundings made between the two conventions by Dr. Gallop uncovered all but a minuscule 6 percent ready to vote without any further preliminaries.

A factor in this early judgment assuredly was the certainty that President Johnson would be named at Atlantic City to run in his own right, but the strong suggestion is conveyed that the voters interviewed were pronouncing judgments pro and con on Senator GOLDWATER.

The cons had it in imposing degree, 65 percent for President Johnson to 29 percent for the Republican nominee, the remaining few unsettled.

Although he has scant cause to admire polls, Mr. Farley's appraisal of the November election prospect runs in the same direction.

YEAR 1932 COMPARISON

Looking ahead before the Democrats filled out their national ticket with a nominee for Vice President, Mr. Farley thought it reasonable to believe President Johnson would run as strongly as did President Roosevelt in 1932 as a first-term candidate, when Mr. Farley was his campaign manager.

He carried all but six States in unseating a White House incumbent, Herbert Hoover. The six Hoover States, all in the East, were Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Vermont, a corner of the Nation now thought to be leaning heavily toward the Democrats.

Mr. Farley's license to disparage polls if so inclined was earned 4 years after that first Roosevelt election.

LITERARY DIGEST POLL

In the years before the rise of the professional polling organizations the national election previews were conducted by a magazine, the Literary Digest. It foresaw a victory by an avalanche for Mr. Roosevelt's Republican challenger, the hapless Alf Landon.

Campaign manager Farley dismissed this prediction and offered his own, which seemed laughable at the time, that Mr. Landon could carry only Maine and Vermont. When the votes were counted those were the only States that had gone Republican, and it was Mr. Farley's opportunity to laugh.

His insight into national elections is supported by a voluminous correspondence carried on—still in green ink—across the country with old friends in fraternal orders and from his years as party chairman and Postmaster General, all of them politically knowledgeable.

VICE PRESIDENT'S DRAWING POWER

With Farley's law in mind, attention to the early polls following the Democratic proceedings and the nomination of the complete ticket ought to bring illumination on a much disputed topic, whether the identity of a presidential running mate bolsters a ticket, puts a drag on it, or makes no difference.

The prevailing opinion, possibly cynical, is that the choice of the nominee for Vice President influences only those moved by dislike, wins no new votes for the ticket. A poll-backed estimate holds that President Johnson would run strongest running alone, which is impossible.

Admirers of persistence were rewarded at the nominating session when they brought home a long-struggling winner in Texas Gov. John Connally, who made his third trip to a convention rostrum to offer the name of Lyndon Johnson for President. The offer went untaken in 1956 and 1960, but was snapped up on this third try.

The Merits of Hospicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from the vice president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., Mr. Milton A. Ellis, which beautifully illustrates the economic fallacy behind what he so aptly and thoughtfully describes as the "Hospicare" bill, or amendment.

I congratulate Mr. Ellis for the soundness of his thinking, the benefit of which I will pass on to my colleagues by inserting his letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is refreshing from a pure economic point of view,

In so doing I cannot help but reflect that the insurance industry as a whole knows this reasoning to be sound and without rebuttal, as an effective force fighting to preserve the right of free enterprise and the very system which provides millions of jobs in the insurance industry they have been somewhat remiss for fear of "wounding their image."

I hope the thousands of insurance agents throughout the country will not worry so much about their image that they fail to recognize this is their fight also, and that socialized medicine, if it should ever be adopted, would wipe out not only their image but their livelihood. I commend Mr. Ellis' letter to the industry and the Nation as a whole:

METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
New York, N.Y., September 10, 1964.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: Regardless of the merits of "hospicare" and the questionable basis on which it was added by the Senate to the House-passed "Social Security Amendments of 1964," the tax impact seems to be the point that has been generally overlooked.

For a married man with two children earning $5,600 a year, the social security tax increase for 1965 amounting to $64 would more than wipe out the entire income tax cut provided for 1965 income, producing for him a total social security and income tax increase for 1965 rather than a tax cut.

Furthermore, the total social security tax increases through 1971, as provided in the Senate amendment, will just about cancel out the entire 1964 and 1965 income tax reductions for such a family man with average deductions, thus leaving him in 1971 about the same total for the two taxes as before the greatly publicized tax cuts.

We question whether the public thoroughly understands this mounting social security tax burden for the modest income family man. The social security tax is no longer a small tax and, under the proposed bill, it would really bite. In fact, by 1971 this man would be paying a social security tax of over $291 (almost as much as his average income tax in 1965 of $339), and his employer would be paying another $291 (a total of $582 or 10.4 percent of his gross salary).

Nor, indeed, is this by any means the entire story. Preliminary calculations indicate that the tax increases provided in the Senate bill would be insufficient to even cover the cost of the limited "hospicare" benefits added by the Senate amendment and, certainly, would be gravely deficient in providing for "hospicare" and the increased cash benefits added to your original House bill.

Apart from other questionable aspects of the "hospicare" provisions, it does not seem to be a right or a responsible course to add such provisions to the social security program until much more attention is given to the matter of their costs, of their impact on the social security program itself, and on the situation of individual taxpayers and the economy as a whole.

Respectfully yours,
MILTON A. ELLIS,
Vice President.

Act of Extremism in Defense of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, perhaps Senator GOLDWATER's standards are too high for some people, but here is a young man who knows what he stands for and is not afraid to show it. I am wondering whether President Johnson will condemn this man's actions or agree with Senator GOLDWATER that this is no vice.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following story:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 14, 1964]

GI SAVES REFUGEE IN BATTLE AT WALL

BERLIN, September 14.—A German immigrant now in the U.S. Army braved East German bullets yesterday to help a wounded refugee escape over the Berlin wall.

Sp4c. Hans Puhl, 22, was the hero of a 40-minute battle at dawn, during which West Berlin police and East German Communist guards fired dozens of shots at each other. No one was killed, but it was the longest fight since the wall was put up 3 years ago.

Lying in the middle of the fray, on the Communist side of the wall, was Michael Meyer, 21, from the East German town of Fredersdorf. Communist bullets brought him down as he tried to scramble over the wall to West Berlin.

Communist guards then tried to drag him away, but Specialist Puhl—covered by Western police—marched to the wall and ordered the East Germans back.

At a news conference, the soldier said he was riding along the Western side of the wall—in the Kreuzberg district—on a routine patrol with a West German policeman and arrived at the scene just after Mr. Meyer had been shot.

The American dashed to the second story of a nearby apartment house for a view of the other side of the wall.

He spotted the young man on the ground.

"Two East German guards were pulling on him," he said. "I pointed my rifle at them and told them to let him go.

"When they did not let him go, I threw a tear-gas grenade across the wall in the hope that they would stop bothering the refugee and they did."

Specialist Puhl then ran back to the wall, gave his rifle to a West Berlin policeman and pulled out his pistol.

"Two West Berliners boosted me up," he continued, "so that I could see across the wall and I called to the refugee not to move and that we were going to cut the wire on top of the wall."

When the soldier peered over the wall, the Communists opened fire, hitting the upper edge of the wall and showering him with concrete fragments. West Berlin police returned the fire from the windows of the apartment house. Two East Germans succeeded in reaching Mr. Meyer again. One began pulling the refugee, and the other pointed a pistol at Specialist Puhl.

"The American pulled his own pistol from the holster, aimed at the East German and said in German: 'Drop him and get away from here,' " a witness said.

Specialist Puhl denied he had pointed his pistol but admitted it was out of its holster.

The East Germans again retreated. As the soldier covered Mr. Meyer, two West Berliners got a stepladder and wire cutters. Firemen brought a rope and the soldier dropped it to the wounded man.

"We got the rope on him and pulled him across," Specialist Puhl said. "He passed out when we got him over."

Helping were two West Berliners and a U.S. Army sergeant.

Five bullets hit Mr. Meyer. He was reported recovering from wounds in the thigh and shoulder.

A German man and woman were hit by flying glass and splinters on the western side of the wall. It was believed that an East German guard also was injured.

Specialist Puhl, tall and blond, told his story in a clipped, precise manner. A native of Bremerhaven, he spoke with a slight German accent.

He was taken to the United States in 1956 and enlisted in the Army in 1961 after failing to finish high school. His mother, Wilma Makarewicz, is married to an Army sergeant stationed at Fort Knox, Ky.

Before joining the Army, Specialist Puhl worked for a time in a cotton mill at Statesville, N.C.

"The only thing he did mostly was go to church," said Mrs. Fleet Brown, who knew him in Statesville. "He'd go to revivals. Anytime he found out about one anywhere out in the country he'd go to it."

Maj. Gen. John F. Frankling, the U.S. commandant in Berlin, denounced the shooting of the refugee as an "inhuman dangerous action." He said police in West Berlin "will not remain passive in the face of unprovoked gunfire from the Soviet sector of Berlin."

The East German news agency called the incident a "serious provocation."

A Great Moral Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT DOLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the American public has been waiting for many months for action to be taken in the Bobby Baker case. They are still waiting.

They are waiting for the Senate to have a real investigation. They are waiting for this body to face the issue of influence peddling in the House. They are waiting for the executive branch to start proceedings against Bobby Baker.

The Senate, having been prodded again by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], may start with a flurry of activity. Many feel the "second" investigation will end up in another whitewash.

In the House of Representatives, there may be hope that sharp questions raised as to the integrity of this body will quietly go away if ignored. They may be disposed of in this way, but what happens to the reputation of the House? What kind of Congress will the American people picture in Washington if both Houses sit on their hands and refuse to act quickly and decisively?

These are questions for all of us to ponder. They are questions on which the Democratic leadership must surely take a stand before we go to the people, if and when this session of Congress ends.

Either we will have a Congress which has ignored, covered up, and whitewashed flagrant cases of corruption and influence peddling right in its midst, or we will have a Congress which can proudly say to the people that its hands are clean and that the wrongdoers have been punished.

So far, our hands are not clean.

Turning to the executive branch, there are just as many unanswered questions. A few of them are:

Why has not Bobby Baker been prosecuted for filing a false statement with the Small Business Administration?

Why has not Bobby Baker been prosecuted for the forged signature on his income tax return?

Why has not Bobby Baker been prosecuted for his false affidavit to the Federal Housing Administration?

Why has not Bobby Baker been prosecuted under the Foreign Agents Registration Act for his dealings with and representation of foreign interests?

Why was not Bobby Baker prosecuted for his willful failure to file District of Columbia income tax returns until years late?

These are indictable offenses, yet no indictments have been sought, nor has any action been initiated. Consider the circumstances in these cases.

The first instance was the false information given to the Small Business Administration by Bobby Baker in regard to a loan application in behalf of the Carousel Motel. The fact he listed a $100,000 short-term loan as a capital asset is in violation of Federal law, the Federal false statement statute (18 U.S.C. 1001).

In this connection, included is a press release from the Small Business Administration issued early this year in which a defendant was charged under this same statute for a violation of a similar nature. Why does the law apply to one but not to Bobby Baker?

There was evidence presented to the Senate Rules Committee concerning the forged signature on Bobby Baker's income tax return. This is an indictable Federal offense. Everyone knows it, but why has action not been taken?

There is the apparent false and fraudulent affidavit which was submitted by Bobby Baker to the Federal Housing Administration in connection with his loan for a house in southwest Washington. The evidence shows this was not a house in which Baker ever lived or planned to live. He apparently falsely avowed to the FHA that the house was to be occupied by him or a close relative, as the FHA requires. But, in actuality, Miss Carol Tyler, his secretary, lived in the house.

These offenses have been public knowledge for months. The American people have been waiting for action to be taken. As I said earlier, they are still waiting.

There have been two outstanding success stroies of rags to riches—in Washington. They feature Bobby Baker and Lyndon Johnson. These two men were, and still are, I presume, as close as two peas in a pod. Baker's first allegiance was to Lyndon Johnson, his mentor and best friend. Yet publicly Lyndon Johnson now seems barely able to recall Bobby Baker, and the press has done very little digging to learn why.

There is througout America a strong suspicion that someone in a high office is shielding Boby Baker and others involved from proper Federal prosecution.

The American people will not wait forever—or will they?

The press release follows:

The Small Business Administration, announced today the return of a three-count indictment on January 23, 1964, in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, charging Louis M. Ray of Monroe, La., president of First Louisiana Investment Corp., a federally licensed small business investment company, with violations of the Federal false statement statute (18 U.S.C., sec. 1001).

Small Business Administrator Eugene P. Foley said the indictment resulted from information referred to the Justice Department by the Small Business Administration.

The indictment charges that on three separate occasions during 1962 and 1963, the defendant, Ray, as president of the SBIC, executed and submitted to the Small Business Administration, a financial report in which he stated that United Construction Co., Plant City, Fla., was indebted to First Louisiana Investment Corp. in the sum of $47,500, by reason of a loan made to the Florida company.

The indictment alleges that the defendant knew, at the time the statements were made, that there was no such indebtedness. If convicted, Ray could be fined up to $10,000 or imprisoned up to 5 years, or both on each count of the indictment.

Senator Charles E. Daniel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report to the House the passing

of our beloved colleague, the Honorable Charles E. Daniel, who served briefly in the 83d Congress as the junior Senator from South Carolina. Senator Daniel slipped quietly away on Sunday morning, September 13.

Charlie Daniel was one of the greatest South Carolinians in the history of our State. He was a great southerner and a great American. Mr. Speaker, I believe Charles E. Daniel, without question, did more for South Carolina and the Southeast than any man of our time. Charlie Daniel believed that better education, higher wages, and industrial opportunity are the keys to the future prosperity and well-being of the South. He believed that private enterprise is the answer to poverty and depression. While demagogs ranted about the poor man and stirred up class against class, Charlie Daniel quietly did something for the workingman. He created tens of thousands of good paying jobs. In less than 25 years be became perhaps the world's greatest industrial contractor.

Charles Daniel often worked a hundred hours a week to create 40-hour-a-week jobs for others. Charlie Daniel was dynamic, progressive, and energetic. At a time when race relations captured the headlines, Charlie Daniel created good jobs for our Negro citizens and he advocated equal opportunity for all.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost one of our greatest Americans and I have lost a warm, faithful, and devoted friend.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Congress and the Nation the following magnificent eulogy of Senator Daniel delivered at his final rites yesterday in Greenville, S.C., by Dr. L. D. Johnson, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Greenville:

(Scripture: Psalm 23; John 14: 1–6, 27; Romans 8: 31–39; I Corinthians 15: 42–44; I Corinthians 13.)

Sir Christopher Wren, England's fabled 17th cenutry builder, lies buried in St. Paul's Cathedral, whose construction was Wren's crowning achievement. On his tomb is this inscription: "If you would see his monument, look around."

Those words might appropriately be spoken of Charles E. Daniel anywhere in South Carolina, or for that matter, across the land. No tribute of ours could burnish the record of this fabulous man's career, or write his name in larger letters across the progress of this Nation than he has himself already written with his life.

Yet giant trees do not fall in the forest without the shudder of the earth, the trembling of lesser trees now more exposed to the elements, and without leaving an empty place against the sky. We cannot, then, sorrow at his falling without giving expression to the heart's sense of loss felt by all people of integrity and good will who knew him, and without some acknowledgment of how tall he stood among his contemporaries in our troubled time.

Think a man of vision, impatient with little plans and timid, backward looks, and the figure of Charles E. Daniel will loom large before your mind's eye.

Think of a man of immense pride in his country and in his region, whose most consuming ambition was the building of a better tomorrow for all people, and his name will come to your lips. How many times have we heard him say that the future of this country, and the answer to its problems, lay in better educational and economic opportunities for all its citizens. Once I heard him make a characteristically blunt comment that "there are some folks with so little sense that they can't see that better education and better jobs for the bottom third of our South Carolina people will help the other two-thirds, too."

When you think of courage and a will to see things through, and deep conviction about justice and injustice, think of Charlie Daniel. No mountain was too high if it needed to be climbed, no assignment too tough if it had to be done. In a day of featherbedders and quitters, in a time of cowards and calamity-howlers, it is good to have known a man of deeds, of action who would not indulge himself with excuses or muddle-headed laments about why "it can't be done."

When you look for an example of a man who came from humble beginnings and rose to walk as a peer among the great, think of this man whose career defies the cynical slur that America is no longer the land of opportunity for the humble and the poor with a will to be somebody.

When you look for a man whose creed was in his deed, whose word was his bond, impatient with shabbiness and sham, his character will stand as long as men acknowledge the validity of honor among men.

Josiah Gilbert Holland's prayer fits the occasion of our need, and the life of Charles E. Daniel is an appropriate reply:

"God give us men! A time like this demands
strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demogog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking;
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land, and waiting justice sleeps."

And without intrusion, and with gentleness, let it be noted that if you seek an example of a man who loved the companion at his side with a simple, old-fashioned fidelity, here is such a man.

His leaving was too soon, so far as we humans understand such things. But the State and the Nation are better because he lived and wrought.

Let this be our tribute to Charles E. Daniel:

"We live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not breaths;
In feelings, not in figures on a dial.
We should count time by heartthrobs. He most lives
Who thinks most, feels the noblest, acts the best.
And he whose heart beats quickest lives the longest.
Lives in one hour more than in years do some
Whose fat blood sleeps as it slips along their veins.
Life's but a means, not an end; that end,
Beginning, mean, and end to all things—God."

Medical Care for the Aged—In United States and Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the subject of medical care for older people under the social security program has occupied the interest of a great many people in and out of Congress for the past several years. Today I hope we disposed of this issue so far as this session of Congress is concerned, when we sent the Social Security Amendments Act of 1964, H.R. 11865—which had been amended by the Senate to include medical care for the aged—to conference. I believe it is pretty well understood that the amendment will not be agreed to by the Senate-House conference committee.

In my judgment, medical care should not be added to the already overburdened social security program. The issue has been political or ideological, rather than one of how best to provide full medical and hospital care to older people who do not have the means to provide for themselves. The problem of how the cost of necessary hospitalization, doctor's care, dental care, and all medical needs for older people should be provided was answered positively when the Kerr-Mills bill was passed by Congress in 1960. Kerr-Mills takes care of all medical needs, whereas the medical care provision under Social Security would only cover hospitalization, nursing home services, and outpatient diagnostic service. There seems no logical need for this additional tax to be placed on a higher portion of the income of low-income people. If the Senate medicare amendment were to be adopted, the social security tax would be increased from the 7¼ percent of the first $4,800 of gross income in 1964 to the level indicated in the table below.

The total tax in dollars in 1964 is $348, half paid by the employee and half by the employer:

1965	8½ percent on $5,600, or $476.
1966–67	9 percent on $5,600, or $504.
1968–70	10 percent on $5,600, or $560.
1971 and after	10.4 percent on $5,600, or $582.40.

This table shows that by 1971 everyone earning a gross income of $5,600 per year would be paying $291.20 annual social security tax, to say nothing of other taxes.

Mr. Speaker, as these figures indicate, the social security tax will be increasing. Whether or not this scheduled increase is adequate is debatable, in view of the experience of other countries which have experimented with socialized medicine.

An interesting editorial on the experience of the Canadian Province of Saskatchewan was forwarded to me a few days ago. The article is from the Plentywood Herald of Plentywood, Mont., which is

published just over the line from northwestern North Dakota. I commend this editorial, entitled "Medicare Costly for Canadians," to the attention of the Members of the House:

MEDICARE COSTLY FOR CANADIANS

Medicare has proven to be a boomerang in Saskatchewan. The full-scale coverage by statewide medical care is costing much more than was anticipated or is practical.

Now in its second year the program for the 900,000 people of the Province may come to the unprecedented sum of $21 million. This, of course, does not include the cost of administration—and, on today's market, that item frequently assumes startling proportions.

Not only are the state officials biting their nails over the present unhappy financial situation, but also, they are admittedly fearful of the future. Medicare may skyrocket in cost as has the government hospital insurance plan. The hospital plan began with a $7½ million cost and now runs six times that original annual outlay.

Both medicare and the hospital insurance plan come in under the banner of the Socialist government, which now has toppled. But toppled or no, the legislation still stands, a drain on the budget and a worry to the present administration. Apparently more than "the good that men do lives after them."

To solve the Canadian dilemma, officials are considering an interesting solution. It has been suggested that the Government charge fees known as deterrent fees, for patients who need to avail themselves of the doctors' services. This, they say, would discourage the common indiscriminate use—and abuse—of free medicine.

The fee system to support the free system is a little like something from "Alice in Wonderland." It might, of course, be an arrangement that would be all things to all people. The citizen could be implementing both the socialist and the capitalist way of life, since he would be paying taxes to support the programs and paying out of his pocket for program services as well.

Let's beware of this sort of legislation ourselves. So-called free programs are costly, cumbersome, and subject to all manner of unexpected breakdowns. We can congratulate ourselves that the medicare program sponsored by the Kennedy administration did not make it under the wire last year.

Doctors and patients—and almost every citizen is in one or the other of these groups ultimately—will fare better without the helping hand of socialized medicine. Our Canadian neighbors can attest to this.

Nicholas deB. Katzenbach Expected To Succeed Robert Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, during the long days last winter when the Committee on the Judiciary was struggling to write a civil rights bill, I had the pleasure of getting to know Deputy Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach. Our conversations were limited for the most part to the critical issues then occupying all of our attention, and all during that long debate, Mr. Katzenbach was available and cooperative in working out with us the legal intricacies of the bill. But more than that, I came to know that his ability as a legal mind was only an aspect of a compassionate and courageous gentleman. I was deeply pleased when the Washington Evening Star printed the following profile sketch of Mr. Katzenbach with information of his outstanding career as a navigator of a B–25 and following the war, his rapid ascent as a scholar, author, and teacher of the law.

KATZENBACH HAD MAJOR RIGHTS ROLE

The man who is expected to fill Robert Kennedy's shoes as acting head of the Justice Department is a big, coolheaded lawyer who has played a major role in the civil rights field as Deputy Attorney General.

Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, 42, personally directed the force of Federal marshals during the night of wild rioting that accompanied the admission of Negro James Meredith at Ole Miss in 1962.

In June 1963, he confronted Alabama Gov. George C. Wallace at the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa in the "schoolhouse door" showdown in which two Negro students registered without violence.

More recently, he served as an architect of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. In all three instances—as in many others—he has been Attorney General Kennedy's hardworking No. 1 aid.

A 6-foot, 2-inch, 215-pound former law professor, Mr. Katzenbach is no newcomer to tight situations, having spent 2 years in a German prison camp.

B–25 NAVIGATOR

In February 1943 Mr. Katzenbach, who entered the Air Corps halfway through his junior year at Princeton, was navigator on one of three B–25's attacking a convoy in the Mediterranean.

The planes sank 14 Axis ships, but the three were shot down. Mr. Katzenbach, a captain, was rescued from a life raft by the Italians and taken prisoner.

While in an Italian prison camp, he escaped twice but was recaptured each time. Later, he was handed over to the Germans and remained in German prison camps until May 1945.

While a prisoner, he found food scarce, but books plentiful. "There wasn't much to eat, so I read," he recalls. The reading was steady and planned along the lines of his college courses.

Returned home upon his release with 60 days of sick leave, Mr. Katzenbach asked Princeton if he could obtain his degree without returning to the university. It turned out there was a way he could.

He had to write a thesis and take 14 examinations covering courses he had missed. On the basis of his prison reading, and considerable further effort, he earned his degree within 60 days.

Mr. Katzenbach went on to the Yale Law School, where he was graduated cum laude in 1947. He was a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford University, England, from 1947 to 1949.

COUNSEL IN AIR FORCE

Thereafter, he was in private law practice in Trenton, N.J., served in the Air Force General Counsel's office, taught law at Yale University, and was a professor of law at the University of Chicago.

He has written two books—one with Prof. Leon Lipson, of Yale, entitled, "Legal Literature of Air Space" and the other with Morton Kaplan entitled "The Political Foundations of International Law."

While the 1960 presidential campaign was raging, Mr. Katzenbach was studying international law at the University of Geneva, Switzerland, on a Ford Foundation law fellowship.

He had never met the Kennedys, but he was impressed with the campaign and was interested in becoming a member of the new administration. The new administration was interested in having him.

He signed on as Assistant Attorney General, heading up the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel.

SUCCEEDED WHITE

In April 1962, Mr. Katzenbach was promoted to Deputy Attorney General by President Kennedy to succeed Byron White after his appointment to the Supreme Court.

Some observers have felt that calm-headed "Nick" Katzenbach served as a steadying influence on Attorney General Kennedy. A top staffer reportedly called Mr. Katzenbach "the balance wheel."

To Mr. Katzenbach also fell some of the key legal tasks of the departmental leadership. For example, he wrote the legal brief supporting U.S. plans for a naval blockade of Cuba.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS FAMILY

A man who takes a direct approach toward his objectives but does it in a quiet, almost casual way, Mr. Katzenbach may draw some of his grasp of public affairs from his family background.

His father, the late Edward L. Katzenbach, was attorney general of New Jersey. His mother, 79, is president of the New Jersey State Education Board. A brother has been serving as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Katzenbach, who was born in Philadelphia, was married in June 1946 while at Yale Law School to a Washington girl, Miss Lydia Phelps Stokes.

She is the niece of the late Anson Phelps Stokes, former canon of the Washington Cathedral. Mrs. Katzenbach's sister is married to Juvenile Court Judge Orman Ketcham.

The Katzenbachs live in a large, white Victorian house in the Cleveland Park section of Washington. Mr. Katzenbach keeps a 34-foot yawl at Annapolis, but he doesn't get to sail it very often.

French Social Security on Verge of Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues' attention a recent article in the Los Angeles Times describing the fact that France's social security system is facing bankruptcy because of the drain placed on it by health insurance:

FRENCH SOCIAL SECURITY ON VERGE OF BANKRUPTCY—HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM DRAINS FUNDS, PUTS SYSTEM NEARLY $36 MILLION IN RED

(By Don Shannon)

PARIS.—France's social security system, chronically in the red since its establishment in 1928, was described as facing bankruptcy in a report made public Tuesday.

Labor Minister Gilbert Grandval, responsible for the administration of the system, said in a report submitted to President Charles de Gaulle:

"The financial breaking point is near. The solution cannot be found in the framework of the present system."

This year's deficit for the whole program covering 30 million of 47 million citizens is

expected to be $36 million against $10.5 million in 1963.

Chief drain on French social security has been the health insurance program rather than retirement and other benefits, the minister said. Between 1957 and 1962 medical expenditures more than doubled while family benefits and pensions have also risen.

THIRD OF BUDGET

Total expenses of social security are expected to reach $7 billion this year, or more than a third of the national budget.

Contributions by workers and employers were raised last year to 6 percent and 18 percent respectively, so high that further increases would put French industry under severe strain. France already suffers from high costs in competition with other European industry and the Government also fears the effect on its campaign against inflation at home.

Although family allocations rose from $1.04 billion to $1.64 billion, Grandval defended the program as essential to maintaining the national birth rate.

"The birth rate is not only without comparison to that of African or Asian countries but is also very inferior to that of the United States," he said. "The effort in the matter of family allocations should not be slowed down."

COST CUTS

Under the program, families with three or more children receive reductions in public transport and in lower income groups even such items as free shoes. There was a 40-percent increase in the average amount paid per family in the 5-year period from $341 to $476 as the number of children covered increased from 6.8 million to 8 million.

While retirement benefits have gone up 54 percent, French pensions are still low and no government would take the political risk of cutting them.

The obvious target is the medical program, and particularly the 100-percent payment on any medicine prescribed by a doctor. The growth of the cooperative pharmacies was credited by the ministry with stimulating waste of medicine.

A patchwork system, the French health insurance program even includes such things as mineral bath and reducing treatments, if prescribed. Doctors' fees jumped from an average of 63 cents to $1.46 in the 1957–62 period and the average hospital claim from $3.11 to $5.72.

French doctors fear that De Gaulle may be preparing, as a dramatic gesture before next year's election, the establishment of a national health program on the British mode.

The Government now subsidizes a majority of the nation's doctors who agree to treat patients at fixed fees and the medical profession is suspicious of advancing state control. French doctors nearly struck last spring when Grandval published new regulations governing fees, but held off when he retreated.

Even if the Government could force down medical costs, however, subsidizing of the social security system from general revenues appears inevitable.

Civil Rights and the Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, supporters of the so-called civil rights legislation are being kept busy these days trying to convince themselves that there is no relationship between the Negro riots and the enactment of the law. There is, of course, no way of proving the point, one way or the other. Since direct proof is not available we must turn to circumstantial evidence. In that respect all the evidence is against the force bill that was approved.

It will be recalled that during the prolonged Senate debate on the bill Negro leaders warned that unless a strong bill was enacted the Negro community would revolt, and there were dire warnings of riots and catastrophe. That threat was echoed by the politicians. And a strong bill was enacted.

Now, less than 3 months later, what do we find? Almost before the ink was dry after the bill was signed, the Negroes staged demonstrations and riots unprecedented in American history. The law-abiding segment of the Negro community was helpless in the face of overwhelming outbursts of Congo-type violence and destruction throughout the land. One who refuses to recognize the relationship between the enactment of the law and the outburst of racial violence simply blinks his eyes to reality.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include my current newsletter in which I discuss this unfortunate development:

NEWSLETTER

The aftermath of the civil rights legislation is gradually being felt. It triggered outbursts of lawlessness throughout the land. Already, in the first half of 1964, according to the FBI, serious crimes were up 15 percent over the first half of last year. Negro riots have cost $10 million in property damage, with several killed, 952 injured, 2,484 arrested, and 1,080 shops looted or damaged. Most of this came after the civil rights legislation.

In Chicago, in three New Jersey cities, in Rochester, New York City, and in Philadelphia, the biggest riots were staged—following the civil rights legislation.

Some of this would probably have happened had the civil rights bill not been debated. But the yearlong period of agitation, freedom rides, sit-ins, sit-downs, demonstrations, and repeated assurances from the politicians that the Negroes were at last going to be given their "freedom," served to create psychological climate for the outbursts and reactions from Negroes after the bill was enacted into law.

The same thing happened after the civil rights legislation was enacted in 1957—a round of crime and racial clashes evidently inspired by the agitation employed by politicians in promoting the legislation.

Right here in Washington, the "showcase of democracy," Negro crime jumped sharply after the civil rights bill was enacted. Here, more than any place, the plaintive pleas of the politicians were brought to bear on the minds of the Negro populace during the past year. This served to encourage the criminal element who in a spirit of "new freedom"—which the politicians had promised them—flexed their freedom muscles and celebrated.

During the past year 2,634 major crimes were reported in the District of Columbia, only 206 of which were committed by whites.

One of the sad and unfortunate effects of all this is the image that America presents to the world a Congo-type image of wholesale crime and interracial strife throughout the country.

And the end is not in sight. It will take a long time for this Nation to return to a state of normalcy and overcome the setback in the progress that was being made in the field of race relations before appetite for the Negro vote got the better of the politicians.

Legislation Reviewed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, looking back over this session of the Congress, three bills stand out in my mind because of their particular importance to the Pacific Northwest and to my district, the Second Congressional District of Washington State. These bills are the Northwest power preference bill, the wilderness bill, and the land and water conservation bill, all of which have recently been enacted into law.

Because of their importance, and because these bills were of special interest to me as a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I made them the subject of a newsletter report to my district. I believe other Members of Congress may be interested in my views on these matters and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I insert my newsletter, "The Northwest and Congress," together with the section entitled "As I See It," in the RECORD:

THE NORTHWEST AND CONGRESS

Three bills of major importance to the Pacific Northwest have been passed by this session of the Congress. Because of my membership on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I was able to participate in the writing of this legislation.

The Northwest regional power preference bill is now law, guaranteeing Pacific Northwest users first call on electric power produced in the Northwest. Before this bill was passed, existing "preference" legislation gave any public or semipublic entity the first chance to purchase federally produced power. It was possible that the city of Los Angeles or the Sacramento Utility District, for example, could claim "preference" over private industry in the Pacific Northwest. This is no longer the case.

With plans for the construction of an intertie system linking the Bonneville Power Administration with California now well underway, the impact of the Northwest power preference bill is tremendous. The Federal Government has agreed to include private and public utilities in a combination effort to build a $700-million intertie network, with the Federal Government paying no more than 40 percent of the total cost. Congress has already authorized $45.5 million to initiate the Federal phase of construction, and the Bonneville Power Administration will soon be able to sell excess power to California and Arizona. The BPA, which has been operating at a deficit, is expected to increase its annual income by $20 to $30 million, and a rate increase, which seemed inevitable for all Northwest power users, will not be necessary. Should BPA's excess power ever be needed in the Pacific Northwest, however, the Federal Government has guaranteed that's where it will be used.

The wilderness bill was also passed this session, climaxing nearly 6 years of effort to write legislation suitable to all. This meant lumbering, mining, recreation and conservation interests had to be satisfied. After

many hearings, this has been done with legislation giving statutory protection to some 9 million acres designated as wilderness area. The wilderness system can be expanded, but the final bill retained the view of the House of Representatives that Congress should have the power to initiate legislation providing for any expansion. Had an earlier Senate version of the bill triumphed, Congress would have had only veto power over recommendations of the Executive, and an ill-conceived reversal of the constitutional separation of powers between the Executive and Congress would have resulted.

Still another bill of great importance to the Pacific Northwest and to Washington State is the land and water conservation bill, also approved by Congress this session. I opposed portions of this legislation because it provides funds for the acquisition of more land by the Federal Government when the Government already owns 34 percent of all land in the continental United States. These funds would be financed partly by admission fees, which are not the same as user fees, where facilities such as stoves or launching docks are actually utilized. The admission fee charges a fellow simply to get into a forest or park area, and I'm against this.

Another section of the bill, however, will provide Federal matching for State funds to both acquire and develop recreation areas. Normally, 60 percent of the appropriations will be for State and 40 percent will be for Federal purposes, but the ratio can be varied by annual appropriations acts. It also may be varied up to 15 points by the executive. I hope the Congress and administration will keep this in mind by designating a greater portion of the Federal money for State-matching purposes, including the development of recreation areas. I have never heard a complaint that the Federal Government owns too little land, but many of you have pointed to the need for greater development of recreational facilities. I would hope this law will be administered to meet this need.

AS I SEE IT

(By Helen Westland)

Have you ever seen that sign "Plan Ahead"? This is just about the predicament of all we congressional wives who are anxious to get out to our various districts, and truly be of some help to our husbands in their campaigns. I got the winter clothes out of storage, then the temperature in the District of Columbia went up into the nineties. I saw to it that the car was in shape for cross-country traveling, had the maps marked with new highways, and here I am, ready to go. Then JACK says, "No, we won't be going this week, but I'll be flying out there to vote in the primary. I'll be back, but you be ready to depart, just in case." Apparently, I'm what you call a slow starter, but believe me, one of these days Congress will adjourn, we will arrive, and we'll both be looking forward to seeing all of you again.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Dorwin W. Suttle, First Judicial Appointee in Texas by President Johnson, Making Enviable Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the San Angelo Standard-Times, of San Angelo, Tex., published on September 13 an interesting article on U.S. District Judge Dorwin W. Suttle, of the Western Division of Texas, the first U.S. judge in Texas appointed by President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Judge Suttle's appointment was confirmed by the Senate on July 30, 1964; and since that time he has been most active in the performance of his duties.

Judge Suttle, a brilliant trial lawyer, had served as city attorney of Uvalde, county attorney and special judge in Uvalde County Court, was director of the Uvalde Chamber of Commerce, and is a member of the Border (Tex.), the Texas, and the American Bar Associations.

The article in the San Angelo Standard-Times, captioned "A Challenging, Rewarding Job," tells something of the energy and judicial temperament of Judge Suttle.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the San Angelo (Tex.) Standard-Times, Sept. 13, 1964]

A "CHALLENGE REWARDING" JOB—AS U.S. JUDGE

(By Marj Carpenter)

PECOS.—For the third time in 2 years the Pecos division of the Western District of Texas has a new Federal judge.

Judge D. W. Suttle, formerly of Uvalde and now of El Paso, took the bench at Pecos for the first time on Tuesday morning to hear motions on the long civil docket of this term of court.

Judge Suttle has been presiding actively in the district since July 15 without a break, with most of these weeks spent in El Paso.

He was appointed to replace Judge Homer Thornberry who was transferred to the Austin district to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Judge Ben H. Rice, Jr.

"Fortunately for me and the El Paso and Pecos divisions of the district I have been able to retain on my team Miss Grace Jones, secretary, and Hershel Foley, court crier, who served under Judge Rice and A. C. Valenzuela, court reporter, who served under Judge R. E. Thomason, recently retired," he said.

The new judge was sworn into office July 11.

On July 15 he was in Federal court in Del Rio, July 20 in El Paso and the week of July 27 in San Antonio.

Having practiced law in Uvalde 36 years, the judge has deep roots in that area "and would probably have never left there for anything except this office."

The judge assumed the office, he said, with a deep feeling of responsibility. He pointed out the differences in pressures on the trial attorney, which he has been for many years, and the duties of his new judgeship.

He also pointed out that being a judge is "very challenging and rewarding work and the responsibility makes a man humble.

"As a lawyer I was a partisan; as a judge I am compelled to a decision as to what is right," he said.

Asked how he thinks he will like west Texas, the new judge cited an incident that occurred in his family many years ago. He recalled that after the death of his first wife, when he and his children were "camping out," they were debating whether to go home that night.

His daughter (then 8 years old) said, "I don't understand, Daddy. I thought home is where we're together. Aren't we home now?"

And the judge added, "This is how I feel about west Texas. We will make El Paso and west Texas home."

Although the Uvalde attorney had been mentioned as a possible choice for a Federal judge appointment on at least one occasion prior to becoming the appointee for this district, he was still surprised and somewhat overawed when the event actually transpired.

Suttle and his former law partner, W. A. Kessler, with whom he has practiced 27 years, had just completed a new office building in Uvalde.

"We had also remodeled our home there," the judge stated, "and this is a hard thing for Mrs. Suttle to leave."

Kessler, who was Suttle's roommate in college, was an attorney in Austin during the years that Suttle served as city attorney. Ever since then the two have been partners and close friends.

Suttle's most famous client—for 30 years—has been former Vice President John Nance Garner. The new judge said that "he is a longtime client and a good friend. I visited with him just this past weekend when I was in Uvalde."

Asked about other friends, the judge remarked with a smile, "Well I suppose it is rather obvious to everyone that President Lyndon B. Johnson and senior Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH are my friends because otherwise I certainly would not be here."

D. W. Suttle is many things—a Texan, having spent his entire life in this State, born and reared in the New Braunfels and San Marcos areas and having spent his entire law career in Uvalde.

He has been an active civic leader—chairman of the Democratic executive committee in Uvalde many years, a past commander of American Legion there, a past president of the Uvalde Lions Club, school trustee, a director of the chamber of commerce there and active in the Episcopal Church.

As a businessman he was associated with several business and financial institutions in the Uvalde area.

His family includes his wife and four children. They are Stephen Suttle who attends Texas University Law School; Joanna Suttle, who is taking a business course in Austin; and two stepsons, Fred Whitecotton, who attends Southwestern University, and Frank Whitecotton, 11, of the home.

The judges eyes light up when he talks about his family.

And now the new Federal judge indicates he's deeply interested in filling out the responsibilities of his position and in making new friends.

On his desk during the interview were several briefs submitted on matters in which he was currently hearing motions.

As the interview was closed the judge turned back to these with his attention focused on the duties of the day—his new duties as a new Federal judge.

Alaska Earthquake Damage Being Overcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, my immediate purpose is to give you and all my colleagues in this Congress an outline of accomplishments thus far attained in Alaska in overcoming the great earthquake disaster of last March.

I am particularly pleased to have this material at hand to present, as this Congress comes to a close, because it gives me a last chance this year to record my deep appreciation to the administration, from the President down through the executive branches, inclusive, and to all the Members of both Houses of this 88th Congress for timely and generous and indispensable monetary and other assistance to Alaskans during their hour of greatest need. I know that I speak for all the people of Alaska in expressing this appreciation.

I am also pleased to note that this report, which comes from a fine speech by Alaska's Governor, William A. Egan, to the convention of the Alaska Association of Realtors at Anchorage on September 10, is distinctly encouraging as well as embodying a thorough grasp of the situation.

The text of the Governor's speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it was with great pleasure that I accepted your kind invitation to address you today, and I have looked forward to coming here.

The realtors of Alaska have an overall record of public-spirited fairness and human understanding in their dealings with citizens. Since that fateful evening last spring when devastation befell many of the south-central district's cities and villages, your organization has worked closely with public servants in government in providing an

answer to some of the technical questions arising with respect to land problems.

I welcome the opportunity to tell you of some of the things that have been accomplished since the great disaster of last March and to speculate a little as to what lies ahead for our State.

You are all aware, of course, of what is going on in this dynamic community. In the historical sense, it was only for a moment that progress here was halted.

In those first dark days after the Good Friday catastrophe, when most of our south-central Alaska communities lay in ruins. The true spirit and courage of Alaskans shone forth. There was no question that in time we would rebuild our State and make it a better place. We knew there could be no finer memorial to those who had perished.

Today, all about us, we can see that memorial being erected. The wreckage of that awful disaster—for the most part—has been cleared away. New buildings are going up, testifying to the steadfastness of Alaskans and their faith in the future of this State.

Your convention now in progress is positive indication of your belief that Alaska is but crossing the threshold of its development potential.

It is truly inspiring to walk about the streets of this city. The accomplishments of Anchorage since that not so long ago Good Friday evening bears witness of the unshakeable never-say-die spirit of Anchorageites and all Alaskans. The New J. C. Penny Co. store, the First National Bank addition, the Alaska Sales & Service Building, the First Federal Savings & Loan reconstruction—these are but a few of the evidences to any visitor that Anchorage is here to stay. Everywhere there are signs of this. The Cordova and Hill Buildings are once again occupied. Many other buildings damaged on March 27 have been restored. There are more accommodations for visitors in Anchorage now than there were before the disaster.

All but three Anchorage area schools are in use again. Completion of repairs on one of these—Denali School—is scheduled by November 30. Restoration of water and sewer lines is proceeding ahead of schedule. Employment is at a higher level than last year.

The Department of Labor reports that 86,300 persons were employed in the State in mid-August—900 more than in July and 2,000 more than in August of last year. The increased employment is attributed primarily to earthquake reconstruction activity. But there has also been an increase in industry which is in no way related to the great disaster. Oil, timber, and hard rock mineral development, are among those reflecting noticeable employment increase.

The number of construction workers filing unemployment claims in August was less than half that for the same month last year. While the July-to-August improvement in employment this year was most pronounced in construction, every other major industry showed some improvement.

At this point, I want to inform you that employment of resident cannery workers in Cordova was virtually unaffected by Japanese salmon buying in Prince William Sound. The explanation for this is that the two major American salmon canneries in the area customarily import most of their labor from Washington State. Therefore their 11th hour decision not to operate this year had the greatest impact on fishermen. Most Cordova cannery workers found employment in the several small American canneries which operated there this year—and fishermen, who had been faced with the prospect of spending the summer on the beach, were able to make a living.

In the devastated areas of south-central Alaska, reconstruction work is going ahead. Planning has been completed for urban renewal projects at Valdez, Seward, and Homer For Cordova and Seldovia certain work and planning is underway.

The Valdez project involves relocation of the entire community at Mineral Creek several miles away. The move is necessitated by geological findings that the present townsite is dangerously unstable.

Engineering for the access road to the new townsite and for a 600-foot dock is complete. The Army Corps of Engineers has awarded a contract for construction of harbor facilities. Most of the work in connection with the Valdez project will not begin until next spring, but it is hoped that sewer and water mains can be installed at the new townsite before this winter.

At Seward, a contract has been awarded for rehabilitation of utilities and sewers, and bids have been received for reconstruction of harbor facilities. The Seward urban renewal project involves relocation of the community's industrial area—which was destroyed by sea waves and fire on March 27—to the head of Resurrection Bay.

At Kodiak, the harbor breakwater has been restored, and replacement of boat floats and other inner harbor facilities is expected to be finished by November 15. The Kodiak urban renewal project involves reconstruction of the community's commercial center.

I want to emphasize that, while substantial progress has been made to date, the work of rebuilding our shattered communities is expected to continue for the next 3 years.

A 3-year highway reconstruction program will be 26 percent complete, and the Alaska railroad expects to have a usable facility at Seward and its track reopened to that port city by the end of the year.

The Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs—which has undertaken to build new homes for Old Harbor, Port Lions (formerly Afognak), and Chenega villagers—reports it anticipated having the buildings up by about November 1. Chenega, which was smashed by the sea waves on March 27, is to be relocated at Tatitlek, near Valdez.

The Indian Bureau is now forwarding supplies to the building sites from Whittier and recruiting carpenters. The work must be accomplished before winter sets in too deeply. Many of these villagers are still living in the temporary homes constructed in April and May.

Of special interest to you, I am sure, is the Federal-State program of mortgage relief for Alaskans whose homes were severely damaged or destroyed last March.

The program, while not as broad as I had hoped for, nevertheless will provide a measure of relief for nearly 400 Alaskans.

Eleven million dollars is to be made available by the State and Federal Government, on a 50–50 basis, for this mortgage relief program. The Alaska Legislature appropriated the State's share at its recent special session.

The State will administer the program, and a proposed plan for implementing it has been forwarded to President Johnson. The plan, based on recently approved amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act, must have the President's approval before it can be put into effect, and the Congress must yet appropriate the authorized Federal share of the funds.

Some persons have declared that because Congress has not yet appropriated the Federal Government's $5½ million share of the program, I should not have called the recent special session of the legislature. I want to emphasize here that I had been assured by high officials of the Federal administration that no appropriation would be likely from Congress for the mortgage program until the State of Alaska developed its plan and demonstrated it intended to follow through with the program. The special legislative session was a concrete demonstration of the intent of Alaskans to do everything possible to help ourselves.

The mortgage program, while not a cure-all, will enable many Alaskans who have suffered grievous losses to reestablish homes and rid themselves of crushing mortgage obligations.

Some have questioned why we are attempting to establish a program that will not benefit all Alaskans. I have answered that this program will help all Alaskans—by preventing bankruptcies and defaults which would tarnish our State's reputation in financial circles.

We are acting to maintain the financial integrity of Alaska. But the main point is that this program is the best we could get from Congress at this time. When we consider all of the other support Congress and Federal agencies have extended to us, I believe each of us can say, "well done."

As I have said, our plan for implementing the mortgage relief program is now being studied by the executive branch of the Federal Government and is subject to rejection or modification. For this reason, I will only describe it generally to you today.

The plan is intended to enable the State to relieve mortgagors by retiring or adjusting outstanding home mortgage obligations or other real property liens secured by one-to four-family homes damaged to the extent of 60 percent or more of their preearthquake value.

It is contemplated that the State commissioner of commerce will administer the plan, through an agency to be known as the Alaska Mortgage Redemption Agency.

Payments from the fund for retiring or adjusting mortgage obligations and other real property liens on a single property are not to exceed $30,000, and a mortgagor shall absorb the damage loss to the entire extent of his equity in the property. No payment will be made which would directly or indirectly compensate the owner for any portion of his equity interest.

I want to repeat here it was the intent of Congress in establishing this program to relieve the owners of badly damaged or destroyed homes of overwhelming mortgage burdens and nothing more.

A homeowner applying for mortgage relief will be required to pay $1,000 toward liquidation of his mortgage or lien obligations. Principal payments made subsequent to March 27, 1964, will be deducted from this required payment.

An applicant may choose to retain title to his property or relinquish it to the State. It is intended that if he chooses to give up title, the mortgage redemption agency will provide the full amount needed to retire his mortgage, except for $1,000.

I will not describe the plan more fully at this time because it is only a proposal now. If it is accepted, the State will act immediately to make it work for a substantial number of our fellow Alaskans in dire need of assistance.

I want to touch on one or two other subjects before closing my remarks here today.

I have mentioned that employment is at a high level. I want also to point out that, despite the loss of many fishing boats and damage to others, the 1964 Alaska salmon season—overall—is the best in 15 years, with the pack expected to total more than 3,600,000 cases.

Looking to the future, a high level of employment is anticipated for the next several years in the State partly because of the extensive reconstruction work scheduled.

And there is reason to believe 1965 will be our biggest tourist year. Everything that has made our State a prime tourist attraction in the past is intact. The magnificence of Alaska's scenery and the friendliness of her people are undiminished. It is not unlikely that many persons will want to visit the 49th State next year to view the progress that will have been made by then in the reconstruction effort.

There are those who would cast doubt as to the economic future of our State. These are the same people who predicted gloom in the first days of statehood. They are the people who never see the forest because of the trees. They are the well meaning folks who could not see that building an adequate transportation system on land—on water—and on the airways—was the basic ingredient needed to stimulate economic development. They are the ones who thought that building new schools, airports, boat harbors, public buildings, hospitals and strengthening the physical and academic plant at the University of Alaska would sound the death knell for Alaska.

These people are the ones who believe that the status quo should have been maintained as we moved from territorial status to statehood. Brakes should have been applied to our land development program, to our fisheries conservation and management program, to our visitor promotion program, to our job training programs, to our agricultural program, and to many other progressive activities.

They are the ones who speak of living out on the tundra under the stars—but who, themselves, live in fine homes, utilizing and enjoying all the modern conveniences helpful to a better way of life.

They are the ones who fail to see the countless new hotels, motels, homes, service stations, and other business establishments which have sprung up in Alaska since statehood. They will not admit that the volume of gross business has nearly doubled in Alaska over the past 5 years.

They close their eyes to the fact that timber utilization and production has increased noticeably and admirably over the past 5 years; that the same thing applies to our salmon, halibut, and shellfish development programs; that the oil and gas industry has come into its own in Alaska over the same period; that our coal mining and other hard rock mining has made strides; that our visitor travel industry is growing, on land, sea, and air; that agricultural production is progressing, and that many small industries have come into being in many of our communities. They fail to note the progress made in developing our human resources. For example—last year more than three times as many graduates of the University of Alaska qualified as teachers for Alaska's schools than was the case in 1959. I could go on and on.

But the point is that while, sure, we do have problems, as does any other State of our American Union, those who preach doom and gloom without interspersing facts in their remarks, do a great injustice to our great State of Alaska.

These same people continue to belittle the oil industry's great contribution to Alaska's past statehood progress. They point to bonus payments for competitive bid oil lease lands as being "windfalls." There is no "windfall" to it. Those of us responsible for administering your Government studied geological reports discussed likely values with knowledgeable men in this field. We had every faith based on—not dreams—but factual data—as did the leaders of the petroleum industry, that these lands were immensely valuable.

That faith is now paying off. The productive activity in Cook Inlet which is now fact, is about 2 years behind schedule with respect to notations I made in a little black book of mine back in 1961. But the ultimate result will be essentially as I noted for my personal reference 3 years back.

Oil production royalties from production of the Soldatna Creek and Soldatna River units on the Kenai Peninsula, bring the State approximately $3,500,000 annually. When production from the presently proven oil fields in Cook Inlet is in full swing, I venture to say that the additional annual production royalties to the State will reach a minimum of $20 million. Quality of the oil in the Cook Inlet discoveries appears to be of a higher quality and each well appears to average a greater flow rate than those which are in production on the peninsula. On each of these counts, State royalties will be higher annually per well. The area of each of the presently discovered inlet fields will permit, under State spacing regulations, many more wells in each field than is presently the case in the Soldatna-Swanson River units.

The above does not take into consideration the likelihood of other Cook Inlet discoveries, or discoveries elsewhere, such as on the Arctic north slope.

In referring to the Arctic north slope, let me say that there are many in the oil industry who feel that area will be one of the world's heaviest petroleum producers.

And so, my friends, the income we have received thus far from our oil resources—rather than a "windfall"—may have been far too little for the value which is being proven.

Rather than a "windfall" only time will tell whether the State, in its determination to foster economic development, will be later accused of not holding out for enough in money payments from its early years competitive bid oil lease land activities.

The oil industry is here to stay. The industry's future activities will grow and grow, and the economy of the State of Alaska will grow and grow with it. Income derived from this one industry's production will have the effect of placing the State of Alaska's treasury on a sounder and more stable basis than that of any State of this great Union of ours.

It is true that the next 2 years will be lean ones, State budgetwise. But we are out of the glimmer stage, State budgetwise, and developmentwise. Ahead of us the sun is shining through.

Oil and gas development, fisheries production growth, timber industry expansion, agricultural production, hard rock mining, visitor travel, job training programs, educational progress, service industries and a fine transportation system—all the things that make for a better Alaska—are moving along.

We can each of us be mighty proud, you and I, regardless of political affiliation, of the forward trek that has been made since January 3, 1959.

Your organization, the Alaska Association of Realtors, has made significant contribution over past years to the well-being of Alaska. Your membership is composed of men and women of vision, of progressive thinking. Alaska is on the march. I know that each of you will be in there working shoulder to shoulder with your public servants on the State and local government level to develop the inheritance with which destiny has endowed us.

Thank you.

Speech by Ambassador Juracy Magalhaes to American-Brazilian Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Ambassador Juracy Magalhães at a luncheon given in his honor by the American-Brazilian Association, at New York City, on September 14, 1964.

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

SPEECH BY AMBASSADOR JURACY MAGALHAES DURING A LUNCHEON GIVEN IN HIS HONOR BY THE AMERICAN-BRAZILIAN ASSOCIATION

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to find myself amongst so many friends, Americans and Brazilians, all joined as brothers by the spirit of solidarity which characterizes the relations between our two countries and is reflected in the high objectives of this admirable American-Brazilian association. I would like to thank the distinguished president of the association and his colleagues of the board of directors for their kind invitation to this very pleasant luncheon and to all those present I would like to express my appreciation for their kind company.

Brazil and the United States are fortunately linked by a perennial communion of interests, sentiment, traditions, honor, and earnestness. This is the lesson of our histories ever since Brazil joined the community of sovereign nations, and today, especially in the present company, I need not stress any further the high significance of the ties between our countries. I will permit myself, however, to quote the following words spoken by Thomas Jefferson in 1787:

"As a North American I firmly believe that my country not only wants but also needs an independent, strong, and friendly Brazil to carry out in the southern portion of the hemisphere the mission that is ours in the northern part. Our two nations, united by a sincere friendship, would not only maintain peace throughout the Western Hemisphere, but would form with the other countries of America a bloc capable of resisting any aggression from Europe."

With the passing of the years the international situation to which President Jefferson referred has changed, as have the objectives of the union of our countries; nevertheless, the pronouncement of that distinguished statesman remains steadfast in its substance, thus giving one more proof of his political foresight.

Relations between Brazil and the United States have had high points, such as happened during World War II when Brazil made possible the great American action in Africa and, shortly thereafter, when its troops joined American troops on European soil in the defense of the Western democratic system. I realize that, on the other hand, these relations have undergone difficult moments brought on by misunderstandings which were, fortunately, shortlived. Today they are on the plane desired by the peoples of both countries, which is that of frank and constructive collaboration, be it politically or economically or financially.

In his remarkable speech on July 31 in which he defined Brazil's foreign policy, our eminent President Castelo Branco left no doubts as to Brazil's basic option in favor of the Western democratic system as the conditioning factor in the country's international position. Within this framework, President Castelo Branco said with regard to the United States:

"We have the conviction that Brazil and the great North American nation look after their mutual economic and trade interests in tune with a high-level policy and with a reciprocal friendship. The characteristics of Brazil's present situation coincide with this continent's desire for peace and also with the fundamentals of the collective security which is so much the responsibility of the United States."

With both the prudence and determination required and with the conscious support of the Brazilian people, the present Government of Brazil has been carrying out the struggle against the devastating inflation

fostered by the previous administration and is in the process of defining and beginning to put into effect such plans as are indispensable to draw the national economy out of the stagnation in which it had almost foundered. Many of the steps taken and measures adopted have not met with popularity and have, therefore, brought on criticism which is not uncommon in regimes that advocate freedom of opinion and of assembly. The program outlined by the Government does not seek to serve groups but the nation itself and it shall be carried out with earnestness, steadfastness, and honesty of purpose.

The Brazilian people are convinced that the effort toward the development of the country has to be domestic and demands the sacrifice of all sectors of the nation. We are determined, in Brazil, to proceed at any cost along those lines, and this we shall do. We do not forgo, however, collaboration we may receive from friendly countries as a complement to our efforts in order that the pace of development may be accelerated without any setback to our internal needs. In past years foreign capital, whether public or private, had reasons for fear the Brazilian market, although many times it found favorable conditions for investment in that market. Today there is no longer any reason for fear: to public financing we present an earnest and competent government and to private investment we offer the security of fair legislation and an enormous variety of mutually advantageous applications.

In view of the nature and extent of the economic and trade relations between our two countries Brazilians trust that great part of this foreign financial cooperation will come from the United States, whether through its government or through its business community.

Our friends here present are well aware of the real situation and of the enormous potential of Brazil. In my thoughts at this moment were turned only to you, I would limit myself to thanking you again for the honor of your gracious company, but I speak to you, with my thoughts turned also to those Americans who, unfortunately, are not aware of what goes on in Brazil and what the Brazil of tomorrow will be like. We must proclaim to them that Brazil is that strong ally that the United States wanted and needed as early as in Jefferson's time. We must tell them that Brazil is a country completely reintegrated in its national dignity, earnestly desirous of promoting its development and honoring its share in the heritage and in the preservation of Western democratic civilization.

The transmittal of this message is an important part of my mission in this country and to fulfill this task I trust, ladies and gentlemen, that I can count on your cooperation.

Thank you.

Needs for 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as the presidential election approaches and the campaign increases its pace, the voters of the United States will be seeking answers to the many issues that will be debated. There will be claims and counterclaims that must be resolved and decisions will have to be made in a calm and objective manner. There is a deep significance in the choice presented to the voters and more than ever before an intelligent awareness of the issues involved is needed.

In a recent column, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, an experienced reporter of public affairs, gives excellent advice to the voters who face a campaign which will undoubtedly be fraught with emotion. I urge that his words be given careful attention. The article follows:

NEEDS FOR 1964

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—"Faker," "liar," "extremist," "hipshooter," "irresponsible," "preposterous," "ridiculous * * *."

With invectives like these already floating around loose in the atmosphere, it is evident that partisan oratory in this year's presidential campaign is going to be very partisan and very oratorical.

There is no doubt that the United States is heading into a highly emotional and inflammatory campaign—for understandable reasons.

While the country is still in the period of relative political calm, I want to mention three needs of the 1964 election, not as they affect the politicians but as they affect the voters.

The first need is to realize that the United States is facing a more meaningful decision than in any presidential campaign since the end of the war. Neither Senator GOLDWATER nor President Johnson is an echo of the other; each represents a fundamental choice—a crossroads of history. There is no one around to make this decision but the voters. What formidable—and precious—responsibility.

The second need is to realize that the only way we can really know what is going on in this superheated campaign is to keep our heads even if, at times, all the politicians seem to be losing theirs. As individuals we can be alert to the excesses of partisan politics so we and the country will not be misled.

The third need is to make certain that others do not do our thinking for us, that we think for ourselves, judge for ourselves, and decide for ourselves. Since the political parties will rarely be presenting their views objectively, it is important for the voters to be doubly objective in examining their views.

I am not talking about what to think—but how to think. For any value they might be in negotiating the shoals of "campaign oratory," I offer the following guidelines which have been helpful to me in reporting and appraising public affairs many years:

1. Cherish and nourish the desire for full information. One is not fully qualified to assert an opinion until he is able to expound the case for the counter opinion.

2. Use of a variety of sources of information. Whenever possible, read the full texts of the speeches of the presidential nominees. Make an effort to tap sources of opinion and appraisal with which you are likely to disagree.

3. List the issues which you feel should be controlling and try to examine the answers each candidate makes to the other's claims.

4. To get the right answers, you must ask yourself the right questions. The best questions concern "why" and "how," not merely what.

5. Develop the art of listening. It is a rewarding state of mind. In respecting your own views, respect the views of others.

6. Realize that you can have as deep a conviction as you wish even when you recognize that the other side has a lot of truth in it. Frequently people hesitate to look faithfully at the other side for fear the strength of their convictions will be weakened by the fact that some of the arguments on the other side are valid. You can have a 100-percent conviction even if there be only a 10-percent difference between your views and those who conclude differently.

7. Periodically engage in some good intellectual housecleaning. At every good opportunity, look at your favorite opinions and prejudices; put them out on the table in front of you. Make them justify themselves before you put them back in your mind.

There is no special dispensation for the capacity to think logically, cogently, objectively, usefully.

We're going to need to do it in this campaign.

Distortion in the Washington Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on last Tuesday morning, September 8, I spoke in Dallas before the national convention of the American Federation of Government Employees. On Wednesday afternoon, September 9, the Washington Star printed an extraordinary article about my speech—extraordinary because of its distortion.

This story, this fable in the Washington Star, was printed at page A–2 in the September 9 issue. Its caption reads as follows: "U.S. Classified Workers Assailed by YARBOROUGH on Pay Activity."

This is a very misleading headline, to say the least. In fact, I praised the American Federation of Government Employees for the fairness and skill of the presentation by its officers of its case, before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on which I serve. I recounted the history of the recent Federal pay raise act in Congress, narrated how the House bill raised the salaries of the employees in the low brackets and of those in the high brackets, but left those in the middle brackets—E–9 through E–12—without comparable salary raises. I properly credited the AFGE with having ably called this discrimination in pay increase to the attention of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, with a resulting correction of this gross inequity by our committee, by the Senate, by the conference between the two Houses, and ultimately by Congress itself.

The first paragraph of this Washington Star article reads as follows:

An extraordinary attack on Government classified employees as ingrates and snobs has been made here by Senator YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, at the American Federation of Government Employees biennial convention.

This is a complete distortion of what was actually said. Never at any time, at any place, either publicly or privately, have I called Government employees, classified or unclassified, either ingrates or snobs. Such a statement is patently ridiculous.

In my speech to the AFGE, I narrated that of the 592,500 U.S. postal employees,

approximately 400,000 belong to employee organizations; but that of the more than 1 million classified and wage board U.S. employees, less than 250,000 belong to any kind of employee organization. I urged the AFGE to recruit prospective members, so as to have the organized voice that postal employees have.

At Dallas, I did, indeed, make a partisan political speech for the Democratic Party. I stated to the delegates that they were under the Hatch Act, and could not campaign; but that I was an elective officer, not under the Hatch Act, and could, and would, campaign there. Such conduct was ethical and proper, but it seems to have irritated the Star reporter.

If the response of the delegates present was any criterion of their feelings—and I have had enough political and public-speaking experience to know that it was, my speech was approved by the delegates at Dallas. If I called those Federal employees any names, they did not seem to realize it when the time for applause came.

However, to be impartial and candid in my report to the Senate, I point out that later an officer of AFGE told me that a member said to him, "Well, he did not win me over, I am still a Republican." In the course of my remarks, I had invited any Republicans who were dissatisfied with their party to "come over and join us Democrats." But I do not believe that Americans resent being asked to join either of the two great American political parties now in existence in the United States.

In order to set this matter straight, I ask unanimous consent that my prepared text, as released to the press at the AFGE Convention, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE WELFARE OF THE FEDERAL WORKER

(Excerpt of a speech delivered by Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH before the National Biennial Convention of the American Federation of Government Employees, at the Adolphus Hotel in Dallas, Tex., Tuesday, Sept. 8, 1964)

Fellow Americans, fellow Government workers, I am honored to be your guest at this national convention of the American Federation of Government Employees. As a ranking member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, legislation affecting your lives has been an important part of my responsibility.

I believe our committee, under the leadership of the great chairman, OLIN JOHNSTON, has worked as hard as any congressional group in American history to bring about legislation to improve the life of the Government employee.

This 88th Congress takes second place to no Congress in American history in the work it has done to bring the Federal employee to a more nearly equal standard with the worker in private industry.

What has been accomplished was done with the influential and effective work of the American Federation of Government Employees. It has been in many cases your informed membership, the respect held for your organization by Members of Congress, the executive branch and agencies of the Government that has made you a partner in the shaping of new laws. Yours is a dynamic organization, a part of a dynamic administration team. The AFGE gets things done.

Within your organization is the experience, the know-how, the day-to-day accomplishment that makes it possible for the American Government to undergo a change in the White House such as the one following the tragic assassination of John F. Kennedy—a change effected with the full confidence of the American people—an orderly transition impossible of achievement by any other government.

You are building for the future of the Federal employee by the high standards you have set in your relation to the public interest

Your membership has increased by 25,000 or 30,000 in the past few years; it is now up to 136,000, and is still growing.

You have good cause to be proud of your role, as I am proud of mine as a Member of the Senate in helping to make the Federal Government attractive to the highest caliber of men and women.

A great step forward was accomplished when President Kennedy signed into law the Salary Reform Act of 1962, including the principle of comparability. And another step was achieved when President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the pay bill last month. I worked with your federation on this bill; we were successful in increasing the raise for classified employees in the middle grades.

In the next Congress we shall continue to look at such matters as the "level of competence" provisions in the 1962 act which have caused you concern.

This 88th Congress has already improved the Health Benefits Act of 1959, and it is my hope that we can turn more attention now to needed reforms in the retirement system.

I might add while we are on this subject that I introduced two bills which I think would greatly improve the retirement plan.

I have been concerned for some time about all the sick leave that may be lost by an employee retiring after many years of dedicated service One of my bills (S. 1661) provides that one-half of this accumulated sick leave at retirement shall either be compensated for in cash as severance pay or all the accumulated sick leave shall be used as added service time in computing the annuity.

Another of my bills (S. 1662) would correct the inequities in the survivor annuities plans.

Obviously their chance for enactment in this session is less than bright, but I assure you I will be back next year to reintroduce these and to work for their passage. We must not allow the Federal Service again to stand still while the rest of the world goes marching by.

These great strides have been made by a Democratic majority in Congress over the outspoken opposition of the current Republican Party leadership, which knows no greater pleasure than to denounce the Federal Government—a Republican Party that has as one of its greatest unspoken goals—unspoken but well understood—the curtailment of Federal Service and the death of the union movement.

It has been a Democratic Congress that has paved the way for first-class citizenship for you and others like you.

If we are to maintain these gains, if in fact, we are to prevent a loss of all that has been achieved, you owe it to yourselves and to your country to vote and above all, to encourage others to vote for a forward-looking Government.

For first of all you are American citizens with full rights of participation in your Government, and citizenship carries no greater responsibility than the selection of those who will represent you well in the years to come. I am a candidate for reelection to the U.S. Senate, running against a Republican opponent who sows seeds of distrust against the Federal Government, who endorses wholeheartedly the backward philosophy of the current National Republican leadership.

I am a straight-ticket Democrat, for this has always been the party of peace, prosperity, of hope, the party of vision, and the party of action. And with your vote, we shall continue the forward march in the spirit of Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy, Johnson, and Humphrey.

Letters to Representative Beckworth and a Clipping About Independent Oil Operators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include some letters which I have recently received and a copy of an article that appeared in the Longview Daily News, September 14, 1964. Some of our dairymen have real troubles. The same is true in connection with our independent oil operators:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1964.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have your letter of August 15, 1964, to Secretary Freeman and the enclosed letter from Mr. J. G. Anderson, general manager of the North Texas Producers Association, concerning a request for an emergency hearing on class I prices under the Texas Federal milk orders.

A public hearing has now been announced for August 26 at Dallas. At this time evidence will be received concerning the need for an emergency increase in the class I price in the north Texas, San Antonio, central west Texas, Austin-Waco, Corpus Christi, and Lubbock-Plainview Federal order markets.

If we may assist you in any other way, please call on us. Mr. Anderson's letter is returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,
CLARENCE H. GIRARD,
Deputy Administrator,
Regulatory Programs.

PITTSBURG, TEX.,
September 10, 1964.

DEAR LINDLEY: We have read Mr. Gerard's letter with interest, and do appreciate what you are doing in behalf of the struggling dairymen, and believe you can get them some relief.

One thing for sure—you are the man we have always been the one we can go to with our problems, and know if anything can be done you can and will.

LINDLEY, it is still hot and dry here, and that contributes much more to our troubles.

Sorry, have been so long in returning this letter—but so many things on our mind and so much to do—we have carelessly neglected it.

Thanks so very much for your efforts and we are still counting big on you and look forward to seeing you home.

So sorry to learn of your loss in illness.

We will be dropping you few lines again soon as time eases a bit.

Sincerely yours,
RUBY LEE and J. W. DUFFEY.

INDEPENDENT SAYS OIL MEN FACING TROUBLE

TYLER.—Texas' independent oil men are in deep trouble, the executive vice president of the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association (TIPRO) asserted today.

"The average or typical independent is being rapidly squeezed into virtual inactivity if not altogether out of this business," said Earl Turner of TIPRO.

"There is a grave monopoly trend in the oil business which cannot, in the long run, benefit any segment of this industry, any producer State, any consumer, or the security of our Nation," Turner told the Rotary Club.

Discussing "causes of deterioration and solutions needed," Turner said TIPRO will decide at its annual meeting in Fort Worth Sunday what measures should be taken to aid the independent.

Turner named partially subsidized foreign oil as the foremost source of the independent's problems. Foreign oil, he said, "has been allowed to gobble up a seriously disproportionate share of U.S. market growth."

He said closely tied in with cheap oil from abroad is "cutthroat price competition at the marketing level—competition of a kind which certainly does not benefit the consumer in the long run and can be disastrous to the nonintegrated producers without access to cheap foreign oil."

A third source of difficulty, he said, is "failure of prorating States like Texas to get their fair share of production within the United States. This is primarily because of the disproportionate growth in Federal offshore production."

Sudden Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to insert the following message from the Sunday School Times. It was relayed to me from one of my constituents. I commend it to my colleagues for sober consideration:

SUDDEN DESTRUCTION

Rapidly transpiring events in the Far East have again brought our Nation face to face with the possibility of war. We have found again that while it is easy to talk about war as a means of solving our international problems, it is never easy to contemplate the awful reality of war—especially in today's nuclear age.

War is hanging over us. The stock market is shocked. Families of servicemen are shocked. Our own Christian consciences should be shocked. The Vietnam crisis should serve as a call to national prayer and repentance.

War is never a blessing. It is always a judgment. No one wins. It is judgment on victor and vanquished alike. The finger of God, as it were, is writing on the wall for everyone to see. We see again the awful possibility of sudden destruction. When people say, "There is peace and security," then sudden destruction will come. That is the word of the Lord. (1 Thessalonians 5: 3.)

The United States is living in unparalleled luxury. This Nation has been blessed beyond all measure. Yet on us falls the responsibility for thwarting Communist aggression, for spending billions of dollars for armaments, for using the lives of thousands of men to preserve freedom.

Never before has a nation held such an awesome responsibility. And because we have been so blessed by God, we have a greater responsibility before Him.

With a surging crime rate, racial violence, alcoholism, and sex being exploited as the god of this age, we find little reason to believe that we shall be spared some kind of judgment. Perhaps we shall survive as a nation, but at what cost?

Too long have we looked askance at our national sins. Too long have we trusted in our material standard of living. Too long have we trusted in our scientific achievements. Too long have we been willing to settle for the cheap veneer of a weak religion without the cross of Christ as the center.

National prayer and repentance is not simply a means of saving our own skins. It is what we owe Almight God for the bounteous mercies He has bestowed on us. Repentance also means more than a few tears of sorrow. It means a determination to renounce sin and to follow the Lord Jesus Christ, regardless of cost.

Perhaps Vietnam will shake us out of our complacency. It is easy to think the danger is too far away to concern us. But we know that with the rising power of China, there is bound to be conflict. We need to examine our own hearts now before the living God to whom we shall one day give account.

Sudden destruction can overtake an individual as well as a nation. That is the lesson of the man who tore down his barns to build bigger ones. This is the picture of the United States today—building, building, and more building—but on the foundation of sinking sand instead of the foundation of rock, which is the eternal word of God.

This crisis is a call to return to the scriptural standards of personal and national living. And this kind of obedience to the word of God must begin with Christians. We must show the Nation the way of faith and obedience to the living Christ, who is before all things and in whom all things hold together. We have been delivered from the dominion of darkness and transferred to the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in whom we have the forgiveness of our sins.

No crisis is a call to panic, but rather a call to sober reflection. We must pray as never before for our Nation, not only that we shall be spared a war, but that we shall be a God-fearing and God-loving people. This alone is worth striving for. If we save our lives, but lose our souls, of what value is it?

May the possibility of sudden destruction shock us to our knees, in honest petition for the mercy of God and for the souls of men lost without Christ.—JAMES W. REAPSOME.

E. B. Taylor, Dickinson Businessman and Civic Leader, Preserver of Historical Documents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, E. B. Taylor, Texas rancher and businessman who has a devoted interest in the history of his State, is the subject of an interesting article published on August 2, 1964, in the Houston Post Sunday supplement, Now.

The article describes Mr. Taylor's office in Dickinson, Tex., and some of the documents it contains as a veritable history museum, with its historical documents on display for the public.

Mr. Taylor's interesting collection is focused in part on Texas life under Mexican rule.

Because of the historical significance of the article by John Rainey, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

SURROUNDED BY TEXAS HISTORY

(By John Rainey)

The sign at 4310 Washington in Dickinson says "E. B. Taylor, real estate."

But it is not really a real estate office, not much anyhow.

It is a Texas history museum, loose pages of history come to life, an arsenal of Texana, a place where weapons and documents are stored.

Taylor does sell real estate; that's for business. He collects historical documents; that's for love.

It started in 1947, after Taylor moved to Galveston from Florida and married Caroline Adriance, granddaughter of John Adriance who fought in the Texas revolution.

Taylor worked in the Adriance real estate business until his wife's father died in 1953. The business was the oldest licensed real estate business in Texas.

As his father, Henry Adriance, had kept all the documents that had been involved in land transactions. Many went back to the time when Texas was part of Mexico.

Taylor got infected with the collecting virus then and has never recovered.

A WAY OF LIFE

To him the papers told the saga of life on the frontier.

"They tell of a way of life, the feelings of people, their hardships, their trials. Texas is a way of life, not a place," Taylor says.

Most of the documents of Henry Adriance were sold off with the business, but not all. Taylor is attempting to get that collection now, but that is another story.

Taylor got into the real estate business on his own, and began to fill the walls of his offices with guns and knives that were once the gear of Texans.

The more he acquired, the more he learned about the game of collecting. He has advanced to the point where he rarely will tell the source of his material.

A short walk around his office is a refresher course in history. There is an August 27, 1839, issue of the Galvestonian, of which three copies of volume 1 are known to exist today.

Up in the left-hand corner it says "single copies two bits." A single copy is worth at least $5,000 now.

He has the only known document listing the names of Mexican prisoners taken at San Jacinto.

Then there is the broadside printed by Marcos de Esparza, Governor of Zacatecas, which is said to have precipitated the war between Mexico and the United States.

It too is the only copy known to exist.

A letter from Issac Millsap to his wife and children is dated March 3, 1836. Millsap wrote it from behind the walls of the Alamo.

The only known copy of a reward poster issued during the days of the Republic is there.

Ask Taylor where he got a certain document and he gets to grunting. He'll say C. Dorman David, owner of the Bookman, if that is the case. He'll crow if he beat David on the deal. But otherwise, Taylor

prefers to say "an old man at Galveston," or "I can't tell that."

His particular interest is the period of Texas life under Mexican rule and up until it entered the Union. He also is putting special emphasis on Galveston County.

INSIDE THE ALAMO

The letter from Isaac Millsap to his wife and children follows, reprinting the spelling and punctuation as found in the letter:

"BEXAR, *March 3, 1863.*

"MY DEAR DEAR ONES: We are in the fortress of the Alamo a ruined church that has most fell down. The Mexicans are here in large numbers they have kept up a constant fire since we got here. All of our boys are well and Captain Martin is in good spirits. Early this morning I watched the Mexcans drilling just out of range they was marching up and down with such order. They have bright red and blue uniforms and many canons. Some here at this place believe that the main army has not come up yett. I think they is all here even Santana. Colonel Bowie is down sick and had to be to bed I saw him yesterday and he is still ready to fight. He did't know me from last spring but did remember Wash. He tells all that help will be here soon and it makes us feel good. We have beef and corn to eat but no coffee, bag I had fell off on the way here so it was all spilt. I have not see Travis but two times since he told us all this morning that Fanning was going to be here early with many men and there would be a good fight. He stays on the wall some but mostly to his room I hope help comes soon cause we cant fight them all. Some says he is going to talk some tonight and group us better for defense. If we fail here get to the river with the children all Texas will be before the enemy we get so little news here we know nothing. There is no discontent in our boys some are tired from loss of sleep and rest. The Mexcans are shooting every few minutes but most of the shots fall inside and do no harm. I dont know what else to say they is calling for all letters, kiss the dear children for me and believe as I do that all will be well and God protects us all.

"ISAAC.

"If any men come through there tell them to hurry with powder for it is short I hope you get this and know—I love you all."

Address Delivered to the American Mining Congress Convention, September 14, Portland, Oreg., by the Honorable John J. Rhodes, of Arizona

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD the following transcript of an address I delivered to the American Mining Congress Convention in Portland, Oreg., on September 14 concerning our national policies as they affect the mineral industries.

The transcript follows:

It is well for the mining industry to consider carefully the positions of the two political parties which affect it. Literally, the Federal Government is in mining up to its ears. To begin at the beginning, Federal law governs the manner by which discoveries are claimed in most of our land area which is mineral bearing. Then, Federal law governs the use of the surface over mineral claims, and the extent of subsurface rights. In other words, it controls the environment in which most mining operations must be carried out. Under certain conditions, Federal loans are available for the discovery and development of mining ventures. The operation of the mines, while mainly regulated by State law, must also be cognizant of Federal laws having to do with fair labor standards, labor relations, taxes, depletion allowances, and many other matters. In addition, the tariff policy of the particular party in power can have great effect upon the market price to be received for minerals and metals, and therefore impinges directly upon the profitability and feasibility of mining operations.

The tariff policy is not the only way in which the Federal Government may affect mining markets. After World War II many minerals and metals were stockpiled, looking toward the day of another national emergency in which they might be needed. In the 1950's, the policy of trading surplus agricultural products for strategic minerals and metals began. This resulted in the creation of a second stockpile. The policy which the Government follows with reference to the retention or disposition of stockpiled minerals and metals is profoundly important to the marketing situation.

The position of the Government insofar as marketing is concerned is so predominant as to be able to cause rumblings at the marketplace, even with indirect action or by the collateral affects of Government activity. For instance, as you know many minerals and metals are stockpiled either as ore, or as low-grade material which needs smelting or beneficiation before use. In these days of peacetime, Government officials felt it wise to upgrade part of our national stockpile. The policy was evolved of paying the processor in kind—in other words, with part of the product which he had refined or up-graded. This system could not cause any great disruption in the market because the processor receiving the payment in kind was a person knowledgeable in the ways of the market, and therefore disposed of the material in such a manner as to leave the market relatively unaffected.

However, another Government official got the idea that he could get more people interested in processing stockpile materials if he paid the processor in some material other than that being processed. In other words, you might pay the beneficiator of manganese by releasing aluminum to him. This practice could be dangerous to the market because it could result in the release of stockpile material into the hands of persons who have no interest in maintaining the stability of the market of that material, or do not possess the necessary knowledge to do so. Thus far, the quantities so released and the time of release have not caused havoc in any metal markets, but this policy could be dangerous if it were not kept under strict surveillance by the industry and by Government.

The actions of the Government have certainly been devastating concerning the mining of our most precious metal—gold. There is neither the time nor the inclination to go into all of the reasons that gold has been pegged at the price of $35 an ounce. In my opinion, these reasons are good and sufficient ones, and at this time I have no quarrel with them.

However, I do disagree with the reluctance of the Federal Government to do anything to encourage the mining of gold. A task force of the International Monetary Fund, in a very searching analysis of the international monetary situation, recently came to the conclusion that the expanded velocity of trade in the free world will require a basic medium of exchange which exceeds the available gold supply, and also exceeds the level of dollar credits which we can afford to have in the hands of other countries. The alternatives seem to be: (1) Find a brand new medium of exchange; (2) curtail trade in the free world; (3) increase the supply of gold.

I think we can say without serious fear of contradiction that the first alternative is impracticable at the time being. We can also say that the second is unthinkable. This leaves only the third alternative—increasing the supply of gold—as the means of keeping free world trade expanding, and at the same time keeping the dollar credits in the hands of foreign nations from rising to imprudent levels.

I have for years advocated the payment of a subsidy for newly mined gold. This would be a one-time payment, would be made in legal tender, and would be charged as a general expense to the Government. The gold, after it has been purchased and put into the gold reserve, would assume the value of $35 per ounce. Gold sold out of the gold reserve would be sold at that price.

I have heard estimates as to the increase in the output of gold which would result from such a plan. If the estimates are correct, the increase in the domestic gold production would be spectacular. I can think of no better way to aid the mining industry, and also to help solve one of our knottier problems of domestic and international finance.

Government can also be helpful to the mining industry. It can be helpful in continued research aimed at more efficient methods of discovery and development of mineral resources. Research into mine safety and the physical risks involved in mining have been and will continue to be helpful both to the mine operator and the miner himself. By continuing a reasonable depletion allowance, as the Republican platform pledges to do, we can continue to help our mining industry to show a reasonable profit, and to spend the necessary money for exploration and development to insure an adequate supply of minerals and metals for future generations.

The technology of mining and processing of mineral products has advanced so rapidly in the last several years that ore bodies which were formerly hardly worth mentioning are now extremely valuable. Many of those bodies were claimed by companies or individuals some years ago, and the claims were patented under the prudent man theory. At the time of patent, those claims were not commercially feasible. However, the foresight and ingenuity of the mining industry led the persons who patented the claims to believe that some time in the future the time, trouble, and money expended in perfecting their patents would become a good investment.

There is every reason to believe that advances in mining technology will occur which will be at least comparable to those we have already made. Yet under the Department of the Interior's present criterion, many ore bodies which will be commercially valuable in the future could not now be patented. I recognize the reasons for the change in the policy of the Department, and some of them are valid. Certainly, our land policy should always guard against fake and frivolous mining claims. However, the record of the mining industry in taking nothing and turning it into something makes me feel that the Government owes to this industry the trust and confidence which is inherent in the prudent man test for patenting claims. In other words, your record is good enough that in my opinion government should say to you, "If you are willing to risk your time and money in perfecting a patent, we are willing to give you the same type of break which we have given you in the past." Along

these lines, you will note that the Republican platform of 1964 contains a pledge for "continuing review of public land laws and policies to secure maximum opportunity for all beneficial uses of the public lands; including the development of mineral resources."

The multiple-use concept of public lands has been evolved through the years as the best means of providing maximum utilization of one of our great public treasures for the best interests of all our people—in this generation and in future generations. It recognizes not only the needs of our citizens, but the versatility of our public lands, properly utilized, to provide the solution to these needs. Along these lines, the Republican platform pledges "full cooperation of all governmental levels and private enterprise in advancing the balanced use of the Nation's natural resources to provide for man's multiple needs." The enactment of the Wilderness Act, after many years of hearings and negotiation, occurred in this Congress. In its first forms, the wilderness bill was inimical to the multiple-use concept. Over the years, opponents and proponents of wilderness legislation were able to conduct full discussions, and with the help of the able staffs of the Interior and Insular Committees of the House and Senate, were able to evolve a bill and a program with which other users of the public lands can live. Had it not been for the strength of the multiple-use concept, and the devotion which many people feel toward it, this piece of legislation either would have been passed prematurely, or not passed at all. In my opinion, the Wilderness Act owes its very existence to the fact that it now is in a form which is not radically contradictory to the multiple-use concept.

I had previously mentioned the importance of the Government in the areas of price stability. It is certainly important to the mining industry to know the policy of either political party with regard to the maintenance and/or disposition of the national stockpile. A penchant to turn the stockpile into quick cash, could certainly be dangerous to the markets. On the other hand, absolute refusal to allow some flexibility in the level of the stockpile would be shortsighted. Flexibility should never become market management, as this would really put producers at the mercy of the Government, but some action taken in emergencies to level the more acute peaks and valleys of supply and demand should be beneficial.

In my opinion, the mining industry should always try to make sure that an administration is in power which realizes the inherent dangers in improper management of the stockpile, and is dedicated to the principle that the stockpile will never be used in such a manner as to hurt free enterprise or damage our free mining industry. It should recognize that the primary purpose of the stockpile—to provide for the national defense—carries with it a secondary responsibility. That responsibility is to use the stockpile in such a way as to provide for the maximum benefit to all our citizens and to the free enterprise system

I have also mentioned that the tariff policy of any administration is important to the mining industry. The U.S. Tariff Commission has recently held exhaustive hearings in an attempt to determine the probable effect on domestic industry of the inclusion of certain products in the list to be discussed in the Kennedy round of GATT talks. As yet, no recommendations have been made. In Geneva, no additions or deletions from the public list of commodities which might form the subject of the Kennedy round have been made. While I have no desire to be unduly political, it is widely opined in Washington that the main reason these decisions have not been made public concerns the proximity of the elections, both in Great Britain and in the United States.

Strong cases were made for flexible import quotas for lead and zinc, for retention of the present copper tariff, and for other applications of tariff and quota policies to other minerals and metals. The facts needed for making a decision are certainly in the hands of the U.S. Tariff Commission, and I for one do not feel that it is asking too much to request that it proceed post haste to let us know the recommendations it will make to the President.

There are many portions of the Republican platform dealing indirectly with mining, as they deal with all the segments of our free enterprise system. For instance, we pledge an overhaul of the entire tax structure. I think it is important to all industry that this be accomplished, and that the watchword in the new tax system be balanced budgets, industrial expansion, job creation, and a high velocity economy. Inherent in most of our platform is a basic reliance upon the free enterprise system to carry the major share of the load of our economic endeavors—either alone or in partnership with Government. Equally inherent in the platform is the idea of smaller government and bigger people. This platform returns to the concept that the Government should do only those things for the people which the people cannot do at all, or as well, for themselves. This is a hard-hitting platform, and one which in my opinion places the Republican Party in the mainstream of American thinking in this year of 1964. I commend it to you for your reading, and solicit your support for its principles.

Reapportionment: Muffle Farm Counties?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Wooster Daily Record, of my congressional district, is one of the fine newspapers of Ohio. I was particularly impressed with an editorial which appeared in that newspaper August 19 on the question of reapportionment:

REAPPORTIONMENT: MUFFLE FARM COUNTIES

Intelligent persons sometimes change their minds when presented with additional facts or when adjusting conclusions to be more in tune with the times.

But when an individual, particularly an attorney, completely reverses his line of logic, we question the motivation. Such is the case with "reapportionment of State legislatures," a very controversial issue spurred by a ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Using the 14th amendment as a base, Chief Justice Earl Warren and five of his colleagues ruled that most State legislatures are selected unconstitutionally.

In his majority report in a 6-to-3 decision, Chief Justice Warren said in June: "the equal protection clause requires that seats in both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned on a population basis."

But, as Governor of California in 1948 he said that one house in the legislature should be elected on a geographical basis. We agree with Warren of 1948, not the Warren of 1964. However, unless Congress acts to sidestep or delay the Supreme Court decision, Ohio and about 40 other States must redistrict.

Governor Warren in 1948 was most convincing when he said: "The agricultural counties of California are far more important in the life of our State than the relationship their population bears to the entire population of the State.

"It is for this reason I have never been in favor of restricting their representation in our State senate to a strictly population basis. It is for the same reasoning that the Founding Fathers of our country gave a balanced representation to the States of the Union, equal representatiion in one house and apportioned representation based upon population in the other."

The Indianapolis Star says about last June's decision: "The Court deals with people as with a sack of marbles. They are to be rolled out on a tabletop and divided into equal piles."

In 1903, approximately 98 percent of Ohio voters ratified the Hanna amendment which stated that each county is entitled to one seat in the house. We think the amendment was a sensible one, since it assured each county at least one State representative.

Big city blocs have pushed reapportionment for some time. Knowing population density is in the urban areas, they see this as a way of controlling much of the State legislation.

The farmer in the predominently rural counties is in the minority as far as number. But as far as his place in the economics and livelihood of Ohio, the farmer plays a giant part. We would hate to see small rural counties lumped together just to muffle their voice in Columbus.

Wayne and Holmes County each has a State representative. Under reapportionment, the two counties could possibly have one representative between them. Other groupings would include a wider complex of rural counties: Auglaize, Logan, and Champaign could be joined as could Paulding, Putnam, Van Wert, and Mercer. The list is endless.

Ohio is considering the reapportionment ultimatum and trying to decide when and how the task should be accomplished.

In the meantime, Congress is considering a number of measures which could delay or nullify the Supreme Court ruling. Ohio Congressman WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH has proposed an amendment which merits serious consideration. We hope it becomes law. It simply would give States the right to apportion one or both houses of their legislatures on a basis other than on population alone.

L. A. Chitwood, Jr.: Housemover Extraordinary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to commend to the Congress a "housemover extraordinary" and a dedicated American.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable L. A. Chitwood, Jr., of Charleston, S.C., is the type of industrious man whose initiative and ability developed this Nation and made America the greatest power on earth. He is a splendid example of our free enterprise system.

Recently the News and Courier—one of South Carolina's distinguished newspapers—carried an article relating some of the more humorous aspects of the housemoving profession. It is an excel-

lent article, and I would like to add my high regard for this quiet, unpretentious gentleman. Among his many, many friends in the Charleston area, he is respected and loved for his high integrity, his capable ability, his unswerving devotion to his fellowman, and his community and Nation:

BE SURE TO GET THE RIGHT HOUSE

(By Charlotte Walker)

Every profession has its error potential, but while a lawyer's mistakes go to jail, and the architects—in time—are covered with ivy, a housemover's loom as big as—as big as a house. And don't suppose a mover of houses doesn't have his off days, even as you or I.

The firm of L. A. Chitwood, Jr., has been occupied in housemoving for many years. Actually, this is only a small part of the firm's operation. Transport of heavy equipment for industry and the Government account for the greater part of the firm's revenue. Housemoving, though, captures the imagination.

Mr. Chitwood's experiences in this field—and they range from moving the 750-ton Flynn Hall at the University of South Carolina and Marshlands Plantation house, largest single unit ever to be put aboard a barge in this region, to small dwellings—leave one convinced that fact is infinitely funnier than fiction.

No small contributing factor to the listener's enjoyment of Mr. Chitwood's tales, is the personality of the man himself: a charming blend of audacity, philosophy, and commonsense coupled with a sense of security that is unusual in our time. He has never experienced business competition and—as one of his employees explained, "As long as people go on building things where they shouldn't have, there'll be plenty to keep us busy."

To illustrate this: Some years ago a rich, would-be client asked Mr. Chitwood to move her house from the corner of a large lot to the center. It wasn't much of a house and moving it would have been no problem. But Mr. Chitwood, after studying the project, declined the job.

"Look, ma'am, you don't like the house where it is. Can't say I blame you. Trouble is, you wouldn't like it wherever you put it."

So the client, instead of moving the house, tore it down and built a new one which she could well afford to do. Fortunately, Mr. Chitwood also could afford to be independent.

On another occasion two brothers, who had lived in adjoining houses all their adult lives, quarreled. One decided to have his house moved to another location some miles away. Naturally, they called Mr. Chitwood. Also naturally, Mr. Chitwood quickly sized up the situation.

"If you move there's a good chance you'll go on feuding for the rest of your lives," he told them. "Better you should stay right where you are until you both come to your senses."

The most important concern of the housemover in addition to moving the right house, that is—is the smoothness of the operation. A sudden movement sufficient to cause a vase to fall from the mantel might also cause a crack in the plaster.

This was demonstrated on the occasion when a house had to be moved to make room for a new highway.

The aged lady whose house it was, refused to budge from her home. Her daughter pleaded, but mama remained adamant. She'd come to that house as a bride, she said, and if the house collapsed, she'd just collapse with it.

While a distraught daughter pleaded with her strong-minded parent, Mr. Chitwood stepped outside. A short time later the daughter emerged in tears, apparently convinced that her mother was doomed. To her obvious amazement, she noticed that the great oak, which for generations had been on the right of the piazza, was located now on the left. When she rallied from this further jolt to her serenity, Mr. Chitwood explained that the moving had been going on all the time she'd been inside.

Although Mr. Chitwood has moved many a house since his first modest project to the Marshlands Plantation house—he is unable to recall the exact number—one house he never will forget.

It all happened years ago when Charleston's suburban development was in its infancy. Mr. Chitwood was retained to move a house bought by the client, to a newly landscaped lot in another area. So, full of enthusiasm one morning, Mr. Chitwood and his merry men sallied forth to pick up (literally) a house. This was accomplished without so much as fluttering the red and white striped dish cloth that hung in the kitchen window. In due course they deposited the house on the client's landscaped lot.

Just as the project was completed, the client drove up.

"What do you think of it?" Mr. Chitwood asked, pardonably proud of completing the project with such dispatch.

The client studied the house for a few minutes; walked around it and joined the still-beaming Mr. Chitwood. "I think it looks just fine," the client admitted, "but if you leave it there, just where do you expect to put my house?"

When Mr. Chitwood rallied from this materialization of a house-mover's nightmare, he did the only thing any right-thinking house mover would do. He had the pipes and wiring disconnected, replaced the house on the trailer, and sped away to return it to its rightful owner. Fortunately it hadn't been missed, and Mr. Chitwood and his crew and technicians restored the house to its foundations. When the job was completed, he wearily waved the crew away and waited, in his car, for the occupants to appear.

When the owners—a young working couple—returned home Mr. Chitwood explained what had happened during their absence, and apologized. Their amazement came as no surprise to Mr. Chitwood, and he waited while they, in turn, walked around the house and studied the situation.

Then the woman gave Mr. Chitwood one long, lingering look and went indoors. The husband returned to where Mr. Chitwood waited and asked, solicitously, how he felt.

Mr. Chitwood allowed he felt fine.

The other did not even attempt to conceal his skepticism.

"Look man, what's the sense in coming to me with a yarn like that?" he demanded in effect. "Any fool can see that this house hasn't been moved since the day it was built."

It was a delicate situation, but Mr. Chitwood eventually did convince the other that his house had been moved. In the meantime it was all very embarrassing.

It's one thing to explain that you've picked up another man's hat or umbrella by mistake, but walking off with another man's house—to say nothing of driving it all over the countryside—well, that's something else again.

Mr. Chitwood has never been in such a position since—except in dreams.

And when that happens, he wakes up screaming.

A Descent to Political Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to the following significant editorial which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times of September 14 concerning the proper role of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense in the political campaign:

A DESCENT TO POLITICAL LEVEL

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee, and the Pentagon keep busy these days denying charges made by Senator Barry Goldwater.

It is regrettable that Rusk, custodian of what is left of a bipartisan foreign policy, concluded it necessary to follow the Democratic Party line in refuting a Goldwater accusation that the Kennedy administration took action in the Cuban missile crisis "at a time that would have maximum domestic impact" in the 1962 congressional elections.

The Goldwater accusation was of a type which probably can be neither proved nor disproved. The Secretary, party to the secret conferences and decisions incident to that crisis, certainly was well within his rights in defending his integrity and that of the late President John F. Kennedy by denying the charge. But to bring in the now overworked allegation of a "lack of basic understanding" on the part of GOLDWATER was to descend to the political level; a level from which a Secretary of State should remain aloof. Anti-intellectualism is a curse. But so is intellectual snobbery.

GOLDWATER may have contributed to wrecking the bipartisan foreign policy. But a Secretary of State who engages in political bickering presides at its interment.

Rusk's ironic assurances that "the Democratic National Committee has not made arrangements with Indonesia to drop parachutists into Malaysia, or made arrangements with the rebels to occupy Stanleyville in the Congo" are in the same pattern.

That he would be especially sensitive to criticism is understandable. During his secretaryship the North Atlantic Treaty alliance has fallen into disarray, U.S. policy in the Congo, implemented through the United Nations, has been disastrous, European allies, asked to boycott Fidel Castro's Cuba, have boycotted our Cuban policy instead, Laos has all but gone Communist as a consequence of our agreement to its supposed neutralization and America's prestige abroad has sunk so low that a government in Zanzibar drives our diplomatic representatives out at pistol point and mobs in Panama attack the Canal Zone. Meanwhile, we contributed vastly in money to Sukarno's buildup which now enables the Indonesian dictator "to drop parachutists into Malaysia" even as we contributed vastly in money to drive Moise Tshombe out of Ktanga. Now, Tshombe having returned as Prime Minister of all the Congo we become solicitous over his loss of Stanleyville to other rebels.

These things can be recounted without suggesting Rusk has been solely responsible for them.

Many factors have to be taken into consideration. Some of them were and still are beyond our control. Others were not and are not. But if there is any "lack of basic understanding" it is not wholly confined to Senator GOLDWATER.

The Secretary indicates an awareness of the Democratic National Committee. It might not be amiss for him to leave political bickering up to that agency. He has sufficient to do if he is to reeestablish some semblance of purpose and effectiveness to our badly fractured foreign policy.

The same observation applies to the Pentagon. It is continually leaping into the political fray with denials of this or that Goldwater charge directed against it. If it had earlier responded to the Vietcong in South Vietnam with the same avidity as it now responds to Senator GOLDWATER (not the Pentagon's favorite major general in the Air Force Reserves) that unhappy dilemma might be resolved. The Pentagon is peculiarly sensitive to Goldwater barbs. It quickly issues denials, having noted, perhaps, the political effectivness of the missile gap charges (subsequently disproved) made by Kennedy when he was a presidential aspirant in 1960. Although the Pentagon is as quick in responding to GOLDWATER as GOLDWATER is said to be on the trigger, it should be conceded that it hasn't incorporated political insinuations in its denials.

State and Defense are two agencies which should remain wholly aloof from political campaigns.

If the President believes attacks directed against them are worthy of response, he, as the candidate and as the head of his party, should reply to them himself or have someone other than the State and Defense Departments do it for him.

Senator FULBRIGHT is eager to break into print. He has replied to GOLDWATER on foreign policy three times in recent weeks. He has the party line of intellectual snobbery for all with whom he disagrees down pat.

State and Defense don't belong in politics and shouldn't be compromised by engaging in anything resembling politics.

B. Brian Murphy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Longview Daily News, September 9, 1964, in connection with the late Brian Murphy, of Hughes Springs. Brian was a great, good, and outstanding man and citizen:

B. BRIAN MURPHY

Hughes Springs and east Texas have lost a distinguished citizen in the untimely passing of B. Brian Murphy. A man in prime usefulness to his community and to his State and the Nation at age 50, he succumbed to a heart attack Saturday night and was buried Tuesday following services at the First Methodist Church and graveside rites conducted by the American Legion.

Mr. Murphy was a man of ability. But of perhaps more significance, he was a man of courage and dedication and determination and the will to stick to a task until he had accomplished it or made good at it. As a business and civic leader, as a veteran of the Armed Forces, as a churchman, and organization leader, he was prominent in his community and region.

In many ways and on numerous occasions, Brian Murphy brought public attention and honor to his city and area. He was State historian of the American Legion, and a former commander of the Hughes Springs post of the Legion. He was active in the Hughes Springs Lions Club and had served in several district posts with Lions International.

He was executive secretary of the Hughes Springs Chamber of Commerce, operator of the Hughes Springs Credit Bureau, judge of the Hughes Springs Corporation Court, Democratic chairman for Cass County, and was manager of a housing rental authority.

This writer had known Brian Murphy for many years. He was news correspondent for the Longview newspapers in Hughes Springs for a number of years and had served these newspapers in this capacity on more than one appointment. He was an energetic and trustworthy newsman who showed concern for his fellow man and a keen interest in all of the worthwhile affairs of his community and area. He was a friendly and helpful man.

Here was a man who chose to serve out his too brief life in the city and community he loved. He served in many capacities, came into contact with both ordinary citizens and leaders in many walks of life, but in it all was sincere and understanding and willing to be of service He will be missed by many, this writer included.

All of us, family and friends alike, are conscious of the fact he made a continuing and worthwhile contribution to many areas of progress and to the economic well-being of east Texas. This is the accepted role of the good citizen, and Brian Murphy filled it with distinction and honor to himself and his community.—CARL L. ESTES.

NASDVA Man of the Year Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it was a source of considerable pride and pleasure for me to learn that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], had been selected for the Man of the Year Award by the National Association of State Directors of Veterans' Affairs.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement which was made at the time this well-merited award was given to the gentleman from Texas:

NASDVA MAN OF THE YEAR AWARD

Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE will receive the first NASDVA Man of the Year Award.

The award will be presented at the NASDVA Convention in St. Petersburg. Congressman TEAGUE. will speak at the presentation.

"No man has achieved more in behalf of veterans than Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE. His work spans more than a single year. It covers his entire public career," Pete Wheeler, Georgia, chairman of the selections committee said in announcing the award winner. Other members of the selection committee are Robert G. Hansen, Minnesota, and C. S. Collier, Jr., West Virginia.

The NASDVA man of the year is chairman of the U.S. House Veterans' Affairs Committee. He has held this chairmanship since the beginning of the 84th Congress. He is the author of more veterans legislation than any other man who has ever served in the Congress of the United States.

From College Station, Tex., Congressman TEAGUE arrived in Washington in 1946, a battle scarred and much decorated combat veteran. He had himself spent 2 years in an Army hospital recovering from severe injuries suffered while leading a battalion of infantrymen from Utah Beach to the Rhine River.

He introduced a bill as a freshman which became the War Orphans Act. He's still improving that act. Only this year, the War Orphans Act was extended to provide educational assistance to children of veterans totally and permanently disabled.

This first bill reflects his legislative philosophy of demanding first priority for the widows and orphans of comrades felled, or severely injured in combat. After caring for these, Congressman TEAGUE's philosophy gives disabled veterans the next priority rating, followed by hospital benefits, and pensions.

The boyhood nickname, "Tiger" aptly stuck in the Halls of Congress, as Congressman TEAGUE fought the battle of veterans' benefits.

Some of his successful legislative fights:

All recent bills granting major increases in disability and death compensation, including special bills allocating increased benefits to the blinded and other seriously disabled, and measures extending the presumptive period for granting service connection for certain diseases.

Bills permitting widows of veterans of World War II and Korea to receive benefits on the same basis as widows of World War I veterans.

The codification of all veterans law, now title 38, United States Code.

The bill permitting the Veterans' Administration to make direct loans to veterans in small and rural towns where private mortgage money for homes was not available.

The long-range improvement of the VA hospital system.

He was chairman of the special committee which corrected the fly-by-night, get-rich-quick school operators who duped GI's. He directed another select committee which dealt the fatal blow to the dishonest building contractors who bilked veteran homebuyers of money.

On three occasions his firmness blocked attempts to curtail the VA medical budget.

The Korean GI bill was largely Congressman TEAGUE's work, particularly those sections of the bill which corrected inadequacies of the World War II GI bill.

With this record, the "Tiger" has not grown fat and lazy. He is the author of H.R. 8009, a bill already passed by the House and awaiting Senate action. This bill, most significant new veterans' program in years, would provide nursing care for elderly veterans.

"This outstanding record makes Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE man of the year for many years. It is most proper that he should be the first recipient of the NASDVA award," Mr. Wheeler said.

No Mention of Faith in God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel of Tuesday, September 8, 1964:

BREAD ALONE?

Before the 1964 national party platforms are buried under the avalanche of campaign oratory just getting underway, a comparison of their religiousness is in order.

The Republican platform takes note of God and the Nation's heritage of religious faith. The Democratic platform makes no reference to God or religion.

DEMOCRATS DON'T MENTION FAITH

About the only religious note to be found in the Democratic platform is in the sentence, "Peace should be the first concern of all governments as it is the prayer of all men." The Democratic platform does mention faith, but in relation to freedom, not in a religious sense. It talks of "unity of spirit" in a civil sense. It omits mention of religion in its plank on "ending discrimination based on race, age, sex or national origin * * *" although it does allude to it in pledging "equal opportunity and equal treatment for all Americans regardless of race, creed, color or national origin."

The Republican platform sounds a religious note in its first sentence: "Humanity is tormented once again by an age-old issue—is man to live in dignity and freedom under God or be enslaved—are men in Government to serve, or are they to master, their fellow men?"

Prophetic of the nonreligious character of the Democratic platform, the Republican document, drawn a month and a half ahead of the opposition's platform, has this to say:

"Much of today's moral decline and drift—much of the prevailing preoccupation with physical and material comforts of life—much of today's crass political appeals to the appetites of the citizenry—can be traced to a leadership grown demagogic and materialistic through indifference to national ideals founded in devoutly held religious faith. The Republican Party seeks not to renounce this heritage of faith and high purpose; rather, we are determined to reaffirm and reapply it."

GOP ENDORSES PRAYER IN SCHOOL

On the issue of separation of church and state, made controversial by Supreme Court school prayer rulings, the Democratic platform is silent. The Republican platform pledges "support of a constitutional amendment permitting those individuals and groups who choose to do so to exercise their religion freely in public places, provided religious exercises are not prepared or prescribed by the State or political subdivision thereof and no person's participation therein is coerced, thus preserving the traditional separation of church and state."

The Republican platform closes on a religious note: "We Republicans, with the help of Almighty God, will keep those who would bury America aware that this Nation has the strength and also the will to defend its every interest."

Communism is branded as "atheistic" by the Republican platform, but not by the 1964 Democratic platform, which differs also from the 1960 Democratic platform in this respect.

In fact, the 1964 Democratic document is in marked contrast with the 1960 Democratic platform, which said: "But man does not live by bread alone. A new Democratic administration, like its predecessors, will once again look beyond material goals to the spiritual meaning of American society."

U.S. RELIGIOUS HERITAGE IGNORED

In its lengthy "accounting of stewardship," in which the 1964 platform itemizes how the Kennedy-Johnson administration has lived up to the 1960 pledges, no mention was made of how it measured up in fulfilling the "spiritual meaning" pledge. Whether the 1964 Democratic platform was drafted godless deliberately or inadvertently we wouldn't know. Either way, the omission is bad. It fails to recognize America's religious heritage. It neglects to acknowledge that God—not just Democratic leadership—helped get us through the last 4 years.

Worst of all, it suggests that we are to be led into the promised land of the great society without divine guidance. But as atheistic communism proves, it can't be done.

Without spiritual greatness, there can be no material greatness. It is disturbing that the Democratic platform, unlike the Republican platform, virtually ignores religion.

A Do-Something Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune in its September 6, 1964, edition published an editorial entitled "A Do-Something Congress." The article rightly points out the accomplishments of this Congress. It is a fitting tribute to a Congress that has received more than its share of unjust attacks.

Under unanimous consent, the editorial follows:

A DO-SOMETHING CONGRESS

The 88th Congress, which started out pretending to be molasses in January, is winding up in a burst of activity which is phenomenal. Loyal Democrats declare it is the most productive Congress in generations, and they may be right.

Some of this, undoubtedly, reflects the adroit arm-twisting talents of that master politician and accommodationist, Lyndon B. Johnson.

But there is more to it than that. There is the element of the "getting this country moving again" theme proposed by the late John F. Kennedy, and, in our view, Congress has accurately reflected the consensus of the American people in passing as much landmark legislation as it has.

According to available economic analyses, the tax cut measure is proving more successful than its most ardent supporters dared hope, in stimulating the economy.

The test ban treaty was the first, and most significant, official easing of tension in the cold war, and has given rise to hopes that other steps can be taken.

Passage of the wilderness bill and the land and water conservation fund bill give assurance of more attention to, and assistance for, the outdoor needs of generations of Americans yet to come.

The war on poverty bill gives rise to hopes that a true and massive assault on the causes of much of the Nation's poverty can be isolated and, if not cured, at least ameliorated.

The civil rights bill ends a century of virtual inaction in putting into effect the mandate of the Constitution that all men are entitled to the equal protection of the laws.

The education bill, which extends and broadens the National Defense Education Act, and gives assistance to impacted areas, is a long step toward improving both the quality and the quantity of education available to our young people.

The foreign aid bill this year passed almost intact, and despite the objections raised by Senator MORSE and others, gives rise to the renewed belief that sensibly administered foreign aid is one of our best defenses against the encroachments of communism, as well as offering decent help to nations not yet able to go it alone.

The Federal pay raise bill gives recognition to the fact that our civil service and military are workers worthy of their hire, and will make it easier to find, and equally important to keep, topflight people in responsible jobs in Government.

The mass transportation bill, while unpopular in many places, is a recognition that our cities are strangling to death in a flood of automobiles, and lack the resources to do the necessary job unassisted.

An increase in social security, so desperately needed by many older people, will be passed, possibly with some medical care provision, before Congress adjourns.

An omnibus housing bill has given further proof of the Government's concern for the housing and living standards of the people, no matter what their own resources.

These are the major accomplishments of Congress, and it adds up to an exceedingly impressive list.

Many things—important things—remain to be done. But the tenor of Congress this past year gives rise to hopes that they will be done in the foreseeable future.

Notable among these are a revamping of congressional procedures, themselves, which often frustrate the expressed desires of the majority, and a provision for Presidential succession when there is no Vice President. Action on the latter is, probably, much more likely than on the former, for many powerful Members have a vested interest in the present congressional power structure.

This session also has been notable for some of the things they have refused to do.

High on this list is the cooling off given the proposed Becker amendment, and many other similar ones, which would have put local school districts in the business of telling their students when and how to pray—something that is emphatically not the business of the government.

And a group of Senate diehards have thus far succeeded in fending off an ill-considered proposal to strip the Supreme Court of its authority to interpret the U.S. Constitution in matters pertaining to State legislative apportionment. Whether they can continue to do so remains problematical. Let us wish them all possible success.

All in all, Congress this year need make no apologies nor excuses.

Some of the measures fully merit the use of the word "landmark," for they will provide important benefits for the people of America for years to come. Others, while important, are more extensions of present trends and policies than they are breaking ground in new areas.

One can decry "big government," but the fact is, that it takes a big government to provide the services that 192 million people need and cannot provide for themselves.

The Congress has made giant strides in improving these services this year.—E. A.

Los Alamos, New Mexico's Latest Contribution to the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, on August 28 a power test of the nuclear rocket reactor Kiwi B–4A was conducted at the

Nuclear Rocket Development Station, Nev., by the University of California Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. The test, which was a successful one, is the culmination of seven previous tests—first begun in 1959. The Kiwi project has had as its basic objective the development of basic graphite nuclear rocket technology. With the completion of the Kiwi project, Los Alamos will be directing its future nuclear rocket efforts to development of advanced, higher power, graphite reactor technology under the project name, Phoebus.

The industrial team of Aerojet-General Corp. and the Westinghouse Astronuclear Laboratory are continuing development of the reactor series which is being adapted from the Kiwi reactor for application to the Nerva nuclear rocket engine.

The nuclear rocket program—designated Project Rover—is a joint Atomic Energy Commission-National Aeronautics and Space Administration program administered by the Space Nuclear Propulsion Office.

In a great sense the groundwork for nuclear space propulsion has been laid through the success of the Kiwi project. We are on the brink of witnessing a great event—the beginnings of the nuclear space age. We might even compare the success of the Kiwi project in the space age with the combustible engine and its profound effect on the motorcar industry.

It is altogether fitting that this revolutionary accomplishment in the space age took place in Los Alamos—the Kitty Hawk of the nuclear age. And the birthplace of the atomic bomb.

The early story of Los Alamos is one of the most remarkable of all time: the creation of a secret community, the assembling of the cream of this Nation's scientific manpower, and, less than 3 years after the first controlled nuclear chain reaction, the design, construction, and explosion of an atomic bomb, which hastened the end of World War II and heralded the dawn of a new era.

Yet, Los Alamos is more than a Kitty Hawk, more than a dramatic episode experienced directly by some of you here and to be experienced by future generations through the pages of history. Los Alamos is not only a creature of and a creator of the nuclear age, but also a pioneer in the continuing development of atomic energy to meet the ever more stringent demands of military security and the new requirements of the space age. True, Los Alamos is now only one of a number of Atomic Energy Commission installations, and the Government shares the responsibility for nuclear development with private firms and research institutions. Nevertheless, the contribution of Los Alamos has continued to be a unique and vital one.

It was decided after World War II that the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory should be kept as a permanent research center primarily concerned with the development of atomic weapons but also engaging in basic nuclear research. Although many of the original personnel left with the ending of the war, by 1947 the problem of scientific manpower had begun to be solved and the construction of more permanent facilities was in progress. Clementine was a familiar name in Los Alamos about this time. This fast, plutonium fuel reactor was succeeded in the mid 1950's by the Omega west reactor. Another research reactor, SUPO, the Los Alamos water boiler, had its startup in 1950, and during the late 1950's work was done on aqueous homogeneous reactors.

The atomic weapon activities of Los Alamos have been guarded by strict security. It is only through nuclear testing that the public has become aware of the advances being made in this area. On March 1, 1954, as part of Operation Castle, the first hydrogen bomb was exploded, and the United States became the possessor of a superweapon whose destructive power is beyond the scope of our human comprehension. The role of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory in developing this fusion bomb was recognized on July 8, 1954, when President Eisenhower awarded a special citation to the laboratory.

Los Alamos' contribution to the development of atomic energy is probably best shown by a glance at several of its present activities. Together with Sandia Corp. and the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Livermore, Los Alamos continues to have responsibility for the development of nuclear weapons required for our national security. Thus, the 1964 completion of the new Phermex electron accelerator and supporting facilities is just one more step in the development of an advanced weapons arsenal. The Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory is also participating with the Department of Defense in the Vela surface-based detectors program directed to detecting these explosions through instrumented satellites. Satellites instrumented by the Atomic Energy Commission have already been orbited by the Atlas Agena and have functioned successfully.

But Los Alamos' role in the space age is not limited to this military program as we have seen with the research and development involved with the Kiwi project.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD some rather pertinent remarks about the Kiwi project by the editor of Missiles and Rockets:

But last month's test marked more than a milestone in the program. It demonstrated what a determined and capable design team can accomplish in the face of setbacks in research and development.

The years beyond—when automated and manned spacecraft are landing on Mars, when man pushes further into space in the search for life outside this planet—will owe a debt to the determined group who carried out their own search in the western desert into the troubles of the Kiwi project—B–4A.

These are but a few of the programs at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. Just what is the contribution of this laboratory to New Mexico and the Nation? Its benefits are immeasurable. It has brought to New Mexico a community of more than 13,000 persons and the Atomic Energy Commission, partly because of Los Alamos, in fiscal year 1963 incurred more costs in this State than in any other. Yet the $93 million operating costs of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory and the $184 million invested in it are no measure of its contribution to our economy and daily living. The contribution of Los Alamos is one of technological strength, strength essential to our military security, our world leadership, and the preservation of the peace. And its promise is of continued security and leadership in a still newer era, the space age.

Medical Care for Those Over 65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most penetrating analyses that I have yet heard on the subject of medical care under social security was presented in an editorial over KGBX radio on September 11, 1964. With a decision on this issue fast approaching I commend this editorial to my colleagues' attention:

MEDICAL CARE FOR THOSE OVER 65

Of all the grand and glorious schemes to part us from our take-home pay, the administration's medicare plan is probably most cruel. Most everyone we have talked with, including a great number of people over 65, are wondering what medicare would do to our social security system. Now that the Senate has passed a medicare proposal, the House of Representatives will be considering it.

By 1970, we will have over 20 million people over 65 years of age. The vast majority of them will enter retirement after 20 to 25 years of regular employment at rising levels of pay. Thus, there is every reason to expect that the income positions of the people will progressively be higher—and likewise, their ability to afford health insurance will improve in the years ahead. In 1952, America had over 8½ million people that weren't covered with some type of health insurance. By 1962, that figure was down to 1.9 million—a drop in uninsured of almost 7 million people.

Under the medicare proposal the Government is saying to each of us, "You aren't smart enough to take care of your own health needs. You don't even have the ability to spend wisely the money we propose to collect for health care. Therefore, your all-wise Government will spend that money for you and provide you with medical care and services—but no cash."

Such a plan would help destroy the independence of those over 65, because the Government would be paying for services for them. Under our social security system, cash is paid out to each person covered and each person decides how and where and when he wants to spend the cash he receives.

Another extremely important point in comparing medicare and social security is this: If a person has substantial job earnings or self-employment income, he is considered capable of self-support and, it can be presumed, that he does not need social security benefits. The social security program contains a work test that measures an individual's eligibility for social security benefits against his earnings throughout the year. Every medicare proposal, however, discards the work test and declares that health care benefits should be paid "as a matter of right" even though the benefits may be paid out to a millionaire. Why should you and I help pay the medical expenses of any mil-

lionaire? That's socialism of the worst order.

Nobody knows how expensive medicare might be or how many times the Government would have to raise the amount they take out of your paycheck to keep such a medicare program going.

Please don't misunderstand us. The issue is not whether one is for or against health and medical care for the aged. There is no dispute over the goal that everyone, regardless of age, who needs and seeks medical care should receive it regardless of the ability to pay. But the basic issue is this: What is the best way to finance medical care cost without damaging our present voluntary system of health and medical care?

Congress faces a monumental decision. The financing of health care through compulsory social security taxes would become an irrevocable decision, for by the time the success or failure of such a program could be accurately evaluated, it would be so deeply embedded in the Nation's political system, economic structure and medical framework that reversal would be impossible. Fourteen million retired people, 4 million widows and children, and more than 62 million people presently working, and their families, look to social security for certain types of protection. Who can say that attaching medicare to social security might not destroy the entire system?

KGBX believes Missouri should join the 39 other States that have already implemented the Kerr-Mills plan that, since 1960, started providing a broad plan of medical assistance for elderly people who need help. Let those who can afford to pay for their own health care, pay it, and reject the socialistic medicare scheme, thus preserving our social security system; and our voluntary system of health care. That's the American way.

DON C. DAILEY,
General Manager, KGBX.

Hon. Carl Vinson, of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished dean of the House of Representatives, my colleague, CARL VINSON, of Georgia, has received many honors in his day.

Of particular interest to thousands of his friends and admirers is the following story of August 19, by Frank Eleazer, an outstanding journalist and fellow Georgian.

Under leave I insert this story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

(By Frank Eleazer)

WASHINGTON, August 19.—For "Vinson College" this was the last homecoming, graduation, senior prom, and annual picnic, all rolled into one. Everybody made jokes and laughed extra loud. This was so nobody would cry.

Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, 80, dean of the House and for 30 years chairman, autocrat, and headmaster of its Armed Services and predecessor Naval Affairs Committees, is leaving Congress at the end of this session after a record half-century's service.

There may be another minor cleanup committee meeting or two but for practical purposes the entire student body knew that after today's session school was out, and this time for good.

Today's class was set for 11 a.m. in the big, ornate, red-carpeted hearing room where Uncle CARL through the years has gaveled his legislative lessons into the heads of scores of lesser lawmakers, one of whom, a bright pupil named Lyndon B. Johnson, went on to be President of the United States.

The stated agenda was a group photograph, and VINSON gaveled his noisy charges sternly to order. He pocketed his nose-riding spectacles and assumed a solemn aspect. Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, at his right, put on his glasses and smiled. While a dozen photos were taken other committee members traded gibes and said "cheese."

When all this was done, RIVERS reached across VINSON and picked up his gavel. He banged it experimentally a couple of times. If Democrats retain control of Congress this fall RIVERS will succeed VINSON as chairman next year.

"Since we are living in the days of coups," he told VINSON, "it's just as well for me to take this gavel now so I can get accustomed to it."

"Mr. Chairman, you are leaving us," RIVERS began, and members squirmed in their seats. "This brings about a certain nostalgia," he went on, and there was evident fear around the U-shaped committee dais he might inadvertently get mawkish about it.

"You have been accused of lots of things, rightly or wrongly," RIVERS went on, and the members relaxed, "and I think more rightly than wrongly."

He touched only lightly on these accusations, because everybody already knew what they were. VINSON has been fondly labeled a tyrant, an emperor, a jehu, a monarch, a caliph, and even a lifetime tobacco-chewer with ridiculously inadequate aim. Furthermore, he never has denied it was so.

"You have done one thing," RIVERS conceded. "You have sown in the hearts of the members of this committee seeds of love and affection that have grown and matured and will last as long as the sun and as life itself. We will never forget our association with you."

Then he pounded the gavel and ordered staffers to bring out a "small token" for VINSON. Laboriously they lugged in and placed on the witness table a box about the size of a desk. RIVERS directed VINSON to open it up.

With his pocket knife Uncle CARL slit the top. He pulled out the padding and discovered a smaller box. This too he opened. Another box was inside. This one was for real. In it was a shining gobboon and a note:

"This isn't it, but you can put it next to what it is."

What it really was was a color TV, to be delivered later to VINSON'S farm at Milledgeville, Ga., along with the spittoon which by then will have been suitably engraved with names of all the current roster of members.

To keep the laughs coming Representative CHARLES S. GUBSER, Republican, of California, said he would insist his name go into the brass as "GRUBSER," as "in joke" referring to VINSON'S faculty for calling unruly students (like GUBSER) by names not quite their own.

Already engraved, for later installation on the top of the television, was a brass plaque praising VINSON for his "50 years of outstanding leadership and dedication to the Nation."

VINSON said the TV was just what he would need down on the farm. "It will enable me in the days to come to tune in and see if you are carrying out your duties like I have taught you to do," he said, playing his role to the end.

As for the spittoon, he admitted that would be handy too. It will enable him finally to get rid of the galvanized water bucket he normally carries from room to room at his Milledgeville house.

That seemed to be about it. But RIVERS, who had secretly ordered a lunch of cold cuts and shrimp served in the committee room, directed the members to stay. VINSON commended RIVERS' vigorous style. He said MENDEL definitely seemed to be learning the job.

The First Anniversary of Malaysia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on September 16 the Federation of Malaysia celebrates the first anniversary of its independent existence, and we wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Majesty, the Yang di-Pertuan Agong; His Excellency, Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman; and His Excellency, the Malaysian Ambassador to the United States, Dato Ong Yoke Lin.

The Federation of Malaysia, consisting of the former federation of Malaya and the British territories of Singapore, North Borneo, and Sarawak, was joyously proclaimed 1 year ago on September 16, 1963. The idea of a new state in southeast Asia, called Malaysia, was first proposed by Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman in the month of May 1961. The proposal was well received by the British Government which gave it its full support and encouragement from the very start.

There was opposition to the creation of Malaysia by the Communist countries of the world. They attacked it as a sinister attempt of the West to perpetuate its special form of colonialism in southeast Asia. In Indonesia, President Sukarno also began to speak out against Malaysia calling it a dangerous threat to his country of almost 100 million people.

During the following year, a serious crisis developed between Indonesia and those who were planning the new state of Malaysia. Several attempts to settle the dispute by negotiation and compromise failed in their main purpose. President Sukarno's government announced that it was adopting a policy of "confrontation" toward Malaysia and that the ultimate aim of this policy was to crush the new state.

In spite of the intense opposition by Indonesia and the major Communist powers, the Soviet Union and China, the Federation of Malaysia was finally proclaimed on September 16, 1963. In this country the formation of the new state was hailed as an encouraging and significant event. The U.S. Government announced that it welcomed Malaysia and that it looked forward to "close and cordial relations between our two nations."

However, regional tension was greatly intensified immediately following the formal proclamation of Malaysia. In-

donesia did not extend diplomatic recognition to the new state and even went so far as to cut off its trade with Malaysia. The situation has steadily deteriorated during the last year. In Djakarta, President Sukarno still calls for a policy of confrontation against Malaysia and the Indonesian Government has been actively supporting the guerrilla movement in the Borneo territories of Malaysia.

The United States has not been as deeply involved in the dispute between Indonesia and Malaysia as it has been in others. Attorney General Robert Kennedy did make a trip to southeast Asia in January of this year to try to mediate the dispute. And the U.S. Government has tried to check President Sukarno's aggressiveness by refusing to consider new foreign aid programs for Indonesia. But, for the most part, the United States has deferred to Great Britain as the principal Western power involved.

As the people of the new state of Malaysia celebrate their first anniversary on September 16, we in the United States also honor these democratic and freedom-loving people. Their courage in these days of tension, their progressive attitude and stanch stand against communism assure the continued close and amicable support of the American people. I am confident that there will be a long and friendly relationship between our two countries.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Arthur Hoppe has made some very pertinent observations, first on the convention and, secondly, on the Virginians who are running for Congress in California and New York.

These columns were published in the San Francisco Chronicle on August 30 and 31:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Aug. 30, 1964]

STUFF THE DELEGATIONS—EN ROUTE TO WASHINGTON

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Now that the conventions are over, it is time to build for the future. And what I'm building for the future is an all-purpose stuffed delegate.

For, as anyone who's been in Atlantic City all week can tell you, the only official duties of an official delegate in these days of television are three: It must make noise, it must wave placards, and it must, above all, help fill the empty seats. The vision of a speaker addressing empty, unlistening seats is the nightmare of all convention managers. Which is really why we have delegates. Who don't listen either.

So delegates are desperately needed. But, obviously, a neat, cheaply constructed, all-purpose, stuffed delegate could perform these three functions far more efficiently and economically than fallible human delegates. The party will save millions; those in control of the convention will be assured an enthusiastically harmonious vote on all motions; and it's doubtful anyone but cab drivers and bartenders will note the difference.

Best of all, this will save untold wear and tear on the frail human delegates who now must devote 4 long days to performing these arduous mechanical chores. And who hate every minute of it.

It probably isn't generally known that human delegates despise conventions, but all you have to do is talk to them. Their reservations are fouled up, they can't see or hear from their seats, every party they crash is overcrowded, they can't get a cab, a table, or a girl, they despise whatever city they are convened in, and their hotel room is not only miles from anything, but it is a direct insult.

Indeed, at the recent festivities in Atlantic City, the California delegation was quartered at the Ambassador, which might be described as a stately old hotel. If it were more stately. And prizes were finally offered to the delegates with the most heartrendering tales of woe, most of which involved doorknobs falling off, thereby locking people in bathrooms. First prize was a week in Atlantic City. Second prize was 2 weeks in Atlantic City.

But you can't blame delegates for being grumpy. Here they've taken a week off from work and spent hundreds of dollars in some place they can't abide, being constantly pushed and shoved around, in order to perform three simple mechanical functions for the television cameras an all-purpose, stuffed delegate could handle much, much better.

Yes, there 's no doubt the human delegate is on his way out. At long last, thanks to our fast-advancing technology, man will soon be relieved of the dreary burden of suffering through boring, tawdry, artificially staged political conventions in the flesh.

Yet it's odd, but the few delegates I've approached with the idea have been strangely unenthusiastic about being saved. Frankly, I'm beginning to suspect they're already looking forward to attending the next boring, tawdry, artificially staged convention. And, come to think of it, so am I.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Aug. 31, 1964]

TODAY VIRGINIA—TOMORROW THE WORLD

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—The reason I stopped off in Washington was to visit historic Virginia, known far and wide as the Mother of Presidents. Only I think they now ought to change their slogan to "The Home of the Washington Senators."

For Virginia, as you know, is the home of Mr. PIERRE SALINGER, who was such an upstanding resident of Virginia that he was recently appointed U.S. Senator in Washington. From California.

This, of course, started a trend. "If good old Portly PIERRE can be a Senator," said his fellow Virginian, Mr. Bobby Kennedy, "I guess I can be a Senator, too."

But, unlike Mr. SALINGER, Mr. Kennedy was handicapped by not being a registered voter in Virginia. So he couldn't run for Senator in California. No, he's a registered voter in Massachusetts. So naturally he's running for Senator in New York, which is our second largest State.

While numerous Californians and New Yorkers have expressed their opinions of this trend, no one has thought to find out what Virginians think. And to remedy the oversight, I cornered an eminent Virginian, Col. Jefferson T. Stonewall, on the portico of his ante bellum mansion.

"It's appalling, son," cried the Colonel, shaking his cane angrily. "These carpetbaggers have no right running for Senator in such faraway places as California and New York."

Carpetbaggers? "That's right, son," he said. "They weren't even born here in Virginia. Yankee carpetbaggers, that's what they are. And it's a terrible thing, these Yankee carpetbaggers going around the country posing as true Virginians."

Terrible for whom? "For true Virginians. Why, it's getting so there's hardly a respectable State left for a bona fide Virginia gentleman to run for Senator."

Deplorable. "Yes. In order to put a stop to it, we had a meeting of true Virginia gentlemen at the Robert E. Lee Hunt Club. It was most successful. We drew lots for the 47 States which are left. However, I announced publicly afterward that I regretted I had no ambition to be U.S. Senator from Illinois."

Commendable modesty, I said. "Well, frankly, I prefer a smaller State. So I swapped Illinois to my neighbor, Colonel Beauregard. Yes, shake hands with the next Senator from Utah. And should you pass through the capital of Boise, do tell them that as a true Virginian I shall always have the interests of my loyal Utah constituents at heart. Or is it Amarillo?"

Well, I think Colonel Stonewall will make a fine Senator from Utah. He won't get embroiled in petty local issues (not being familiar with any), he won't be beholden to local political bosses (not knowing a soul), and he won't give long-winded speeches on the scenic beauties of glorious Utah (never having seen the place).

Now all that bothers me is why should California and New York have to settle for less?

Yom Kippur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it would be well for the world if every one of us would dwell on the purpose of the Jewish observance of Yom Kippur, taking stock, on this solemn occasion, of how far we have fallen short of our proper goals and of our solemn intentions—of how much we have done that we should not have done, and of how much that we should have done we have left undone. By the physical sacrifice of fasting, and of long prayers, the Jewish people on this occasion symbolize their repentance for past failures, and their intention to do better in the future. The spiritual meaning of the ceremonies and prayers of the day is concentrated in the passage from Isaiah, always read in the synagogue services on Yom Kippur:

Is not this the fast that I have chosen? To loose the fetters of wickedness, to undo the bands of the yoke, and to let the oppress go free. * * * Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry and that thou bring the homeless to thy house? When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him and that thou hide not thyself from thy fellow man. Then shall thy light break forth as the morning * * * and thy righteousness shall go before thee.

On this occasion of repentance, of mourning for the dead, and of preparation for the joys and achievements of the new year, my prayers are with my

Jewish friends, and I am happy to feel that I too may be remembered in their prayer and worship.

Needed Change in Self-Employed Retirement Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that appeared in the Journal of Commerce of Tuesday, June 30, 1964:

KEOGH ACT STUDIED BY ACTUARIES

PORTLAND, OREG., June 29.—Liberalization of the 50-percent rule of the Keogh Act would result in much wider use of Keogh-type pension plans, an actuarial panel reviewing the act was told here.

Any liberalization of the rule would give many more employees the protection of a funded retirement program, the panel, conducted by the Society of Actuaries, was informed by Angus L. Crawford, of San Francisco, a consulting actuary.

Mr. Crawford stated that the most important feature of the act (H.R. 10) and a major deterrent to those who wish to set up Keogh-type retirement plans is that only 50 percent of the contribution made by a self-employed person is deductible in the year it was made, in contrast to the fact that contributions made on behalf of employees, either under a self-employed plan or a corporate plan, are fully deductible.

"The self-employed seem to be very much aware of their responsibility of providing retirement benefits for their employees," he said, "and the fact that the law requires this before the self-employed individual may participate does not seem to be the major stumbling block that the 50-percent limit on deduction is."

The San Francisco actuary noted that the early experience of the California Medical Association plan showed that single doctors and two-doctor partnerships mainly enrolled in the 2 weeks available during 1963. In many cases, he said, there were up to three covered employees for one participating physician.

ORIENTATION NOTED

The panel, the last of three regional discussions on the subject conducted by the Society of Actuaries, was told by another speaker, Elmer R. Benedict, second vice president of the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., that the H.R. 10 law and regulations seem oriented to the "money purchase formula."

With this in mind, he said, life companies have developed flexible contracts, riders or split funding procedures because the fixed benefit formula may not be suitable in all instances.

The Hancock executive noted that under the fixed benefit approach in the typical situation where the owner-employee is older than his common law employee or employees, a smaller proportion of the total contribution would be contributed on behalf of the common law employee than under the money purchase approach.

According to Mr. Benedict, at least three life companies have had fixed benefit formulas approved by the U.S. Treasury. But, he added, the Treasury may impose restrictions resulting in less difference between the fixed benefit and money purchase approaches.

TWO CATEGORIES

The moderator of the panel, Daniel F. McGinn, associate actuary, Occidental Life Insurance Co., said H.R. 10 business falls into two basic types. These he described as:

1. The large professional association programs, which will be handled either by group annuities on a split-funding basis; through a self-administered trust fund; or through a master trust using individual policies with a "side fund."

2. The small employer programs, which probably can be most effectively funded by individual policies.

A session on employee benefit plans heard Leslie A. Cannon, actuary of the Great-West Life Assurance Co., Winnipeg, reviewed government pension plans in Canada.

The Canadian actuary said that the Canadian Old Age Security Act fails to take into account differences in the cost of living in various parts of the country, and all major political parties have made preelection promises to add a "second deck" of pension benefits in the form of a contributory earnings—related pension plans.

Many important details have yet to be made public, he added.

Mr. Cannon also said that contributions to the plan will probably commence in January of 1966, but the starting date could conceivably be advanced to July 1, 1965.

The existing Old Age Security Act in Canada is expected to be amended to provide for payment of reduced amounts after age 65, without a retirement test, he said.

Why Lyndon Johnson Must Be Elected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest editorials that has come to my attention in recent years is one which appeared in the September 19 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. So far as I have been able to determine this is the first time since its establishment in 1728 that this distinguished and influential magazine has ever endorsed a Democratic candidate for the office of President of the United States. The Post states unequivocally that its traditions and inclinations notwithstanding, it has cast its eyes over the qualifications and the record of the Republican Presidential candidate and found him dangerously wanting. The editorial speaks for itself in forceful terms—in disappointment in the choice of the Republican Party's Presidential candidate and in applauding the accomplishments of President Johnson. I commend the editorial to all American citizens concerned with giving America sound leadership:

WHY LYNDON JOHNSON MUST BE ELECTED

A healthy, vigorous two-party system is absolutely indispensable to the survival of American democracy. Its proper functioning requires each of the major parties to put forth a man who is unmistakably and unquestionably qualified to be trusted with the incalculably grave and terrible powers of the Presidency.

In the presidential election of 1964, the two-party system has been seriously endangered. One of the great parties, the Democratic, has fulfilled its duty by putting forth a man, Lyndon B. Johnson, who has many flaws and leaves much to be desired, but who is unquestionably as well qualified to be President as any tried and tested leader the Democratic Party now affords.

The other great party, the Republican, has shirked and betrayed its duty by putting forth a man, BARRY GOLDWATER, who is manifestly unqualified to be President and whose unsuitability for this awesome responsibility becomes clearer with every passing day and with every feckless word he utters.

The two-party system has thus been endangered because this misfeasance on the part of the Republican Party has left the enlightened, the rational, the prudent, the responsible American voter no acceptable other choice in this election. He is not even given the option of an echo. He is given only the option of a question mark, of a man who is seemingly congenitally unable to say what he means or even know what he says, to say anything clearly or to hold the same conviction 2 days in a row. BARRY GOLDWATER's tongue is like quicksilver; his mind is like quicksand.

The Post therefore urges the election of Lyndon B. Johnson as President.

It urges, even more strongly, the defeat of BARRY GOLDWATER.

We are confident that Johnson will make a good President because he already is a good President. In the 10 brief months he has held the highest office, he has shown an ability unmatched in this century to bring all the diverse and warring factions of Congress behind the enactment of positive, progressive, and needful legislature programs. In his greatest test as Commander in Chief—the attack on our Navy in the Gulf of Tonkin—he has acted with both the forcefulness and restraint which is required in the man who alone controls the ultimate weapon and bears all the fearful responsibility which that entails.

We are equally confident that GOLDWATER would not make a good President. He has not even made a good Senator. He has been in the Senate 11 years and not one piece of memorable legislation attaches to his name. He has been in its councils through the most momentous and revolutionary decade in the history of this Republic as we have strained every seam and fabric of our traditional habits and thinking to keep abreast of an age when all the supposed boundaries of man's environment are being broken, gravity defied, space penetrated, the moon reached, the riddle of the human cell being unraveled. Merely to understand, much less to master, this surge and change, heavy with unguessed new treasures of technology to increase man's wealth, has required and will require government entry into areas never before imagined. But BARRY GOLDWATER has managed to live through this whole tremendous epoch with his face turned squarely to the past, his eyes closed, and his mind preoccupied with one—and only one—idea: somehow to shrink the Government back into the familiar and comfortably small proportions of his Arizona youth. BARRY GOLDWATER has left no mark in the Senate because, as he has truthfully declared, he sought to erase marks rather than to make them: "I have little interest in streamlining government or in making it more efficient, for I mean to reduce its size. I do not undertake to promote welfare, for I propose to extend freedom. My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them. It is not to inauguarate new programs, but to cancel old ones." He is like the Cincinnati kettlemaker who, when first hearing of Kentucky ironmaker William Kelly's use of air to make steel, exclaimed, "I want my iron made in the old way or not at all."

His mind is surely not in phase with today's world.

GOLDWATER changes his "convictions" almost as often as his shirt. One day he is for abolishing social security, the next day for strengthening it, one day for giving field commanders control over nuclear weapons, the next day for restricting control to the NATO supreme commander. Many of his statements are inherently contradictory nonsense—e.g., to cut all Government expenditures, while expanding defense (which already takes more than half of every tax dollar spent)—like advertising a car that is bigger on the inside but smaller on the outside. Some of his statements, if they have any meaning at all, are rather frightening in the subconscious thoughts which seem to lie behind them, particularly those concerning his strange love affair with German prowess: "With all due respect to American military leaders, Germany would have won both World Wars if she had not been badly led." "I think it was the Germans who originated the modern concept of peace through strength." This last remark prompted Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of Foreign Affairs, to ask the New York Times to clarify whether it was Hitler's or the Kaiser's "peace through strength" that GOLDWATER had in mind. However, it is always possible that he really had nothing in mind, as when he told reporters who briefly boarded his cruising Sundance, "I've thought for some time that talks with the Red Chinese might be profitable." He later radioed ashore that what he really meant was that the United States should be ready to threaten the Chinese, telling them that "if they didn't stop, then you would blow up a bridge or show some other sort of force." He finally cleared everything up by adding, "I'm not really recommending this, but it might not be an impossible idea."

GOLDWATER is a grotesque burlesque of the conservative he pretends to be. He is a wild man, a stray, an unprincipled and ruthless political jujitsu artist like Joe McCarthy, whose last-ditch defender he remained even when three-fourths of the Senate had voted to condemn their Red-hunting colleague. He still defends McCarthy, well knowing that he imputed treason to General Marshall and to President Eisenhower. He will not condemn the John Birch Society, though knowing that its leader, Robert Welch, has called Eisenhower a Cominunist agent. Yet, in order to get Eisenhower's vacuous blessing, GOLDWATER was capable of a tongue-in-cheek erasure of his infamous "extremism" slogan, a statement that was not written in haste but with extreme care, and gone over time and again by GOLDWATER before he uttered it. These words can, and should, forever symbolize the total fraudulence of his claim to be a true conservative: "Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice, and * * * moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue." That statement deserves to be the "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion" of this election, and BARRY GOLDWATER deserves to be defeated for it alone, no matter how much he tries to clown it away. He knew what he meant by it, and so does every John Birch fanatic and Ku Klux vigilante.

For the good of the Republican Party, which his candidacy disgraces, we hope that GOLDWATER is crushingly defeated. It was clear, from poll after poll, that the rank and file of Republican voters overwhelmingly preferred other leaders to GOLDWATER. It was equally clear that the fanatical Goldwater bias of a majority of convention delegates revealed the capture of the Republican Party by a new breed of so-called leaders whose selection had been steamrolled by extremist, well-heeled types. The men who have most deserved to lead the Republican Party, by virtue of their long, distinguished, and responsible service in it, and to the country, have been made to feel unwelcome, hissed, and hated in it, as they were repudiated by it. A crushing defeat for GOLDWATER will drive the fanatic saboteurs of the Republican Party back into the woodwork whence they came. It will provide the opportunity for the party's true leaders to build anew from the wreckage that these heedless, reckless, ill-mannered, and arrogant men are sure to leave. Then the two-party system can be restored, and the voter will again have a choice, not a calamity.

My Talks With the Presidential Giants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, this week I forwarded to the newspapers in my congressional district an article written by me on the subject of my talks with the presidential giants—Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson. It has occurred to me that this article might be of general interest to some people outside my congressional district and accordingly I am now inserting it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article is as follows:

The Washington skyline along the Potomac River is dominated by three memorials erected to presidential giants who led our Nation in other years. These memorials are for Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson.

But what a mockery that we cease to follow their counsel in these times. Memorials are for memories. Yet we remember only their names, not their precepts.

I go out to the long shadow of Washington's tapering spire that reaches 555 feet toward the clouds. "General," I say to his imagined presence, "You wrapped us in swaddling clothes and gave us a healthy start. Now look. We number over 180 million and our stars have grown from 13 to 50. Do you have any comment?"

"Why yes, Congressman, I do. You must recall that I once gave a farewell address in which I told the people to beware of entangling foreign alliances. But, among other entanglements, our country has been engaged in some kind of a Vietnam conflict for the past 10 years. This has already cost $3 billion and hundreds of American casualties. Vietnam is nearly 7,000 miles away. It is very foreign and we are very much entangled. We must be off our rocker to do such things." The General fades away with heavy sorrow and I move on over to the Lincoln Memorial hard by the Potomac.

Mr. Lincoln is lonely and brooding sitting there in his large chair. Knowing he came from Kentucky soil and the plain people of his time, I am not backward about accosting his spirit that seems to be neither earthbound nor tonguetied. "Well, Emancipator, it must be a great feeling to know that you preserved the Union and took your place among our country's immortals."

He replies, "You said a mouthful about preserving the Union, but have you forgotten about my statement calling on Americans not to violate the laws, to have full reverence always for law and order, never to redress any grievance by mob action? Yet riots this year in Harlem, Philadelphia, Rochester, and other places have cost 5 lives, nearly 1,000 injuries, and more than $6 million in property damages. And these terrible acts have been done by some of the very people for whom I gave my life." So spoke the Great Emancipator and I have never seen such sadness and disappointment in a human face. And now I cross the Tidal Basin to find out what is on the mind of Thomas Jefferson.

And right there stands Mr. Jefferson, a fine figure of a man, if I ever saw one. "Hello, Mr. Jefferson," I greet the founder of the Democratic Party, "it must be quite a satisfaction to you to realize you started the very political party that now controls the White House, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. Have you any misgivings about the whole business in this election year of 1964?"

"Well, Congressman SILER, you are a Republican from the mountains of Kentucky. But you and many others have often quoted me as saying that the Government that governs the least governs the best. I believe it then and still believe it now. Yet right here are the plain figures—more than 2 million people are working for the Federal Government; it has more bureaus than ever before; it is meddling in more things, clear out to the heads of the hollows, than ever in history; it has a Federal budget of $98 billion that is never in balance; it has a Federal debt of more than $300 billion that no one plans to reduce. Do you think I could sleep if I were still living at Monticello? Why, I would be taking 10 aspirins daily and 2 tranquilizers every night. Congressman, you are a Republican and I am a Democrat. But we see many things very much alike. If you were running this year, I think I would vote for you. And, if I were running, I think you would vote for me."

"Of course, Mr. Jefferson, you bet your boots I would. But not for bigger, bigger, bigger government."

Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, America's great trio. While we hail them, we do not heed them. And that is a very poor memorial indeed.

Challenge—Not Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed with the article "Challenge—Not Compromise" by the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover which appeared in the September issue of the New Age. Because Mr. Hoover's words are so true, and because the solution to the problems he discusses lies within the ability of each one of us to reach, I feel that this article should be required reading for all who have an opportunity to see it:

CHALLENGE—NOT COMPROMISE

(By J. Edgar Hoover, 33°)

This is a generation of great challenge. Through no choice of our own we are in the world at a time when deadly forces challenge the right of every American to live in freedom under God.

Young people in postwar America have grown up with the disillusioning knowledge that the world is no longer safe for democracy.

We are at war with communism, in different ways on different fronts around the world. The Communist ideology is born in hate, but our philosophy of life is the practice of love and faith.

Just as freedom is our right, so challenge is our heritage—for freedom, once won, must constantly be defended.

AMERICA'S LIFELINE

Today, our country faces the most severe test ever to confront a free people. Here and abroad, mortal enemies of freedom and deniers of God Himself conspire to undermine the fundamental forces which are the lifeline of our country's vitality and greatness—our most formidable weapons, in peace and in war.

What are these forces? They are:

Faith: faith in a supreme being: God, the author of liberty.

Individualism: inherent dignity and worth of every sovereign individual with his personal rights and responsibilities.

Courage: the courage of a free people firmly dedicated to the noblest cause.

Integrity: that quality of trustworthiness which is essential in dealings between men and between countries.

Discipline: and self-discipline, which are vital in a nation governed by laws rather than by men.

Vision: such as led our Founding Fathers into the perilous dangers of a hostile wilderness that was to become the proud American Republic in which we live today.

These are America's great bulwarks. They are under savage attack today, just as they were so severely tested nearly 200 years ago at Bunker Hill and at Valley Forge.

Daniel Webster, that brilliant early American statesman, eloquently declared, "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it."

Daniel Webster knew the heavy price America had paid for her liberty. And he knew also the disintegrating effect of self-indulgence, neglect of duty and public lethargy in a nation of free men.

These lethal influences are at work, constantly undermining the sense of personal responsibility and self-disicpline so essential to our Nation's welfare. They form a common denominator with the aggressive enemies of our Republic in assaulting the cause of decency and justice across the length and breadth of the land.

WHO ARE OUR ENEMIES?

Who are these enemies of our Republic? They are the crime syndicates, the narcotics peddlers, the labor racketeers, the unscrupulous businessmen, the corrupt politicians and all others who blatantly defy the laws of the land.

They are the hatemongers and the false liberals who would subvert our Constitution and undermine our democratic processes in furtherance of their selfish ends.

They are the Communists and other subversive elements who wave false banners of legitimacy and patriotism while relentlessly plotting to destroy our heritage of freedom.

Today, the Communists are engaged in an intensive campaign to control the minds and win the allegiance of American youth. Toward this end, a National Youth Commission has been established within the Communist Party, USA; special publications have been issued; front groups have been organized, and an ambitious speech program has been directed against our colleges and universities.

During the past 2 years, Communist spokesmen have appeared on nearly 100 campuses from coast to coast. Their purpose: to create confusion, raise questions and spread doubt among our young people concerning the American way of life.

It is indeed ironic that Communist Party speakers—whose minds and thoughts and actions are in no manner free—should demand the opportunity to parot the Moscow line to young Americans under the guise of academic freedom.

FREEDOM IS NOT LICENSE

Academic freedom is not an instrument for the perpetuation of conspiratorial ideologies. Nor is it an agent of self-destruction—a freedom to destroy freedom. As a free flowing channel of truth and knowledge, academic freedom is not obligated to carry along the silted tributaries of lies and distortions of known Communists.

The Communists look upon students as potential sympathizers, supporters, and contributors to the party's cause. Nor are they unmindful of the rich opportunity for infiltration presented by unwary racial and nationality groups.

COMMUNISTS EXPLOIT CIVIL RIGHTS

This is especially true of the intense civil rights movement within the United States. America's 20 million Negroes and the countless other citizens who share their objectives in the current struggle are a priority target for Communist propaganda and exploitation. Every organization engaged in this struggle must constantly remain alert to this vital fact, for, once under Communist domination, all freedoms and rights are lost.

Make no mistake about the Communists in this country. Whether they are members of Soviet-bloc diplomatic establishments in New York and Washington, or whether they are fanatical adherents of the Communist Party, U.S.A., all represent the same ideology of treachery, deceit, and subversion.

From the immunity which they enjoy as foreign diplomats on American soil, Soviet and satellite officials continue to carry out espionage assignments against the United States. That some American citizens, including concealed adherents to the Communist Party, have knowingly and willingly assisted these Iron Curtain intelligence networks is a criminal disgrace and a blight not only upon our Nation, but upon the entire free world. And it is equally disgraceful that well-meaning but uninformed citizens have permitted themselves to be duped by sympathy campaigns on behalf of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, Morton Sobell, and other traitors.

WORLD CONQUEST IS GOAL

Nowhere is the hope for peace more sincere than in the hearts of all true Americans. But in our quest for peace we must never lose sight of the well-documented fact that every Red leader from Marx and Engels through Khrushchev, Mao, and the American Communist spokesman, Gus Hall, is dedicated to an ideology which upholds world conquest as its ultimate goal.

The Communists have never deviated from this objective. Despite the high-pressure campaign they have mounted behind Khrushchev's phrase of "peaceful coexistence," the Communists know that this is simply a propaganda slogan, devised to further their own ends by stirring the hopes and emotions of those who seek an end to the turmoil, fear, and sorrow that world communism itself created.

Actions continue to speak louder than words, and certainly the Communists have shown no indication of a sincere quest for peace.

The takeover of Cuba and the effort to make it an island fortress against democracy; the ever-constant infiltration of Red Fascists into countries of Central and South America to create a Sovietized Latin America; the increase of espionage activities by Soviet and satellite agents in our country, particularly those who strive to penetrate our Government processes from the protection afforded them by diplomatic assignments in New York and Washington; the frantic efforts of the Communist Party, U.S.A., to subvert our youth; and the intense drive of the Communists operating from concealed positions to wrest control of the movement for Negro rights—does all this indicate a real and sincere desire to live in peaceful coexistence?

In recent years, the Communists have demonstrated an attitude of open defiance and contempt for our laws—an attitude which is fortified by their repeated ability to invoke loopholes, technicalities, and delays in the law to thwart justice. One former judge found cause to warn last summer not only of inexcusable delays in the court, but also of what he considered to be a "trend of decisions in the last 10 years * * * favorable to extreme leftwingers, Communists, and subversives in general."

Another student of court rulings in the internal security field was prompted to observe, "Unfortunately, subversive activities are well on the way to becoming a no man's land in the law."

In 1957, a Federal judge in the Nation's Capital assailed what he considered to be "an unfortunate trend of judicial decisions * * * which strain and stretch to give the guilty, not the same, but vastly more protection than the law-abiding citizen." There has been no reversal of this alarming trend—a trend which is felt in our steadily rising national crime problem.

CRIME UP 40 PERCENT

Since 1957, when the Federal judge issued his warning, crime has increased nearly 40 percent. Its victims continue to mount at a relentless rate. Four serious crimes are committed every minute; there is a crime of violence every 3 minutes; and property crimes—robberies, burglaries, larcenies, and automobile thefts—occur within seconds.

Americans, in growing numbers, are developing a dangerously indulgent attitude toward crime, filth, and corruption. No one can deny that motion pictures are deliberately and defiantly pursuing an increasingly bold courtship with obscenity. No one can deny the role of the television industry in bringing lurid portrayals of violence and sadism into the living rooms—and even the nurseries—of our homes. No one can deny that sensual trash is moving closer and closer to the children's books on the shelves of our newsstands and magazine stores.

Our youth do not need weakness, they need strength. They do not need indulgence, they need the guidance and the discipline which can best be provided by a decent home.

Despite the dedicated efforts of church and civic leaders and others who have a sincere interest in the proper development of our young people, the failures continue to mount. Each year, persons under 18 years of age are involved in nearly two-thirds of the arrests for automobile thefts, and approximately one-half of the burglary and larceny arrests. The newspapers of our major cities recount incidents of senseless murders, violent assaults, and brutal beatings inflicted upon innocent victims by arrogant gangs of teenagers and young adults.

Courts are influenced too much by the age—rather than the record—of the young hoodlum who stands before the bar of justice.

The bleeding hearts, some actually sworn to administer the law either as judges or social workers, are so concerned for young criminals and terrorists that they are indifferent to the rights of law-abiding members of society.

We have mollycoddled young criminals, lightly tapped hardened offenders on the wrists, and released some unreformed and unrepentant hoodlums to prey anew on society.

The time is long overdue for us to adopt a more realistic attitude toward this critical problem. We have tried the charitable approach toward young hoodlums and it has failed.

The crime problem costs the American people some $22 billion a year—nine times the amount contributed to our churches. For

every $1 spent on educating our children, $1.11 goes to crime.

TODAY'S NEEDS

Nowhere in recent months have our people faced a more explosive condition of shame and violence than among the hatemongers, the moral degenerates, the lunatic fringe, and the other irrational fanatics who preach a doctrine of hostility toward their fellow man. This rabble has sown the dragons' teeth of malice and intimidation; and from the ground has sprung a series of hate-driven riots, bombings, and desecrations.

The voices of temperance, logic, and decency must speak out more effectively and make their influence felt. No problem is so acute, no crisis so severe, that terrorism can be tolerated in a society of free men. Hate, terror, lawlessness are not the American way of accomplishing any objective that is truly worthwhile. In meeting the tense crises which confront the United States in this nuclear age, we must look to God for guidance and inspiration.

CHALLENGE, NOT COMPROMISE

This country has never run from its enemies. Challenge, not compromise—bravery, not cowardice—are integral parts of our heritage. Since that critical hour in 1777 when General Washington ordered his Revolutionary Army to "Put none but Americans on guard tonight," it has been the tradition of our proud Nation to rise to its greatest heights in the face of adversity.

There are important lessons to be learned in the pages of American history. From Faneuil Hall to Cape Kennedy, our greatest patriots have been men and women of deep religious conviction; men like Thomas Jefferson, the principal author of our Declaration of Independence, who told his fellow colonists, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time."

In the eyes of a latter-day hero, "Freedom, devotion to God and country are not things of the past. They will never become old fashioned." These words were spoken by Astronaut John H. Glenn.

America remains free because men of faith, men of individualism, men of courage, men of integrity, men of discipline, and men of vision have patrolled her most vital outposts for 188 years.

These strong qualities—faith, individualism, courage, integrity, discipline, and vision—are the keys to freedom. Let us protect and defend the real meaning of America. This is the debt we owe to the brave legions of the past who laid down their lives to safeguard the great truths which guide our destiny today.

Address of Justice Walter B. Hamlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, each year in New Orleans on September 14, the descendants of those gallant men who drove the carpetbaggers from Louisiana in 1874 gather to commemorate the memory of their illustrious predecessors.

The ceremony each year is held at what is known as Liberty Place on Canal Street within a stone's throw of the great Mississippi River and the historical Customhouse, which, according to legend, is built on cotton bales. On the monument are inscribed the names of those who fell in the battle, and each year they are read aloud to a hushed audience whose silent prayers are offered as a salute to these men who laid down their lives for the principle of self-government and self-determination within the sovereign State. A wreath is placed at the monument by patriotic organizations and representatives of the Liberty Place Monument Advisory Commission, which is composed of descendants of those who participated in the battle.

Following the public ceremony the commissioners attend a banquet which is addressed by an outstanding citizen of the community. This year the address was made by Justice Walter B. Hamlin of the Louisiana State Supreme Court, and recognized as one of the finest and most authoritative historians in Louisiana. The depth of Justice Hamlin's research is reflected in each address he makes. His address on September 14 this year presents some very interesting facts, which become very important and more interesting in the light of the times in which we live and the crisis which we face.

I commend to you Justice Hamlin's address:

ADDRESS OF JUSTICE WALTER B. HAMLIN, SEPTEMBER 14, 1964, AT BANQUET, ANTOINE'S, COMMEMORATING THE BATTLE OF SEPTEMBER 14, 1874

Mr. Toastmaster and gentlemen, I desire to thank you again for the honor of addressing you. When Mr. Carriers telephoned requesting me to make this address, I checked my notes which were made by me back in 1952, and the impact of the newspaper articles which I am about to discuss with you, if great at that time, in my opinion is much greater today, as you will realize as we go along.

Back in 1952, through the kindness of Admiral De La Houssaye, I had the extreme pleasure, and I might add that it was coupled with excitement, of going through the history of events leading up to the conflict as compiled from articles in the newspapers of that day.

Time will not allow me to go into them thoroughly, but I would like to bring before you some of the events which sparked the actual shooting. And what struck me in 1952 was that there was a great deal of similarity between the tenor of the news articles of 1874 and those of 1952, and, as a matter of fact, those of today.

As an instance, the New Orleans Bulletin of Wednesday, September 9, 1874, carried a news article under the headlines "Seizure of Arms: Kellogg Confiscates Private Property."

It seems that about 4 p.m. of September 8, two officers arrested a furniture wagon and occupants. The wagon was said to be loaded with guns. The wagon and all parties then repaired to the central police station, where the guns were delivered to the property clerk.

Later in the day the property clerk was served with a writ of sequestration, under the authority of which the constable of the first justice of the peace of the city of New Orleans was to take possession of 24 muskets with bayonets, known as Prussian muskets, and 1,000 cartridges containing a charge of powder and a conical leaden ball, sworn to be the property of Armand Guyol, and in the illegal possession of Gen. A. S. Badger and A. Pecora.

This writ was signed by First Justice of the Peace W. T. Houston, who was later to become the first judge of division B of the civil district court when that court was created under the provisions of the Constitution of 1879. What is so interesting to me is that I was one of the successors in office to Judge Houston.

General Badger, who was served with the writ, refused to comply.

Meantime, there had been an unusual increase in the police force at headquarters, men having been withdrawn from their beats. Why these preparations were made was a mystery.

Quoting from the New Orleans Bulletin (Sept. 9, 1874):

"One of the most bold and cowardly outrages ever perpetrated on the American people by any set of hirelings, was effected yesterday afternoon on Canal Street. Under orders from those higher in authority, the police seized, under an order from a police magistrate, several cases of guns belonging to private parties, on the alleged ground that these weapons were to be used for riotous purposes.

"Without heeding even the common proprieties, the coward Kellogg insists on thus trampling the people of this city in the dust. The Constitution of the United States with its guarantees that her citizens shall always enjoy the right to bear arms, is laughed at, and the usurper, by a tinkle of his little bell, orders, as would Robespierre or Danton, the seizure of a citizen's property simply because his craven heart fears they will be used against him. Both guillotined in 1794.

"This outrage will have the effect exactly contrary to that expected. Mr. Kellogg need not think that the capture of a few private arms will serve to silence the opposition to his hated government. The time has arrived for our people to appreciate the fact that their honor, manhood and liberty is at stake. If we quietly submit to a slavery like that in store for us through the dastardly acts of those supporting the de facto, we sincerely trust the heel of oppression will bear harder upon us."

A rule for contempt was issued against General Badger and Mr. Pecora, but there were writs in their favor granted by a court known as the superior court (an especially created carpetbag court) and the property was, to all intents and purposes, confiscated.

On September 11th the store of Mr. Oliver was entered and robbed in broad daylight by 10 metropolitan police, on authority of a trumped up warrant for a charge of assault and battery. They carried off 3 cases containing guns, and about 12 kegs of ammunition, before they could be prevented by the crowd which rapidly assembled. And to quote again from the New Orleans Bulletin:

"Having secured their booty they marched off with the same to Kellogg's fence, the first precinct station."

Further:

"It is very evident that he desires to precipitate a conflict between the people and his hired Hessians, and that nothing would please him better than to see the streets of New Orleans run with blood."

Still further:

"At the time of the seizure Kellogg, accompanied by Judge Atocha, was coming out of the Custom House, when someone informed him of the fact. Kellogg said 'Did they take them before the whole crowd?' The answer was 'Yes, before the whole crowd.' Whereupon Mr. Kellogg, in a derisive manner, 'Ha, Ha'd' lustily."

There were further paragraphs which sounded warnings to the people to be on the alert, which led to the following call:

"Citizens of New Orleans:

"For nearly 2 years you have been the silent but indignant sufferers of outrage after outrage—heaped upon you by an usurping Government.

"One by one your dearest rights have been trampled upon, until, at last, in the supreme height of its insolence, this mockery of a Republican Government has dared even to deny you that right so solemnly guaranteed by the very Constitution of the United States, which, in article 2 of the amendments, de-

clares that 'the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.'

"In that same sacred instrument, to whose inviolate perpetuity our fathers pledged 'their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor,' it is also declared that even Congress shall make no law abridging 'the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.' It now remains for us to ascertain whether this right no longer remains to us.

"We, therefore, call upon you on Monday morning, the 14th day of September, 1874, to close your places of business, without a single exception, and at 11 o'clock a.m., to assemble at the Clay Statue, on Canal Street, and in tones loud enough to be heard throughout the length and breadth of the land, declare that you are of right, ought to be and mean to be, free."

This call bears the names of such illustrious men as Henry Renshaw, W. H. and Charles Chaffe, Schmidt & Ziegler, J. B. Camors & Co., J. B. Sinnott, John M. Parker.

At the same time a proclamation was issued by Lieutenant Governor Penn, calling upon the militia of the State, embracing all persons between the ages of 18 and 45 years (without regard to color or previous condition), to arm and assemble under their respective officers for the purpose of driving the usurpers from power. An order was also signed by Lieutenant Governor Penn, appointing Gen. Frederick N. Ogden as provisional general of the Louisiana State Militia.

Then the following proclamation was issued to the colored people of the State:

"In the great movement now on foot against the enormities of the rule of Kellogg's usurpation, rest assured that no harm is meant toward you, your property, or your rights.

"Pursue your usual avocations, and you will not be molested.

"We war against the thieves, plunderers, and spollators of the State, who are involving your race and ours in common ruin.

"The rights of the colored as well as of the white race we are determined to uphold and defend." (Signed by Lieutenant Governor Penn.)

The climax of the actual hostilities came with the following headline on September 15:

"The Battle Yesterday: The Citizen Soldiery, Attacked by Kellogg's Hessians, Put Them in Flight—Three Cannons Captured by the Citizens and a Large Number of Small Arms—General Badger, Superintendent of Metropolitan Police, Dangerously Wounded and Captured—Kellogg's Troops Retreat Under Shelter of Customhouse and Are Cooped Up in the Statehouse and at Jackson Square—The City an Armed Camp."

This about sums up what happened, in a few words. However, the body of the article is very enlightening:

"For some moments the firing of musketry and artillery was very brisk, amounting to a very respectable flight. But the metropolitans were soon thrown into disorder, and Badger being shot from his horse, which was killed, they fled incontinently leaving their commander desperately wounded on the field.

"The flight was most disgraceful, the men throwing down their guns, pulling off their hats and coats, and some of them actually jumping into the river to avoid the deadly missiles which by that time were decidedly numerous. In the flight citizens captured two Napoleon guns and one Gatlingun, with ammunition, besides some 75 or 100 stand of Winchester rifles.

"General Longstreet was seen for a few moments, but judiciously made himself scarce, disappearing in a most unaccountable and ungallant manner, when he heard the well-known yell of his old troops, many of whom were in the citizen soldiery that had so unexpectedly to him shown up to confront the Hessian soldiery of which he had demeaned himself so far as to take command. It is to be regretted that he did not show up more prominently instead of sending his lieutenant, Badger, where the balls were thickest.

"The men who fought under him in Virginia from Bull Run to Gettysburg, would have been pleased to have seen more of him."

We know the rest. It took 5 years before the citizens were able to freely hold their constitutional convention of 1879, which was the foundation for the constitution of 1898, and that of 1921, under which our State government operates. The only changes between the constitutions of 1879 and 1921 are those which apply to changes in the times. But the backbone of the constitutions of 1879, 1898, and 1921 is the labor of a people determined to be free, as I know we are so determined today.

Naval Shipyards Should Stay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of interest and concern that I commend to public attention a discerning article by William O. Foss in the September 1964 issue of "Our Navy," entitled: "Naval Shipyards and National Security."

As Mr. Foss so vividly points out, the primary objective of naval shipyards is to keep the active fleet in a constant state of readiness. Naval shipyards are an important part of the Nation's defense team—a peacetime insurance against the demands of emergency. Service to the fleet, rather than profit, is the objective of naval shipyards, and even Congress, which year after year approves of Government funds, has agreed that this is in keeping with our national defense policies.

That these yards have been such an integral part of our first line of defense is high tribute to the thousands of skilled naval shipyard workers throughout the country. Future policy with respect to public yards, with their hard-working employees and their vital skills, should be stated now, not deferred until after the election in November. The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and the public shipyards throughout the Nation should be reassured now that they are understood, appreciated, wanted and depended upon. The implications to the contrary from the Secretary of Defense are unfortunate and unnecessary.

The article follows:

NAVAL SHIPYARDS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(By William O. Foss)

"Stand by for collision."

Within seconds from the outcry of that chilling warning the aircraft carrier *Wasp* sliced into the destroyer minesweeper *Hobson*, and a peaceful night in the mid-Atlantic became a night of terror.

The smaller *Hobson* was sliced in two by the 32,000-ton carrier during high-speed maneuvers on the night of April 26, 1952.

Lost were 176 men of the *Hobson* crew. Sixty-one survived one of the worst peacetime sea disasters in the history of the U.S. Navy.

The *Wasp* was lucky. No lives were lost, but she was badly crippled with a huge gaping hole in her bow.

The tragedy was a serious blow to the readiness of the U.S. Fleet, which was then busy fighting the war in Korea, and keeping a sharp watch for trouble brewing in the western Pacific, the eastern Atlantic, and the Mediterranean.

Down by the head, her bow gone, and her anchor chain trailing 1,000 feet, the big *Wasp* limped into New York at slow speed.

But 11 days after she entered the drydock of the New York Naval Shipyard's annex in Bayonne, N.J., the *Wasp* was ready for sea again.

This was one of the most amazing major repairs to a capital ship in the U.S. naval history.

Within hours after the tragic collision, experts at the New York Naval Shipyard began their important task of repairing the stricken carrier.

Initial estimates were that it would require 5 weeks to 3 months to repair the damage.

That would be too long. The carrier was needed immediately for duty. Absence of the ship for an extended time would hamper the operations of the fleet.

Shipyard planners wasted no time.

While the *Wasp* moved cautiously into port, sometimes in reverse in order to protect the remaining structure, hull experts from the New York Naval Shipyard clambered aboard to inspect the damage. They had been rushed by destroyer and helicopter to meet the carrier.

The hull experts found a 30- by 50-foot bit gouged out of the *Wasp's* bow, with most of the damage below the waterline. Their findings were radioed to New York.

Yard repairmen, armed with torches scaled the carrier *Hornet*, undergoing reconversion in the Brooklyn yard. Her bow would be cut away to fit the section torn away from the *Wasp*.

The damaged *Wasp* entered the Bayonne annex drydock on May 8. On May 19, 11 days after shipyard repairmen had worked around the clock, the job was completed. The carrier was fit and ready for sea. A few weeks later the *Wasp* was on station with the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean.

This magnificent performance by the New York Naval Shipyard is but one example of many of the outstanding repair, overhaul, and shipbuilding jobs that are done by the Nation's 11 Government-operated naval shipyards. As an integral part of the Navy's Shore Establishment, these yards exist to provide optimum material and operational readiness support to the fleet. Or to put it plainly, as does the slogan of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard: "We keep them fit to fight."

But the naval shipyards are in troubled waters.

Many Americans, especially those in the private shipbuilding industry, but also including Members of Congress, want to curtail if not eliminate altogether the 11 shipyards now operated by the U.S. Navy.

The major arguments advanced by those who propose that all or most of our naval shipbuilding and repair work be accomplished by private shipyards are (1) that naval shipyards should not compete with private shipyards, and (2) that private shipyards can do naval shipwork cheaper than naval shipyards.

The Navy feels that naval shipyards are unique in the shipbuilding business, inasmuch as they are being used for but one purpose: To keep the fleet in full readiness at all times, and therefore the naval shipyards are an inseparable part of the Navy's operating forces. To tamper with this important defense structure would be tantamount to reducing the fighting efficiency of our forces afloat. This would indeed be a serious threat to our national security.

Navy officials aren't saying much in public about the plight of the naval shipyards. Their lips have been sealed by orders from Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, who has indicated that he is ready to close down several naval shipyards in the name of economy.

McNamara created an uproar last year when he let out the word that the naval shipyards in Boston, San Franicsco, and Philadelphia would be closed. The avalanche of protests over this proposal caused the Secretary to delay the deactivation move.

Instead he ordered Navy Secretary Paul H. Nitze to head a 15-man board to undertake a comprehensive study of the Nation's shipyard capacity and requirements.

The study, which is now being completed, takes in such matters as:

An analysis of present capacity of shipyards, both public and private, for the construction, overhaul, conversion, and repair of all types of vessels.

An analysis of workloads on a 5-year projection of shipbuilding, repair, and conversion programs.

Impacts of strategic and mobilization considerations on locations of shipyards and major bases.

An analysis of tenant activities and facilities supported by existing shipyards.

An analysis of yard operating costs.

The Nitze board study is supposed to update a shipyard survey made in 1962 for the Defense Department by the Chicago accounting firm of Arthur Anderson & Co. at the cost of $197,000. Results of the survey were kept under wraps until the summer of 1963.

The Anderson study showed that it costs more to build, repair, overhaul, and convert warships in the Navy's own yards than it does in yards of private industry.

The conclusions of the Anderson report were used by the private shipyard owners and especially their spokesman, Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, as ample proof that more, if not all, work done by the Government-owned yards should be turned over to the private shipyards.

On the basis of its study of construction costs of 24 ships, the Anderson firm concluded that 5 private shipyards built 14 of these ships at less cost to the Government than the comparable 10 ships built by 6 naval shipyards.

The Anderson study showed that private shipyards could build nuclear attack submarines at 15.2 percent less than Government yards; Polaris missile submarines at 20.3 percent less; frigates at 18.7 percent less, and conventionally powered aircraft carriers at 31.4 percent less than U.S. naval shipyards.

Conversion work of missile cruisers favor private shipyards by 8.3 percent, according to the Anderson survey.

Repair work, which the Anderson study limited to underwater hull overhauls, favored private shipyards by 10 percent.

These are fine arguments in favor of the private shipyards, but statistics can be used to prove just about anything you want them to prove.

One of the biggest problems of figuring cost of private shipyards versus naval shipyards is the matter of profit versus national security. Which is more important?

Private shipyards are motivated essentially by profits. They are in business to make money. They must weigh profit against loss and select only that work which will yield the greatest gain. In nearly every instance, the margin of profit will determine when, where, and how quickly ships can be returned to a state of readiness.

The primary objective of naval shipyards is to keep the active fleet in constant state of readiness. Naval shipyards are an important part of the Nation's defense team—a peacetime insurance against the demands of emergency. Service to the fleet, rather than profit, is the objective of naval shipyards, and even Congress, which year after year approves of Government funds, has agreed that this is in keeping with our national defense policies.

Most naval officers who have studied the subject concede that private shipbuilding costs are lower than those at naval shipyards, but they hold that the quality of the finished product at naval shipyards is generally as good as, and in some cases markedly better than, that of private yards.

The Anderson report shows that ships in the repair category were completed 3 days faster in naval shipyards than in private yards. Furthermore, in a sample of 175 ships, it was found that ships overhauled by naval shipyards operated 21.3 months before being overhauled again while those overhauled by private shipyards operated only 20.1 months. The difference of 1.1 percent in operating time means that the U.S. Navy would have to have at least two more ships in order to have an equal number available to the forces afloat.

The Navy can also point to the much better safety record of naval shipyards. Not only do naval shipyards make safety appliances, such as prescription safety glasses, available to all generally exposed personnel, at no cost to these employees, but it also enforces rigid safety standards, which adds to the cost of running efficient shipyards.

Also added to the cost of operating naval shipyards are the fringe benefits given the civilian shipyard workers. The Anderson study showed that the Navy was penalized an extra burden of 45 cents per productive hour in the cost comparison with private industry for fringe benefits. Such benefits include annual leave, sick leave, holidays, jury duty and military leave. These fringe benefits and other personnel measures available to naval shipyard workers were, of course, provided by congressional action.

On the other side of the coin, naval shipyard workers cannot strike against their employer, as is the right of workers in privately operated shipyards.

In recent weeks there have been several suggestions that some of these fringe benefits be curtailed, especially the amount of annual and sick leave given to civilian naval shipyard workers. One proposal would require naval civilian administrators to charge all sick leave of less than 3 days to annual leave. This move is aimed at preventing abuse of sick leave.

Private shipyard workers do not have the same job security as do naval shipyard employees. Private shipyards, for example, lay off employees when work dwindles but such layoffs of regular civil service employees are rare in Government shipyards.

Despite a number of chronic problems and an inadequate work volume, the private shipyard industry continues to rank as one of the Nation's major industrial enterprises. The biggest problem of the industry is that there are too many yards for not enough work.

Only 42 percent of the facilities of the Nation's private shipyards were utilized during 1963. This figure, released by the Shipbuilders Council of America, included facilities engaged in commercial shipwork as well as those employed in naval shipwork.

In sharp contrast, naval shipyards operated at 82.6 percent capacity.

Meanwhile, Congress has in recent years stipulated that "at least" 35 percent of the funds appropriated for naval ship repair, alteration and conversion work be spent in private shipyards.

In a letter to Defense Secretary McNamara, the Council's president, Edwin M. Hood, suggested that the work-hungry private shipyards could save the taxpayers money if more work were diverted from the high cost Government-owned naval shipyards.

Mr. Hood put it this way: "The number of people the private shipyards are capable of employing if more shipwork were available is greater than the total employment of the naval shipyards. Private yards are estimated to be able to efficiently employ 100,000 more people than presently; naval shipyard employment is now about 90,000."

This statement caused somewhat of a consternation among naval shipyard workers. William H. Ryan, president of District 44 of the International Association of Machinists, voiced his fears before the Senate Appropriations Committee:

"In other words, the Shipbuilders Council of America would discharge 90,000 naval shipyard employees, and the affiliates of the Shipbuilders Council of America would hire 100,000 employees to do the work that is being performed by 90,000 naval shipyard employees."

"The private shipyards have never recommended the closing of any naval shipyards," said the council in a just-issued "special report." "Such determinations are considered to be the proper prerogative of the Defense Department."

"However," continued the council's statement, "the private yards contend that operation of Government-owned shipyards in direct competition with more efficient, privately owned shipyards, not only is a waste of Federal funds, but also is a basic contradiction of the free enterprise system on which this Nation was founded."

So where does this leave the naval shipyards?

Those in the know don't expect Secretary of Defense McNamara to make a decision until after the national election in November.

Both McNamara and Navy Secretary Nitze have made inspection tours to several of the naval shipyards. They have also visited some private yards.

In view of McNamara's past insistence on cutting out wasteful bases from the Defense Establishment, there is no doubt there will be reductions and deactivation of naval shipyards.

Some observers believe that a 30-percent curtailment of naval shipyard operations can be expected to take effect in early 1965. President Johnson, who admires the economy stand of McNamara, will back his Defense Secretary to the hilt. And if Senator BARRY GOLDWATER should win the election, then there is no doubt that the private shipyard owners will have a champion in the White House.

McNamara has publicly declared that, "I think it is quite clear that we have excess capacity in our naval shipyards system today. * * * I anticipate that at some time in the next 12 months it will be necessary and desirable in the public interest to reduce the operations of those yards."

How do the sailors, the men who man the fighting ships built and repaired by the naval shipyards, fit into this very complex picture?

Sailors may look upon shipyard overhaul periods as necessary evils. Their home away from home is invaded with military and civilian workers of every type and description, ripping, cutting, welding, chipping, wiring, and generally their warship is one big mess.

But on the other hand, an availability period in a naval shipyard means time for liberty and a time to enjoy a brief period of family life.

Visits to naval shipyards become important to the peacetime Navy, which is now a married man's navy. About 75 percent of its officers and 39 percent of its enlisted men are married.

Most naval families live in the area where their husband's ships have their home port or home yard.

The naval shipyards, in addition to being repair yards, have such facilities as barracks, mess halls, chapels, medical, dental, recreation, and training facilities for service per-

sonnel. Navy families, living in the area, are entitled to many facilities, especially the commissary, medical, and dental facilities.

If naval shipyards are deactivated, it means that these facilities and services must be duplicated elsewhere at additional cost to the taxpayer. If they are not made available near naval bases, then the Navy can expect to see a substantial drop in its reenlistment rates.

The private shipyard industry makes much of the fact that the naval shipyards have combined assets that exceed by many times the combined assets of the entire private shipyard industry of the United States. Unlike the private shipyards, which are only concerned with making profits, naval shipyards for reason of national security must be fully equipped with modern technological and military plants.

The Pentagon decisionmakers have a big problem to solve:

If they give more Navy shipwork to private industry, will they bring about the complete destruction of the naval shipyard system?

If they cut off the naval shipyards, will they destroy the effectiveness, the efficiency, and the strength of a well-balanced dynamic fighting organization?

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abele, Homer E., *Ohio*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 4614 Reno Rd.
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Anderson, John B., *Ill.*
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N.J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baker, Irene B. (Mrs.), *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N.Y.* 3001 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Battin, James F., *Mont.* 217 Slade Run Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Becker, Frank J., *N.Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Beermann, Ralph F., *Nebr.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn.*
Bromwell, James E., *Iowa*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif.*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C.*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Bruce, Donald C., *Ind.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N.Y.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burkhalter, Everett G., *Calif.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah.*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N.J.*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif.*
Clawson, Del, *Calif.*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.* 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Corman, James C., *Calif.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, John W., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N.Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dole, Robert, *Kans.* 6815 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y.* 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg.* 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Edwards, Don, *Calif.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Findley, Paul, *Ill.*
Finnegan, Edward R., *Ill.*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I.* 1235 New House Office Building
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Foreman, Ed, *Tex.*
Forrester, E. L. (Tic), *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C.* The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn.*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn.*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla.*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y.*
Gill, Thomas P., *Hawaii*
Glenn, Milton W., *N.J.*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex.* 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y.* 3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa.*
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla.*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y.*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif.*
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Harding, Ralph R., *Idaho*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, William Henry *Wyo.*
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich.*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N.Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Henderson, David N., *N.C.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich.*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J.*
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.* 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N.Y.*
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4807 Newport
King, Carleton J., *N.Y.*
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C.*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa.*
Kyl, John, *Iowa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio.*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif.*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C.*
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah.* 800 4th St. SW.

Appendix

Finns See Trade With United States Outlook Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it was of special interest to note within the past several weeks that a U.S. Trade Development Mission under the sponsorship of the Department of Commerce returned from Finland and reported on many profitable export sales opportunities, after generating a large number of new trade and investment leads for U.S. firms. During the same period the managing director of the Finnish Foreign Trade Association, Mr. Lennart Henrikson, returned to Finland following his "one-man trade mission" to this country with a recommendation to Finnish businessmen that they should attempt to sell more to the United States.

These continuing steps to increase mutually beneficial trade between this country and the freedom-loving democratic Scandinavian nation merit our interest and support. Finland, with its courageous peoples and vigorous private enterprise system, well deserves the reservoir of good will which exists among all Americans who value the historic ties between these two countries.

In my judgment, therefore, the findings of both the U.S. Trade Mission to Finland and those of the head of the Finnish Foreign Trade Association should be given the widest possible circulation in order that the potentialities for increased commerce between the United States and Finland be maximized to the full.

The weekly news magazine of the Commerce Department's Bureau of International Commerce, entitled "International Commerce," included in its issue of July 20 a full report of the U.S. Trade Development Mission to Finland. A most informative summary of the profitable export sales opportunities available is outlined in a release of the Bureau of International Commerce.

Under unanimous consent, I include this account of the highlights in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with two articles and the United Press International wire story about the conclusions of Mr. Henrikson following his 6-week tour of the United States:

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Aug. 3, 1964]

BOTH SIDES COULD DO MORE—FINNS SEE TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES OUTLOOK GOOD

WASHINGTON, August 2.—U.S. businessmen could do much more—and so could the Finnish—in selling to each other's country.

That's the conclusion of Lennart Henrikson, managing director of the Finnish Foreign Trade Association, after a 6-week tour across the United States.

Mr. Henrikson told reporters that he is going back to Finland next week to try to persuade companies there from some misguided beliefs about doing business in the United States—and to help them with pointers on how to start selling here.

OVERWHELMING COMPETITION

Finns, according to Mr. Henrikson, usually don't think seriously about selling in this country because they feel America is self-sufficient, the competition is overwhelming.

The Finnish foreign trade promoter thinks it is not so. He sees opportunity here for Finnish sales of a variety of consumer items—ceramics, furniture, glassware, clothing, and lighting fixtures, among them.

United States-Finnish trade, he said, has a good chance of doubling during the next decade. Last year, U.S. exports to Finland totaled $56 million and Finnish shipments here came to $62 million.

Finland's exports to the United States and other foreign markets largely comprise forest products, such as newsprint and plywood. U.S. sales to Finland include machine tools, grains, cotton, coal, and various base metals.

Mr. Henrikson said he thought there was plenty of room to expand these exports to Finland, particularly in the machinery sector.

He suggested that American business has not been as aggressive in the Finnish market—which last took $1.2 billion in imports—as many Europeans. West German representatives, he said, never seem to leave the side of a Finnish purchasing agent when a decision is to be made.

FINNISH-SOVIET BLOC TRADE

U.S. exporters, Mr. Henrikson indicated, might be able to exploit what looks like a leveling off in Finnish trade with the Soviet bloc. East European offerings, he said, are limited, though about 20 percent of Finland's trade still is done with the Communist group.

Mr. Henrikson's visit marks the first ever undertaken on such a broad scale by a Finnish business representative in this country. He said that it was dictated in large part by Finland's obvious need to step up exports as Finnish import barriers are lowered. Finland is associated with the European Free Trade Association and is slated to give duty-free entry to industrial goods from European Free Trade Association member countries by 1967.

Finland is also going to participate in the Kennedy and tariff-cutting negotiations.

Mr. Henrikson's association represents about 900 Finnish firms doing export and import business.

[From the Washington News]

WASHINGTON BUSINESS: WE ARE ALL DEPENDENT ON EACH OTHER

(By Rice Odell)

A tall, handsome Finn is passing through Washington with some ideas for stepping up commerce between his country and the United States.

"You might say I'm an unofficial, one-man trade mission," said Lennart Henrikson, director of the Finnish Foreign Trade Association, which has a membership of almost 900 firms in Finland which import and export.

"You could sell a lot more to Finland," he advised, "but you have to be active. In our country there are many sellers going around from Germany, Sweden and so forth.

"A purchasing agent doesn't buy just because of a catalog. He wants to see the man himself."

QUALITY

Mr. Henrikson suggested that since the United States is always ahead in the development of new products and machinery, it should go right in and sell them before firms of other nations can start producing, perhaps at lower cost.

He said Finnish firms like to buy U.S. machinery even if it is more expensive, because it is good quality and might be cheaper in the long run.

Besides industrial machinery, Finland's main imports from the United States are such things as grain, fruits, coffee, cotton, tobacco, and petroleum products. The total last year was $56.6 million.

TREES

The other side of the coin is U.S. imports from Finland, which totaled $61.5 million last year. Because trade barriers are going down in the European Free Trade Association, Mr. Henrikson said imports will increase so there will have to be an offsetting increase in exports.

Right now the lion's share of Finnish exports to the United States consists of "everything that comes out of the forest." (Finland, which is larger than Virginia and the two Carolinas combined, is more than 70 percent covered by forests.)

Ships from Finland, for example, bring considerable newsprint to Alexandria for use by Washington newspapers. Mr. Henrikson said that Finland must also increase exports of new lines of machinery and consumer goods such as textiles, ceramics, glassware, furniture, and lamps.

UNNECESSARY

He said his country should also sell more sauna baths here. (Even in Washington, where the weather is sauna-like during much of the summer, more hotels, apartment houses and homes are being equipped with saunas.)

Mr. Henrikson said even the Swedes are selling Finnish saunas here. He added: "There's been a lot of exaggeration about sauna baths, about rolling in the snow afterward, and so forth. You can do if you like, but it's not necessary."

He said Finnish businessmen have traditionally been afraid of the American market, on the theory that the U.S. produces everything it needs. He said when he returns he will advise them otherwise.

TWENTY-ONE PERCENT

He said Finns also don't sell the right way here—they may go to New York, sign one deal and figure they've settled matters for the whole U.S. market. He said he will tell them to rely on research studies, and be ready with enough quantity when deals materialize.

On the sensitive subject of trade with the communist bloc countries, Mr. Henrikson said this accounts for 21 percent of Finland's total. He said he expects the dollar amount to remain at about its present level, but spoke favorably of the West's increased commerce with the East.

"No country can isolate itself economically from the rest. We are all dependent on each other."

COPY OF STORY BASED ON INTERVIEW WITH MANAGING DIRECTOR OF THE FINNISH FOREIGN TRADE ASSOCIATION TRANSMITTED OVER UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL WIRES

(By Henry Keys)

WASHINGTON, July 31.—Lennart Henrikson, managing director of the Finnish Foreign Trade Association, said today that he was returning to Finland at the end of a one-man trade mission to the United States with a recommendation to Finnish businessmen that they should attempt to sell more to the United States.

Finnish exporters, he said, were somewhat afraid of the United States for Finnish products because they fear that the United States produced all its needs.

But, said Henrikson, he believes that the United States would buy Finnish quality products. Finland most certainly could not hope to compete in cheap mass produced goods but could with quality items.

He believes there is a U.S. market for Finnish exports in machinery, textile products, ceramics, glassware, household lighting equipment, and furniture. Henrikson said that he felt that many Finnish businessmen went about the business of exporting to the United States in the wrong way. Many simply visited New York and selected an agent and left feeling that they had done all that was necessary.

However, it was his opinion they should realize that New York was not the United States, that the United States was a huge continental market and that goods could only be sold by direct contact with buyers from the big department stores, through importers and through contacts established in the trade departments of the various chambers of commerce.

He said that on his return he would advise Finnish companies not to be afraid of the American market but to approach it in a more practical way by, in the first instance, conducting suitable market research to find out what goods would sell where.

Henrikson stressed that exports were essential to Finland's economic stability. He said that he would recommend to his organization, which consists of some 900 member companies, that it should make general market studies to assist companies by indicating to them the right way to sell goods in the United States and by helping them to find the right representatives and agents.

Henrikson said he believed American exporters should greatly increase the volume of their business with Finland by following a similar course and sending salesmen to Finland.

It was a joke in Finland, he said, that anytime a company or store buyer was ready to buy something he would find a German salesman sitting beside his desk. This was not without some foundation in fact, he said.

Henrikson said that at the moment Finland's exports largely consist of products made from its forests. It was doing as much as it could with these exports today and needed to open its avenues. Henrikson said that Finland's total imports were today valued at $1.2 billion compared with $1.15 billion for exports. About 80 percent of its trade was with Europe and 6 percent with the United States.

Henrikson, who will spend a week in New York on his way home, will sail from New York on August 7.

[From the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of International Commerce]

TRADE MISSION REPORTS GOOD EXPORT POTENTIALS IN FINLAND FOR U.S. PRODUCTS

Profitable export sales opportunities are available now in the quality-conscious Finnish market for a wide range of American-made consumer goods and industrial products, according to a recently returned U.S. Trade Mission, the U.S. Department of Commerce announced today.

The full report of the U.S. Trade Development Mission to Finland appears in the July 20 issue of International Commerce, the weekly news magazine of the Department's Bureau of International Commerce (BIC).

Mission members generated about 150 new trade and investment leads for U.S. firms in discussions with Finnish businessmen in Helsinki, Lahti, Oulu, Tampere, Turku, Heinola, Salo, and Hanko, May 2–30.

According to the missions' report, Finnish interests run high for such U.S. consumer goods as foodstuffs, small electric appliances and kitchen items, lightweight luggage, shoes, hi-fi and stereo records, fabrics for the many wearing-apparel manufacturers in the country and piece goods for the home sewing customers.

Opportunities also are available for U.S. firms to negotiate licensing agreements for the manufacture in Finland of men's and women's clothing, including rainwear and sportswear and men's shirts.

The chemical and plastics industry, according to the report, is a good market possibility for materials and equipment. Know-how and licenses are sought for the newer U.S. products and processes, especially in pharmaceutical chemicals, herbicides, and pesticides.

Finland's economy, characterized by a steep climb in consumer purchasing power in the last 5 years, has reached a point that commands the interest of U.S. automobile and auto parts manufacturers. Mission members believe there are good prospects for U.S. exports of equipment for servicing vehicles, such as hydraulic jacks and lifts, and for electrical testing, wheel alinement, and tire service equipment.

Modern computers and data processing equipment are just being introduced in Finland, and U.S. exporters will need to consider an aggressive sales program to promote exports in this area.

Finland also presents a good potential for the sale of U.S. packaging machinery, equipment, and service, particularly for food items, drugs, toiletries, and hardware.

Business members on the mission were: Bjorn Andersen, consultant, Maplewood, N.J., formerly president of Celanese Development Corp.; O. Richard Capen, president, Good Humor Co. of California, Los Angeles, Calif.; Carl S. Fuller, management and merchandising consultant, Cleveland, Ohio, formerly vice president, Cleveland Division, Kroger Co.; James L. McGovern, Jr., sales manager, replacement products, Raybestos Division of Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc., Bridgeport, Conn.; and Joseph F. Spilberg, senior partner of Lappen and Spilberg, accounting management consultants of Beverly Hill, Calif.

John A. Donley, of the Department's Business and Defense Services Administration, was mission director. Albert Caya, Jr., of BIC, was trade development officer.

Congressman Otis G. Pike Reports to His Constituents on 2d Session, 88th Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, in my first annual report to my constituents, I described the 1st session of the 87th Congress as hard working and productive. Three years ago I was obliged to describe the 2d session of that Congress as follows:

I could not, with a straight face, tell my constituents that this was the greatest session of Congress in the history of our Nation, nor label it great at all.

Last year it was again necessary to say to my constituents, "Despite the many long months of the session, Congress goes home with the bulk of its legislative business unfaced and undone."

This year, happily, we can say to the approximately 550,000 residents of the First Congressional District of the State of New York that this has been an outstanding session of Congress. It has passed some major legislation of great importance to the Nation; it has passed some other legislation which might not be considered of major importance to the Nation but is of major importance to the district which I have the honor to represent. It has been a real joy to work in such a Congress. The only thing which detracts from that joy is that we seem to have lost the magic formula for wrapping up the loose ends and going home.

The 1962 session of Congress was the longest peacetime session since 1949, and it lasted from January 10 to October 13.

The 1963 session of Congress made that one look like a holiady. It started on January 9 and ran all year, ending on December 30. This year's session started on January 7 and is still running, but not very hard. It is due to adjourn sometime next month, but this annual report is being made right now so no one can say that it was sent out just before election with some ulterior motive in mind.

When the 1st session of the 88th Congress adjourned last December 30, the popular image of Congress was that of a bumbling, ineffectual, weak branch of Government, unable to complete constructive legislation on any major front. There was substantial evidence to support this view.

This year's session has been a very different matter. When we met in January the tax reduction bill had passed the House, but was bottled up in the Senate.

In February it became the law of the land.

In January the civil rights bill had not been considered by either House of Congress, but by February it had passed the House and after a lengthy filibuster it passed the Senate in June and was signed by the President on July 2.

The mass transit program had passed the Senate in January but was bogged down in the House. It finally cleared the committee hurdle in the House in April, passed the House in June, and became law in July.

A new major wheat and cotton subsidy bill had passed the House last December, but was bogged down in the Senate.

The Senate passed a greatly amended version in March; in April the House accepted the Senate version; and it became the law of the land.

So it went throughout the year. Congress cranked out major legislation at a good pace. Bills which had been

bottled up in committees, or blocked by procedural technicalities, found themselves unbottled and unblocked. Bills which were believed to be dead were found to have new life, and many of them became law. I do not mean to indicate in any manner that I supported everything which came before Congress. Of the four bills already mentioned, for example, I did support the tax cut bill, civil rights bill, and mass transit bill, but was strongly opposed to the wheat and cotton subsidy bill. What was good to see was the legislative machinery cranking, instead of just creaking, bills actually being heard in committees and either approved or disapproved, being brought to the floor, and voted either up or down, instead of simply dying by the wayside for lack of attention. This is the way the system is supposed to work, and this was a year in which it worked very well.

One field in which this Congress accomplished a great deal is in the field of conservation of our Nation's natural resources. Two bills of major importance to the Nation became law, and one bill of major importance to Suffolk County became law. One of the bills of national signifiance was the wilderness bill, under which 9,100,000 acres of federally owned property were added to the wilderness system of our national parks, to be preserved as undeveloped and unspoiled areas for future generations of campers and nature lovers to enjoy. The other bill was one which will provide funds for the acquisition of both Federal and State parks and recreation land. Under this bill money will be raised from three sources: sale of surplus real estate, the existing Federal tax on motorboat fuel, and admission and user fees charged at Federal recreation areas.

The fund realized from these sources will be used 60 percent by the States—who must match the Federal contribution—to acquire State recreational areas, and 40 percent by the Federal Government to acquire Federal recreational areas. One of the Federal parks which should benefit from this legislation is our own Fire Island National Seashore, which I will discuss at greater length later.

In the field of education, as well as recreation, this session of Congress has done a good job. The National Defense Education Act extension, together with an extension of aid to impacted areas—where there are large amounts of tax exempt Federal lands or large numbers of Federal employees—has passed both Houses of Congress and should become law before adjournment. Because of the large numbers of Federal employees at our military bases and defense plants, this act is of particular importance to Suffolk County, and many of the district's school boards had contacted our office on behalf of this legislation.

Several programs for the care of our less fortunate citizens were enacted into law during this session of Congress. The most far-reaching and controversial was the so-called poverty bill, under which programs to train school dropouts and unemployed youth for useful work will be undertaken on a broad front. Also under this category of aid to the needy were a new food stamp program designed to encourage greater use of our farm surpluses for welfare recipients, which has become law, and somewhat increased benefits for the recipients of social security, which passed both Houses of Congress but is currently in trouble because the Senate added a hospital insurance amendment to the House bill, thereby unleashing all of the passions and prejudices attached to the word "medicare."

Congress this year extended the housing program under which the Federal Housing Administration has granted FHA loans for homebuilders across the Nation. Again, in an area like Suffolk County, which is growing as fast as any area in the Nation, this is of vital concern to our economy.

It has been a good session, but it has also had its problems. The great Senate filibuster by the conservatives on the Civil Rights bill has now been followed by another, and I hope, shorter, Senate filibuster by the liberals on the subject of reapportionment of State legislatures. We have had our problems in Suffolk County, too. Chief among them has been the impact on our economy of the layoffs at Republic Aviation caused by the end of production of the F–105 fighter-bomber, their only large construction project. Although since the Congressional reapportionment of 1961, the Republic plant in Farmingdale is no longer in the district I represent, many of its workers are, and I have continued to support it. In June, Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, visited the plant with me and was very impressed by what he saw there. Other defense workers from our area travel daily to the huge Brooklyn Navy Yard, and are concerned with the problems involved in keeping a sufficient workload in the yard to maintain its operating efficiency. Defense contracting has always tended to be a very cyclical operation, and some Long Island concerns, such as Grumman and Gyrodyne, have been doing very well. This cannot, however, relieve either the dislocations or the financial problems endured by the long-time worker at the plant which is in trouble.

On a more personal basis, our office has continued to be very busy. Four full-time secretaries in Washington and one full-time and two part-time representatives in Riverhead, Islip, and Southampton are kept hopping both on matters pertaining to legislation and on the varied personal problems of our rapidly growing district. The 1960 census showed our present district to contain 398,254 persons when that census was taken. On May 1 of this year, the Census Bureau certified that our district in less than 4 years had passed the 500,000 mark and was growing at an accelerated pace. New people mean new problems in regard to jobs, schools, transportation and recreation. Insofar as the Federal Government is involved in each of these fields, we have tried to help.

While it has been a busy year it has been a most rewarding year in our office. We have written and seen enacted into national law two pieces of legislation, and have cosponsored a third. In the entire 1st session of the 88th Congress some 14,168 bills and resolutions were introduced, but only 257 became public laws. I do not know what the output of the second session will be, but any Member who introduces seven public bills and sees three of them become law has had a good year.

The three bills included cosponsorship of the bill to extend Federal aid to impacted school districts, referred to above, authorship of a bill for the benefit of the owner-operators of small commercial fishing vessels, and the bill establishing a Fire Island National Seashore. Of these, the most important to Suffolk County will be the last.

Congress has authorized the establishment of a national seashore on Fire Island. It will be the first national park in the State of New York. Twenty-seven miles of the shoreline of that island, from the Robert Moses State Park on the west to the Moriches Inlet on the east, will be put in public ownership. Some 4,300 acres of land on Fire Island, and on several small islands in the Great South Bay, Moriches Bay, and Bellport Bay are included in the project.

The history of this project has been complicated and stormy, but the storms have helped. First introduced as a piece of legislation by my predecessor in Congress, Stuyvesant Wainwright, in 1960, the proposal was roundly denounced by leaders of his own political party at the time. The State of New York took the position that a State park would be more effective than a national park, but that existing State parks made both unnecessary.

In March 1962 the first storms came; winds and high tides lasted for 3 days, and 100 homes were lost on the south shore of Long Island. An immediate cry went up for erosion control, and a temporary State commission on protection and preservation of the Atlantic shorefront was appointed. Their report said that there was no need for additional State or Federal parks, but that erosion control was badly needed, and that the best way to proceed was by a massive barrier running the length of Fire Island and topped by an ocean boulevard. This proposal was approved by the Suffolk County Board of Supervisors on August 13, 1962.

This evoked another storm from those who did not want any road built on Fire Island, and two New York City Congressmen introduced new bills to establish a Fire Island National Seashore. On April 8, 1963 the Suffolk County Board of Supervisors reversed its earlier position and endorsed a seashore proposal, but without specifying what its boundaries should be.

On June 11, 1963, the Interior Department, which had stated that Fire Island itself did not contain enough land to justify a national seashore, made its own proposal, which obtained more land by extending the park east to Southampton Village. This proposal evoked the third storm—from the residents of Southampton who wanted no part of the park in their town. We prepared our

own bill, and it was introduced on June 18, 1963.

Hearings were held on the various bills at Oakdale, Long Island, on September 30, 1963, and in Washington in December 1963 and April 1964.

The storms were over, and all was sweetness, light and agreement—or at least almost all. The bill which we had prepared, with very minor amendments, was approved by the subcommittee and the full Interior Committee of the House, passed by the House, and accepted by the Senate. It was signed by the President on September 11, 1964.

The bill as written sets up a 15-member advisory committee of local residents to help the Interior Department in establishing the park, calls for erosion control on Fire Islands, and makes provision for a future new inlet across Fire Island into the Great South Bay.

It has been a good year. I had a perfect attendance record on rollcall votes from January until September 1, when I went to a Democratic State convention to make a nominating speech for a frien dwho did not get nominated—and missed two votes. As of this date we have had 107 rollcall votes, and I have been present and voting 105 times. Some of the votes are easy; some are tough; some are simple; and some are complex. My constituents will not agree with all of them—neither does my wife. Here are the important ones for the year—I will be happy to know their views on this record:

Voting record of Congressman Otis G. Pike, 2d sess., 88th Cong.

Date	Issue	Vote
Jan. 14, 1964	Authorize $75,000,000 per year for 3 years for Federal grants to be matched by local funds for airport construction. (Yea 298, nay 11.)	Yea.
Jan. 21, 1964	Authorize $45,000,000 for library services and construction of public libraries. (Yea 254, nay 107.)	Yea.
Jan. 28, 1964	Amend Davis-Bacon Act establishing prevailing wage rate on Federal construction work. (Yea, 357, nay 50.)	Yea.
Feb. 10, 1964	Civil Rights Act of 1964. (Yea 290, nay 130.)	Yea.
Feb 20, 1964	Authorized $16,900,000,000 appropriation for fiscal 1965 procurement of aircraft, missiles, and ships. (Yea 336, nay 0.)	Yea.
Feb. 25, 1964	Revenue Act of 1964, reducing personal and corporate income taxes by $11,500,000,000 over 2 years. (Yea 326, nay 83.)	Yea.
Feb. 26, 1964	Recommit (kill) bill providing $312 million for International Development Association. (Yea 208, nay 189.)	Nay.
Feb. 27, 1964	Prohibit Federal Communications Commission from setting standards on length and frequency of radio and television commercials. (Yea 317, nay 43.)	Nay.
Mar. 4, 1964	Recommit bill providing $115,000,000 for Peace Corps. (Yea 90, nay 309.)	Nay.
Mar. 5, 1964	Impose tax on purchase of foreign securities to stop gold flow. (Yea 238, nay 142.)	Yea.
Mar. 12, 1964	Raise the salaries of 1,700,000 Federal career employees and Federal executives, judges, and legislators. (Yea 184, nay 222.)	Yea.
Mar. 24, 1964	Increase Coast Guard appropriation for new ships and planes by $10,000,000. (Yea 160, nay 193.)	Yea.
Mar. 24, 1964	Appropriate $6,200,000,000 for Treasury and Post Office operations for fiscal 1965. (Yea 326, nay 20.)	Yea.
Mar. 25, 1964	Authorize $5,200,000,000 space exploration and research program. (Yea 283, nay 73.)	Yea.
Apr. 8, 1964	Motion to recommit food stamp bill and require States to match Federal grants under program. (Yea 195, nay 223.)	Yea.
Apr. 8, 1964	Final passage of food stamp program. (Yea 229, nay 189.)	Yea.
Apr. 8, 1964	Administration's wheat-cotton subsidy bill. (Yea 211, nay 203.)	Nay.
Apr. 10, 1964	Motion to recommit legislative appropriations bill of $174,000,000 with instructions to amend. (Yea 188, nay 131.)	Nay.
Apr. 14, 1964	Appropriation of $6,900,000,000 for Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies. (Yea 345, nay 21.)	Yea.
Apr. 15, 1964	Authorize $45,000,000 to implement a boundary line agreement with Mexico. (Yea 347, nay 5.)	Yea.
Apr. 22, 1964	Appropriate $46,800,000,000 for Defense Department in fiscal 1965. (Yea 365, nay 0.)	Yea.
May 6, 1964	Appropriate $1,700,000,000 for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies. (Yea 313, nay 40.)	Yea.
May 7, 1964	Authorize $2,600,000,000 for Atomic Energy Commission in fiscal 1965. (Yea 340, nay 3.)	Yea.
May 13, 1964	Motion to recommit (kill) authorization of $312,000,000 for International Development Association. (Yea 132, nay 247.)	Nay.
May 20, 1964	Amendment to add $1,600,000 to agriculture appropriation to construct peanut research laboratory in Georgia. (Yea 181, nay 198.)	Nay.
May 20, 1964	Amendment to prohibit subsidies on agricultural products shipped to Communist nations. (Yea 186, nay 187.)	Yea.
May 20, 1964	Final passage of $5,200,000,000 Agriculture Department appropriation including farm subsidies. (Yea 311, nay 64.)	Nay.
May 26, 1964	Appropriate $1,600,000,000 for construction of military facilities and military housing. (Yea 340, nay 5.)	Yea.
May 27, 1964	Motion to recommit (kill) bill increasing insurance on deposits in banks and savings and loan institutions. (Yea 197, nay 142.)	Yea.
June 3, 1964	Authorize $1,200,000,000 Federal highway program in each of fiscal 1966 and 1967. (Yea 296, nay 0.)	Yea.
June 10, 1964	Authorize $2,000,000,000 foreign aid program for fiscal 1965. (Yea 230, nay 175.)	Yea.
June 11, 1964	Raise salaries of 1,700,000 Federal career employees and Federal executives, judiciary, and legislators. (Yea 243, nay 157.)	Yea.
June 16, 1964	Appropriate $4,300,000,000 for public works projects and AEC in fiscal 1965. (Yea 361, nay 11.)	Yea.
June 17, 1964	Motion to recommit a 1-year extension of so-called Korean war excise taxes. (Yea 185, nay 207.)	Nay.
June 18, 1964	Fix temporary national debt limit at $324,000,000,000 until June 30, 1965. (Yea 203, nay 182.)	Yea.
June 25, 1964	Mass transit bill authorizing $375,000,000 to be matched by States in developing and improving mass transit systems. (Yea 212, nay 189.)	Yea.
July 1, 1964	Appropriate $3,700,000,000 for foreign economic and military assistance and related programs. (Yea 231, nay 174.)	Yea.
July 2, 1964	Accept Senate amendments to Civil Rights Act of 1964. (Yea 289, nay 126.)	Yea.
July 2, 1964	Adopt House-Senate conference report authorizing Federal grants to colleges to encourage water resources research. (Yea 346, nay 0.)	Yea.
July 21, 1964	Permit recipient of "morally offensive" mail to instruct Postmaster to prevent sender from mailing additional unsolicited material to him or his children. (Yea 326, nay 19.)	Yea.
July 22, 1964	Establish land and water conservation fund. (Yea 337, nay 8.)	Yea.
July 28, 1964	Permit self-employed commercial fishermen to use facilities of Public Health Service. (Yea 202, nay 170.)	Yea.
July 29, 1964	5-percent increase in social security benefits, reduce age when widows qualify from 62 to 60. (Yea 388, nay 8.)	Yea.
July 30, 1964	Establish National Wilderness Preservation System. (Yea 371, nay 1.)	Yea.
Aug. 3, 1964	Establish Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in Wisconsin. (Yea 164, nay 154.)	Yea.
Aug. 3, 1964	Colorado River irrigation projects. (Yea 250, nay 67.)	Yea.
Aug. 4, 1964	Require at least 35 percent of funds for repair and conversion of naval vessels be spent in private shipyards. (Yea 186, nay 178.)	Nay.
Aug. 7, 1964	Support President's actions in retaliatory attacks against North Vietnam. (Yea 416, nay 0.)	Yea.
Aug. 7, 1964	Motion to strike the enacting clause (kill) of Economic Opportunity Act (poverty bill). (Yea 197, nay 225.)	Yea.
Aug. 7, 1964	Amendment substituting Senate version of Economic Opportunity Act. (Yea 228, nay 190.)	Yea.
Aug. 8, 1964	Passage of Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. (Yea 226, nay 185.)	Yea.
Aug. 11, 1964	Increase disability and death pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II and Korean war. (Yea 389, nay 0.)	Yea.
Aug. 12, 1964	Authorize payment of U.S. share of cost of International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos. (Yea 268, nay 89.)	Yea.
Aug. 13, 1964	Motion to cut funds of National Aeronautics and Space Administration by $200,000,000. (Yea 114, nay 270.)	Nay.
Aug. 13, 1964	Housing Act of 1964, authorizing $992,000,000 for FHA programs through June 30, 1965. (Yea 308, nay 68.)	Yea.
Aug. 14, 1964	Subsidy program aiding construction of U.S. fishing vessels in U.S. shipyards. (Yea 198, nay 124.)	Yea.
Aug. 17, 1964	Declare sense of Congress that members of United Nations delinquent in dues should lose their votes. (Yea 351, nay 0.)	Yea.
Aug. 17, 1964	Require migrant farm labor crew leaders of 10 or more workers to register with Labor Department. (Yea 343, nay 7.)	Yea.
Aug. 17, 1964	Extend mandatory Federal inspection requirements to previously exempt small mines. (Yea 202, nay 151.)	Nay.
Aug. 18, 1964	Establish mandatory quotas on meat imports (House-Senate conference report). (Yea 232, nay 149.)	Nay.
Aug. 18, 1964	Conference report on International Coffee Agreement. (Yea 183, nay 194.)	Nay.
Aug. 19, 1964	Prohibit all Federal courts from considering cases involving reapportionment of State legislatures. (Yea 218, nay 175.)	Nay.
Aug. 20, 1964	Establish National Council on the Arts. (Yea 213, nay 135.)	Yea.
Sept. 1, 1964	Study feasibility and site for new Atlantic-Pacific canal to supplement Panama. (Yea 320, nay 23.)	(1).
Sept. 1, 1964	Coordinate Interior Department and Agriculture Department regulations on pesticides. (Yea 236, nay 110.)	(1).
Sept. 3, 1964	Recommit food-for-peace program to prohibit sales of surplus food to Poland and Yugoslavia. (Yea 183, nay 175.)	Nay.
Sept. 3, 1964	Extend food-for-peace program for 3 years. (Yea 349, nay 6.)	Yea.
Sept. 3, 1964	Allow 50 percent forgiveness of Federal student loans to doctors practicing in remote areas. (Yea 140, nay 161.)	Yea.

[1] Absent; recorded yea.

Letters to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, all of us would like to encourage our constituents to write to us, so that we can have the widest possible expression of opinion on the issues of the day.

A firm in the First Congressional District of Georgia, the Union Bag-Camp Paper Corp., has published in its employee magazine, the Digester, an article which I hope will make more people realize that we here in Washington want to hear from them.

The article is as follows:

TURN BLUE, SENATOR

When was the last time you expressed yourself to Washington? Out loud, that is.

It's easy. And, not so strangely, your Congressmen—Senators or Representatives—want to hear from you. Your letter can have a pronounced effect on the way your Congressman votes

Some Congressmen have been heard to declare that their vote on a given issue was decided by the respective weights of their for and against files. The heaviest wins. This is hardly a good rule to follow and is likely used sparingly by Congressmen, if, in truth, at all. However, the average Congressman receives 200 letters a day—each representing a potential vote. Woe be unto him if he ignores them.

The late Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn of Texas once commented:

"It is through a Congressman's mail that he keeps informed on what his people are thinking and what they want him to do.

"The Representative is the voice of his people in national affairs. He can't be the voice unless he knows what they are thinking. If he doesn't think as they do, he won't be in Congress long.

"My district is rural and I make it a point to answer every letter that comes written in pencil and on ruled paper. It might be the only letter that person would ever write me."

There is an art to writing a Congressman, though it is always the contents that really count.

Here are the fundamentals:

Be brief and to the point. State your reasons for writing in the first paragraph.

In the second paragraph, if you are not a personal friend of the Congresman, identify yourself.

Use your own letterhead and envelope, or plain stationery (not the company's), and your own stamps. Make the letter entirely yours.

Letters are generally more effective than telegrams except when time makes a wire imperative. Congressmen like to see signatures on their correspondence.

If he does you a favor, don't hesitate to thank him. Congressmen are only human and receive far more criticism than praise.

Be reasonable; seek only possible things.

Don't apologize for writing and taking his time. That's his job.

Never threaten by saying, "I'll never vote for you if you don't do such and such." He will probably tell you that he doesn't want a vote of that kind.

Don't stop with one letter. Keep your Congressmen informed of your views on all important legislation.

HOW TO ADDRESS YOUR CONGRESSMAN

Name ————,
———— Street,
Savannah, Ga., Date ————.
Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL or
Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington 25, D.C.
Dear Senator RUSSELL (TALMADGE):
(Here follows the body of the letter.)
Yours very truly,

Name ————,
———— Street,
Savannah, Ga., Date ————.
Hon. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington 25, D.C.
Dear Representative HAGAN:
(Here follows the body of the letter.)
Yours very truly,

Look, Mr. Freeman, Livestock Prices Drop When Democrats Are in Control of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week, Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, left his post of duty in Washington, D.C., and invaded Iowa, making political speeches, and otherwise, at which time he insulted the intelligence of the people of Iowa, especially the Iowa farmers. Mr. Freeman boasted about his farm program now in effect at a time when our farmer's dollar is worth only 75 cents in purchasing power, the lowest since 1939.

Sure, a majority of Iowa farmers signed up, as no doubt most of them needed the money to bolster up their 75-cent dollar, as has been the case most of the time during Mr. Freeman's reign in office, as well as some years before that time, and no doubt will continue so long as partisan politicians dictate our farm programs.

Mr. Speaker, our farmers are hoping for the day when we will have a Secretary of Agriculture who has recently plowed, planted, cultivated, reaped, and marketed food, feed, and fiber, and one who has fed livestock for milk and meat for market. Many farmers know and tell us it has been far too long since we have had such a Secretary of Agriculture.

It is noteworthy that in none of Mr. Freeman's Iowa speeches did he tell the people about his hard fight to keep Congress from passing a meat import reduction bill, nor did he tell anyone out loud that during his reign in office, he had added over 9,000 employees to his payroll, costing the taxpayers over $60 million, while the cattlemen were losing their shirts and farm income was on the toboggan.

We see no newspaper account of Mr. Freeman telling the Iowa people that according to the official, nonpartisan, Reference Service of the Library of Congress, the actual value of all the farms and all the buildings on all the farms in the entire United States is $143 billion, while our U.S. Federal debt today stands at just a little less than $317 billion, and monuting by leaps and bounds every hour of the day and night. Think of it, and then ask yourself how much longer can we expect our American dollar to be worth even half of what it is today, and just what the harvest will be at the end of this reckless, spending, Democratic joyride.

Did Mr. Freeman tell the people that they now work almost 4 months of each year, just to pay seen and unseen taxes? I am sure he did not. But one thing he did do, according to the newspapers, was to try his level best to scare the Iowa farmers by predicting that if the Republicans get in power in Congress, corn would go down to 80 cents per bushel, hogs to 12 cents, and cattle to 15 cents per hundredweight. Well, now, Mr. Freeman, please take a good, long, look at the following record, after which you should hasten to apologize to the people of Iowa who you so desperately tried to scare with a lot of loose talk.

Here are the facts and figures, straight from the pages of the Omaha livestock market, for all to read:

LIVESTOCK PRICES DROP WHEN DEMOCRATS ARE IN CONTROL OF CONGRESS

Prices on most every farm product were driven down when the Democrats arbitrarily rolled back cattle prices 10 percent in 1951. Remember? Farm prices have not recovered since that time, including prices on all livestock, except when Republicans have been in control of Congress.

Here, for example, are the hog prices at the Omaha livestock market from the year 1940 to date, September 17, 1964:

Year 1940: Low, $5.25; high, $7.30; Democrat-controlled Congress, peace.

Years 1941–47: High, $27.50; Democrat-controlled Congress, war.

Years 1947–48: High, $32.25; Republican-controlled Congress, peace.

Years 1949–52 (cattle rollback): High, $26.50; Democrat-controlled Congress, war.

Years 1953–54: High, $28.65; Republican-controlled Congress, peace.

Years 1955–58: High, $25.25; Democrat-controlled Congress, peace.

Years 1959–62: High, $20.35; Democrat-controlled Congress, peace.

Years 1962–64: High, $18.25; Democrat-controlled Congress, shaky peace.

Our farmer's dollar, nationwide, is worth only 75 cents in purchasing power today, the lowest since 1939. Hence, who dares to boast about the farm programs that have operated since the year 1935?

Look—the Democrats control the Agriculture Committees of Congress. Senate Agriculture Committee—Democrat chairman from a Southern State, 11 Democrats, 8 from Southern States, and 6 Republicans on the committee, 5 from Midwest and Northern States. House Agriculture Committee—Democrat chairman from a Southern State, 20 Democrats on the committee, 12 from

Southern States, all 14 Republicans on the committee from Midwestern and Northern States.

Farm products of the Southern States: mostly cotton, tobacco, rice and peanuts—prices not too good. Farm products of the Midwestern and Northern States: mostly corn, wheat, livestock, poultry and eggs—prices are bad.

Congressmen and Senators naturally look after their own people best. Records prove that when our farmers' dollar is worth 100 cents in purchasing power, they buy more than twice as many dollars' worth of manufactured goods than do the rest of us on an average, which means more dollars in the pockets of our wage earners, and higher employment.

Our farmers, merchants, and wage earners, north, south, east and west, need and deserve a Republican Congress.

Two wars, less than 6 years apart, high taxes, low farm prices, and high cost of all manufactured goods our farmers must buy, have them in a bad cost-price squeeze.

Farmers got fair prices during the wars, but neither they, their wives, nor their sons and daughters, want any more of that kind of business or profits, and neither does any other patriotic American worthy of that title.

Also remember, the Democratic Party was in complete control of the House of Representatives when farm prices went to pot in 1931–32.

These are the records, Mr. Speaker. Let us keep them straight.

Securities Act Amendments of 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, during debate on the Securities Act Amendments of 1964, the 2-hour time allotment expired before discussion of some further possible ambiguities in the bill could be considered.

Further, during the lengthy hearings on these very involved pieces of legislation there seemed to be no end to the questions which would arise by reason of statements made by members of the industry or the Commission as would be entered in the record lastly.

Consequently, Mr. Arthur V. Toupin, general counsel of Insurance Securities, Inc., the sponsor of a large mutual fund registered with the Securities Exchange Commission under the Investment Company Act of 1940, has sent me a copy of a letter he prepared which I find interesting.

In order to give Members of Congress, the industry, and the public generally the benefit of his views, I am including them in the RECORD as a possible aid in further interpreting the scope of this new legislation.

Mr. Toupin writes me as follows:

Recently the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported favorably upon H.R. 6793 as amended. As shown in the committee report, it determined as a matter of policy that brokers and dealers should not be compelled to be members of a national securities association and deleted the compulsory membership provisions. However, so that nonmember brokers and dealers will be regulated in the same particulars as the bill provides for members, the committee amended the bill to give the SEC direct regulatory authority in these particulars over nonmembers.

We believe the committee intended that members and nonmembers be subjected to substantially comparable regulation in the areas covered, so there will be no regulatory advantage or disadvantage in joining or not joining an association. It seems clear enough that if regulation of nonmembers by the Commission were more restrictive or onerous than the regulation of association members, nonmembers, as a partical matter could be compelled by administrative decision to join an association in violation of the policy against compelling such membership.

Although the committee report contains statements from which it can be inferred that there shall be no regulatory discrimination between members and nonmembers of an association, we feel that this intention should be made clear as part of the legislative history of the bill. In addition, one of the new paragraphs of the bill could be construed to amend by inference certain provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940.

Since that act was not considered by the committee, we believe the legislative history of this bill should show that there is no intention to amend or change the provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940. To accomplish this, I am enclosing a statement which, if it becomes part of the legislative history of the bill, will clarify these points. We feel confident that the enclosure is consistent with the spirit and intention of the committee in adopting these amendments and hope that you will support its inclusion in the official record when this bill is considered by the full House.

The enclosure has been reviewed and approved by Investors Diversified Services and by Waddell & Reed, and they have authorized me to state that they approve its contents and urge its inclusion in the RECORD.

The following is the attached dissertation on the legislative history as referred to in the foregoing letter of Mr. Toupin:

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF PARAGRAPHS (8), (9), AND (10) OF SECTION 15(B)

As stated in the committee report, the committee determined as a matter of policy that brokers and dealers should not be compelled to be members of a national securities association and deleted the compulsory membership provisions from the bill. However, it was the feeling of the committee that brokers and dealers who do not voluntarily become association members should be subject to regulation by the Commission comparable to that imposed by associations on their members. To accomplish this, paragraphs (8), (9), and (10) of section 15(b) were added to the bill. In this regard, it is intended that there be no regulatory discrimination as between members and nonmembers and that there be a substantial comparability between the regulation of each. There should be no regulatory advantage or disadvantage to a broker or dealer in joining or not joining an association. If the regulation of nonmembers by the Commission under these paragraphs were more restrictive or onerous than the regulation by associations of members, nonmembers, as a practical matter, could be compelled by administrative decision to become association members in violation of the policy against compelling membership established by Congress.

Thus, the standards established by the Commission under paragraph (8) of section 15(b) and the standards established by associations should be substantially comparable. Similarly, it is intended that the fees and charges prescribed by the Commission under paragraphs (8) and (9) of section 15(b) shall not be significantly greater than those assessed by associations upon members, and that the fees and charges prescribed shall not be based upon the costs of any regulatory activity which the Commission had the authority to perform prior to the enactment of these amendments.

In establishing qualifications and making classifications pursuant to paragraph (8) of section 15(b), it is intended that the Commission may adopt appropriate grandfather clauses exempting brokers or dealers or persons associated with such brokers or dealers in whole or in part, either permanently or for a transition period, from some or all of such qualifications. As the committee report states, a national securities association has this same authority to adopt grandfather clauses.

Paragraph (10) of section 15(b) was added in order to give the Commission powers over nonmembers comparable to the powers given to an association under section 15A(b)(7) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. As is the case with paragraph (8) and (9) of section 15(b), it is contemplated that regulation by the Commission of nonmembers under paragraph (10) will be accomplished so as to avoid discrimination as between members and nonmembers. Among other things, paragraph (10) would authorize the Commission to prescribe rules and regulations designed "to provide safeguards against unreasonable profits or unreasonable rates of commissions or other charges." It is noted that under section 22(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 Congress gave to the Commission authority to make rules and regulations designed to safeguard against "an unconscionable or grossly excessive sales load" in the sale of the redeemable securities of any registered investment company, and provided the Commission with authority to make such rules and regulations applicable to both members and nonmembers of a national securities association. It is not intended that the enactment of paragraph (10) of section 15(b) shall change or alter the authority of the Commission in regard to the regulation of such sales loads, either by enlarging or diminishing that authority as it now exists under section 22(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940. The purpose of the above-quoted portion of paragraph (10) is to give the Commission the same authority over nonmembers in their activities which are not subject to regulation under section 22(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 as an association now has under section 15A(b)(7) of the Exchange Act. Further, the enactment of paragraph (10) is not intended to empower the Commission to supersede by rule or regulation the provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940 relating to maximum sales loads or other charges, or to provide by rule or regulation for maximum sales loads or other charges which are different from those provided for in that act.

Section 15A(b)(7) of the Exchange Act forbids an association to "impose any schedule of prices, or to impose any schedule or fix minimum rates of commissions, allowances, discounts, or other charges." Paragraph (10) is not intended to authorize the Commission to engage in any such regulatory activities which are prohibited to an association. To do so would result in regulatory discrimination as between members and nonmembers.

Speech Reveals "Real Goldwater"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE SKUBITZ
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial written by Rolla Clymer, editor of the El Dorado, Kans., Times, entitled "Speech Reveals 'Real Goldwater'."

Rolla Clymer is known as the "Sage of the Flint Hills" and he speaks for the grassroots of Kansas. I urge my colleagues to review his words:

What BARRY GOLDWATER is trying to do, as a candidate for President, is to effect conservative changes in the structure of our American Government—a government that has experienced little of conservative and business-like handling since the New Deal came into being 30 years ago.

He realizes that such a change cannot be established overnight, but that time and patience will be required to alter the sprawling bureaucracy which has been spread over this land in three decades, and through which the processes of government are ministered today.

In his acceptance speech at Prescott, Ariz., he made three major points; namely, (1) that the "cancerous growth of Federal Government" must and shall be stopped; (2) that Democratic appeasement in foreign affairs should be ruled out, and that (3) Johnson's is an administration of "mobs in the streets, restrained only by the plea that they wait until after election time to ignite violence once again."

It is these three phases of his indictment that the liberals of America are discussing, and attempting to defend themselves against.

But there were many other points in his address, which the critics have passed over entirely, and to which readers will never have their attention called by the headlines. For example, here are a few paragraphs which reveal his alertness to the practical aspects of his proposals, as well as compassion which animates his spirit:

"Of course, the mistakes of the past cannot be corrected overnight. Our economy needs stability and continuity in Government policy. We must proceed with care in our task of cutting the Government down to size.

"Honesty requires that we honor the commitments Government has made to all areas of the economy, whether explicit or implicit.

"Good faith requires that we not disappoint reasonable expectations based on those commitments.

"We, in a Republican administration, shall never abandon the needy and the aged—we shall never forsake the helpless. We understand their problems in our hearts.

"But we know that a true and lasting solution of those problems cannot be found in degrading, capricious, and politically motivated handouts from the White House. It must ultimately be found in a thriving and compassionate economy and in programs principally handled by the levels of government closest to the people.

"Prudence requires that we proceed slowly and steadily in withdrawing the Central Government interventions in our private economic lives."

These expressions indicate the kind of a man BARRY GOLDWATER is in his heart—and not the "trigger-happy," impatient, reckless man his opponents are trying so hard to paint.

The Anniversary of the Birth of Gen. Friedrich von Steuben

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEIL STAEBLER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, September 17, 1964, is the 234th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Friedrich von Steuben, the Revolutionary War hero and trusted adviser of George Washington.

In remembering his birth we respect not only the genius of Von Steuben's military contributions to our Revolutionary War, we also respect the immeasurable contribution which Americans of German ancestry have made and are making to our cherished ideals of freedom.

One out of every five immigrants from 1820 to 1961 came from Germany. They and their descendants have occupied positions of responsibility and leadership in every phase of American life, including the highest office in the land, and have vastly enriched the lives of each of us.

Regrettably, however, the freedom of American life, to which those of German descent have contributed so much, is not shared by some in other lands. Divided Germany itself stands as the symbol of the division of the world into those who are free and those who seek freedom.

From Von Steuben's day until this, the history of mankind demonstrates that freedom is indivisible. Von Steuben came to the United States to serve freedom. Today Americans are in West Germany and in Berlin for that selfsame reason, nowhere better phrased than by President Kennedy when he said, "Ich bin ein Berliner."

Friedrich von Steuben arrived in the United States in 1777, bearing letters of introduction from Benjamin Franklin and Silas Deane. He had served with distinction in the Prussian Army and had been an aide-de-camp to Frederick the Great. He now offered his services to the Continental Congress.

The Congress, impressed by his ability, accepted his offer and dispatched him to Valley Forge where he gave military drill instruction to Washington's troops.

So immediate was his success that in April 1778, Washington promoted him to inspector general with the rank of major general.

So immediately useful was his training, that for the remainder of the war the Continental Army was, unit for unit, equal in discipline and skill to the best British Regulars.

Under trying field and language difficulties, Steuben wrote a manual for the Continental Army, which then had none. His "Regulations for the Order and Discipline of the Troops of the United States" became the Army's military bible and was its official drill manual until 1812.

In 1789 Steuben preceded Lafayette as military commander in Virginia, and at Yorktown he commanded one of the three divisions which laid siege to that city, successfully putting to use many of the tactical skills he had learned in Europe.

After the surrender of Cornwallis, Steuben continued his duties as inspector general of the Army and trusted adviser to Washington. He assisted in planning for the demobilization of the Army and in outlining strategy for the future defense of the United States.

When Washington returned to private life in 1783 he deliberately made his last official act a commendation to Steuben. Washington wrote to Steuben:

I wish to make use of this last moment of my public life to signify, in the strongest terms, my entire approbation of your conduct, and to express my sense of the obligations the public is under to you, for your faithful and meritorious services.

Steuben was discharged from the Army in 1784, and moved to New York where he died 10 years later. In recognition of his services, the State of New York granted him 16,000 acres of then wild land near Utica, and the Congress granted him a pension of $2,500 annually.

Steuben today is remembered for his influence in transforming the Continental Army into an effective and disciplined military force. But he is also remembered as a symbol of the many persons from many lands who founded this great land and who have contributed and are contributing to the strengthening of its ideals. We in Michigan in particular have cause to be grateful for this German migration and it gives me great pleasure to salute today a man who provided such a great example of the contributions those of German descent have made to American life.

Credit Unions Continue To Forge Ahead—844,475 Members in Texas in 1963 Who Received More Than $16 Million in Dividends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been a supporter of the credit union movement in this country. By promoting the idea of mutual assistance, the credit unions have been a source of help to many, many people who would not otherwise have been eligible for loans, and at the same time they have promoted thrift and savings in the communities of our land.

The State of Texas has about 1,250 credit unions with 844,475 members and total assets of nearly a half billion dollars. The national picture shows over 20,000 credit unions with about 15 million members and assets of over $8 billion at the end of 1963.

It is a source of great pride to note in a letter from James M. Barry, managing director of the Texas Credit Union League, that there are 23 credit unions in my own congressional district, with 15,-

938 members. They had shares and deposits of close to $7.5 million and loans outstanding of approximately $7.2 million. They paid over $300,000 in dividends to their members in 1963. Their total assets were slightly over $8,700,000.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and pleasure that I submit for the RECORD Mr. Barry's letter of August 20 to me:

TEXAS CREDIT UNION LEAGUE,
Dallas, Tex., August 20, 1964.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: A copy of the International Credit Union Yearbook for 1964 is enclosed for your personal use and reference.

You will find the figures relating to Texas on pages 16, 24, 28, and 31. They show the steady growth of these unique self-help financial groups in our State.

As of the first of the year there were 1,247 active credit unions in Texas serving 844,475 members. These members had shares and deposits of $413,109,020 and loans outstanding of $378,873,361. Their credit unions had total assets of $471,230,266. They paid $16,350,631 in dividends to members in 1963. In addition many credit unions paid interest refunds totaling $1,410,786 to borrower members, bringing the cost of their loans still lower.

You may be interested to know that in your congressional district there were 23 credit unions with 15,938 members at the start of 1964. They had shares and deposits of $7,434,900, and loans outstanding of $7,193,400. Their reserves were $466,660, and they paid $306,500 in dividends to their members in 1963. Their total assets came to $8,763,600.

Credit union members save their money together in order to make low-cost loans to each other. They help themselves by helping each other. They do not expect help from the State or Federal Governments. They believe in standing on their own feet. The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions is one of, if not the only, Federal bureau which is completely self-supported from supervisory and examination fees. It does not draw any money from the tax rolls.

If you have any questions regarding credit unions or need any more information, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES M. BARRY,
Managing Director.

Against Poverty Since 1776

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE SKUBITZ
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, in this election year, the Congress has passed legislation the declaration of which is war against poverty. Much was written and much was said during the debate on this measure. But little thought was given to the beginning of this so-called war.

The Leon, Kans., News has recently published an article entitled "Against Poverty Since 1776." Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert this article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Although "what is past is prologue," I hope that articles like these will help to shed some light on future legislation of this type. Who knows, they may even cause some of the Members of this august body to stop, look, and listen:

AGAINST POVERTY SINCE 1776

The fight against poverty did not begin with the President's message to Congress in January—it was launched in 1776 by the signing of the Declaration of Independence. By proclaiming that the rights of man were inviolate because they were God-given, not a grant from the State, this Nation began the greatest and most successful battle against poverty in all history.

The key to our success is freedom—freedom to choose an occupation, freedom to own property, freedom to succeed or fail, freedom to select those who govern. These freedoms give everyone the opportunity to improve his position and, fired with this incentive, most people are waging their own individual campaign against poverty.

No, we have not completed eliminated poverty; but compared to any other nation, our success is outstanding. The Socialist Manifesto of Karl Marx was a declaration of war against poverty but the method of attack prescribed was the exact opposite of the formula followed in the United States. Many nations have tried to obtain "social justice" but following the Socialist pattern of a government-managed economy to equalize rewards—not opportunity. The Russian revolution of 1917 gave birth to the "dictatorship of the proletariat" but the slave state method of eliminating want has kept living standards low for all except the party elite. Swedish socialism is, at best, a comfortable peasantry which has stifled initiative and encouraged moral decay. Australia, France, West Germany, and the United Kingdom have all experimented with varying degrees of government management of the economy—all are turning away.

No one will deny that a powerful government can divide the earnings of business, agriculture, and labor so that all will have approximately equal shares. The power to levy taxes may be used to confiscate the earnings of those who produce the most so that those who are less energetic may have equal rewards. Most people support the limited use of this power to help the handicapped and unfortunate. The difficulty comes in knowing where to draw the line. Living "off the government" is a way of life for an alarmingly high number of American citizens.

The most alarming aspects of this new attack on poverty by legislation are the proposals to further inject government management into the economy. Medicare for the aged is a foot-in-the-door to socialize medicine. The ARA and RAD programs use chamber of commerce methods but are in fact another form of Federal Government intervention to influence the location of business and industrial expansion. Federal aid to education transfers much of the authority and responsibility for educating our children to the Central Government. The administration's support for government supply management in agriculture whittles away at the farmer's freedom to choose.

These and the many other huge spending programs now advocated by the Johnson administration are not an attack on poverty. Just the reverse, they attack the very things which have made our Nation relatively free of poverty—freedom to work or play, freedom to spend or save, freedom to own a TV set and a Cadillac but live in a shack in order to do so. We are already too far down the road that leads to socialism—a morally decrepit philosophy which destroys that incentive to do better.

If government should succeed in dividing everything equally according to need, might it not also succeed in eliminating the most important defense against want and misery—the fear of poverty.

Fuel Oil Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the restrictions on imports of residual oil into the United States continue to be a dollars-and-cents deficit to Maine and New England users of this fuel.

It is indeed unfortunate that efforts to eliminate the quota system on residual oil have come to naught, for there is absolutely no justification, in the existence of this restriction, either for security or economic purposes.

The time is long overdue for the casting off of this yoke which presses down upon the necks of industrialists in the New England sector—freedom from this restriction would prove a highly vital stimulant to the Maine and New England economies.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD some articles, pieces which treat of this matter and reinforce my views with respect to this subject. The pertinent articles follow:

[From the Portland (Maine) Sunday Telegram, Sept. 6, 1964]

FUEL OIL RESTRICTIONS

Another point which Warren Daniell, of Great Northern, brought up at the Maine products show preview press conference was his firm's need to get Federal restrictions on foreign imports of residual fuel oil lessened. Back when Great Northern started making its own power, Daniell said, someone told the company that 40-cycle current was the thing to use for industry. It worked out that 60-cycle current eventually became the thing, but Great Northern had its 40-cycle power and was stuck with it, can't interchange now with 60-cycle current. Steam power plants, fairly recently added, provide 80,000 horsepower added to the 120,000 horsepower hydroelectric and hydromechanical system. Great Northern has six power dams.

Daniell said the restrictions on residual fuel oil puts his company at a cost disadvantage that can run to $500,000 a year over many foreign competitors who buy their oil in an open market. Residual fuel oil is the largest single cost item required for operation of Great Northern's mills outside of pulpwood. That cost can run from $3 to $5 million a year, depending on water conditions. It's easy to see why Great Northern and other paper companies—as well as this State's electric power utilities—want to get restrictions on residual fuel oil cut. Daniell said that the best way to lower power rates in Maine is to lower the cost of fuel.

[From the Dover-Foxcroft (Maine) Piscataquis Observer, Aug. 27, 1964]

HOW TO SAVE OVER $2,666,000

This newspaper recently commended Congressman CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE for his at-

tempt to have lifted governmental restrictions on imports of residual fuel oil which are costing New England so much. The New England council has published some facts emphasizing the need for such action.

For instance, the State of Maine is paying over $60,000 in premium prices this year to obtain sufficient heavy fuel oil to heat State institutions. According to J. R. Dyer, State purchasing agent, projected residual fuel oil requiremens for State institutions and departments, exclusive of the University of Maine, for the period 1964–65 will total 122,870 barrels at a cost of $397,735.

According to figures recently released by the U.S. Bureau of Mines, Maine consumers during 1963 used a total of 5,332,000 barrels of residual fuel oil. Elimination of import quotas could mean an immediate saving of over $2,666,000 for the people of Maine. The saving of such an amount would certainly be appreciated by the taxpayers of the State. Congressman MCINTIRE should be encouraged in his efforts.

[From the Lewiston-Auburn (Maine) Journal, Aug. 29, 1964]

THOSE FUEL OIL QUOTAS

Unhappy as we have been over the New England council's position on grain freight rates for Maine, we are happy to commend the council for a recent release relative to the Federal import restrictions on residual fuel oil. The Journal needs no encouragement to attack the continuation of these unrealistic restrictions.

The net result of the imposition of import quotas, which started back in 1959, has been to force New England users of residual oil to pay unrealistically high premiums in order to obtain the fuel. The New England council charges specifically that last year alone "higher fuel costs and higher utility charges resulting from the increased cost added close to $30 million to the heating and electricity bills in the New England area alone."

Meanwhile, it is interesting to note that the Federal Government, through the Interior Department, has seen to it that the cost of residual fuel oil to Washington will be cut this year. This was accomplished through granting the General Services Agency an import quota covering two-thirds of its annual oil requirement of 1½ million barrels. Such relief for New England would be entirely in order and should be given if the Johnson administration is to act consistently on the matter.

Of course we do not believe there should be any import quotas maintained for this product. American oil producers are eager to manufacture as little of this oil as possible. As the council commentary notes, to the oil producer residual fuel oil is "like sawdust to a carpenter."

We trust the New England congressional delegation will work as a team in an attempt to get the Johnson administration to see the light. Residual fuel oil quotas must go.

[From the Dover-Foxcroft (Maine) Piscataquis Observer, Aug. 20, 1964]

CONGRESSMAN MCINTIRE AND OIL QUOTAS

Congressman CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, of the Second District, again deserves commendation for his continuing battle for reduction or elimination of quotas of residual oil imports. "With the decline of approximately $460 million in prime military contracts between fiscal years 1962 and 1963 in the New England States," he said, "it behooves the administration to move quickly in the reduction or elimination of the restrictive residual oil import quotas.

"Maine and the other five New England States are in a daily battle to keep our industries expanding. One way to help this six-State region is to eliminate the residual oil quotas.

"The administration, with a stroke of the pen, can free some $25 million that New Englanders are forced to pay in extra costs for oil.

"The harsh, punitive residual oil quotas have been imposed too long, and must be removed if we are to keep pace in today's competitive industrial race."

Not only does the present oil quota situation have a bearing on the industrial well being of New England, but also on the economic welfare of thousands of citizens who heat their homes and places of business with oil which has become a necessity, albeit almost a luxury at its present price.

Congressman MCINTIRE certainly has thousands of people behind him in his battle.

Rev. Henry J. Callis, a Former Slave Who Gave the Lincoln Memorial Invocation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, Mr. Leon Callis, an employee of the House of Representatives, told me about the accomplishments and life of his great and good father, Rev. Henry J. Callis, which impressed me so much that I asked his good son Leon, to furnish me a biographical sketch of his revered father who lived, labored, and preached the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He was born in the year 1852, and passed to his reward in 1962. Reverend Callis lived a fruitful life, going about the Nation doing good for his fellow man.

A short, biographical sketch of Reverend Callis follows, which was furnished me by the reverend's son, Leon:

Henry Jesse Callis was born a slave on the Smith Plantation in Mathews County, Va. On the death of Capt. John Smith, his owner, the young boy was sent to live with Louisa Williams, Captain Smith's daughter. It was there, during the peninsula campaign of 1862, that Union soldiers raided the area, taking the slaves with them as they left. Then began a strange odyssey for this child of 8 years, which lasted nearly to his death at 100.

On board the troopship that took him from his old home to Yorktown, he discovered a half-brother he had never known. This older brother took Henry under his protection and made a home for him in Slabtown in Yorktown. Perhaps a year later, the former slave boy was moved to an orphanage in Hampton, Va. A wounded soldier in a nearby hospital selected him to be taken to New York to the Jenkins family, who wanted to care for and educate one of these orphans. Not adjusting well in this family, he finally spent the years until manhood, in indentured service on farms on Long Island.

About 1875, he entered Hampton Institute, from which he was graduated in 1879. He taught 1 year in Mathews County and one in Norfolk County, Va.

Subsequently, he worked as a waiter and bank janitor in Rochester, N.Y.

Since his early years in Long Island, Henry Callis had been a faithful Christian and a stalwart worker in the church. After serving some time as a lay preacher, in 1892 he was ordained in the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church and began his ministry, which lasted until 1946. He held charges from Boston to Elizabeth City, N.C., and from Rochester, N.Y., to San Francisco.

One of the historic churches under which Reverend Callis pastored was the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church at Second and D Streets SW., Washington, a landmark, the victim of urban renewal. It was in this church that the first school for Negro children in Washington was organized. During the period of Reverend Callis' ministry at this church, the Lincoln Memorial was dedicated and the former slave gave the invocation.

Henry Jesse Callis was a life-long pleader for Negro equality. Almost from the time of its inception, he was a member of the executive board of the Federal Council of Churches of America. He was a true believer in the teachings of Jesus Christ; a humanitarian in its broadest sense.

Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON W. GLENN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, it is timely that positions on the controversial medicare legislation be brought to the attention of the Congress. Hence, a recent editorial in the Catholic Star Herald having a large circulation in southern New Jersey is pertinent:

[From the Catholic Star Herald, Sept. 11, 1964]

MEDICARE NOW

We hope President Johnson's magic touch with Congress does not fail him now that a limited form of medicare is on the verge of becoming the law of the land. The tax cut was good, the antipoverty bill better, but now we must not forsake our old people. For too long health care has been an unfair burden they have had to bear. After a lifetime of contributing their talents and energies to the national well-being, senior citizens find themselves in a cruel dilemma as old age arrives. With old age comes a decline in earning power coupled often with a decline in health. Proudly our elders pay their hospital and doctor fees which now descend upon them like a merciless hurricane until one day they awaken bereft of their hard-earned savings. Only then are they entitled to community assistance—if they are fortunate enough to belong to a State that makes such provision.

True, there are younger kin who can come to their aid—if they have any such relatives who can afford to help them. But why should illness, difficult enough to bear at any time, become a double-edged sword to those over 65? There is no sane or humane or religious reason why such a state of affairs should continue.

What about private health insurance? Well, according to a 1962 report of the hospital research and educational trust, "Less than half the aged (65 and over) have any health insurance at all and one-third of all low-income persons have no coverage." Well, why don't they get coverage? Again the aged are trapped in a dilemma. Since they are more prone to illness the insurance rates are higher, while their age has placed them in an income bracket of less than $2,700 annually.

There remain the political reasons why medicare has been thwarted. There are the craven fears of some politicians who would not offend the powerful and affluent AMA

which steadfastly opposes any form of Federal medicare. Actually, the AMA opposition does not stem from a desire to destroy the legitimate hopes of old people but from the fear that this is the first step toward socialized medicine. Frankly, there is no guarantee it will not be. But why make our senior citizens the scapegoats of a battle to prevent the establishment of socialized medicine?

But the way of political medicine is to forestall anything that may evolve into a threat against a profession which in our day seems more anxious about wealth than health. So there is little likelihood the AMA will relent. Consequently it will be up to the people themselves to urge their Congressmen to accept the Senate's medicare amendment to the revised social security bill.

Our Beloved Friend, Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to incorporate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a fine report by an illustrious television commentator who is well known and highly respected on Capitol Hill, Mr. Joseph McCaffrey. He speaks of a man who is a classic in American politics, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr. The comments of Mr. McCaffrey reflect the thoughts of all Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who have a profound respect and deep affection for our beloved friend, Speaker MARTIN, and they read as follows:

A friend of mine is ill in Bethesda Naval Hospital and I thought I might just tell you a little about him tonight. He is, without doubt, one of the kindest, most thoughtful men in political life I have ever met.

He was born in 1884, the day before Grover Cleveland, a Democrat, was elected for the first time. His Democratic father wanted to name him Grover Cleveland, but his mother was a Republican and she said no.

Years later it might have been embarrassing for the Republican Speaker of the House of Representatives to be named Grover Cleveland Martin. Especially when he would be the only Republican to sit as Speaker of the House in a span of more than 30 years. Instead, he was named JOSEPH WILLIAM after his father. The father never made more than $18 a week, but young JOE got through high school, working as a delivery boy for the North Attleboro Evening Chronicle. He also picked up some money by playing semipro ball. He was a shortstop and he must have been pretty good, because away back in those days he got $10 a game. And he saved money. He saved it so well that he was able to help a younger brother through college and, when the opportunity came, he was able to invest in the Evening Chronicle and become its editor.

In 1912 he went to the statehouse, then to the State senate and in 1924 he was elected to Congress. At one time, when no one else would take the job, JOSEPH MARTIN served as Republican national chairman, during the hey-day of the New Deal. In 1947 when the Republicans organized the House and in 1953 when they did it again, MARTIN was elected Speaker.

The best tribute that can be paid to Speaker MARTIN was voiced one day some years ago by his great friend, Speaker Sam Rayburn, who said, "JOE never hurt anyone in his life and I think if he had to he would quit this business."

That is the kind of a man Mr. MARTIN is; and everyone hopes he comes back soon.

Sustained Power at Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, Defenders Day, September 12, the anniversary of the successful defense of Baltimore against the British in 1814, is an important day for Baltimoreans. This year they marked the 150th anniversary of this defense. The Propellor Club, Port of Baltimore, regularly observes the occasion with a special dinner, held this year on September 10.

In view of the recent important engagements of the Navy, it was fitting that the president, Robert M. Calder, and the chairman, Ed Mester, should have chosen a Navy man as the speaker for the occasion. He was Cmdr. Joseph J. Meyer, Jr., U.S. Navy, a graduate of the Naval Submarine School at New London, a veteran of 21 years in the Navy and now serving as submarine warfare evaluator in the Office of Chief of Naval Operations in Washington.

With many prominent leaders in shipping and maritime circles in the Baltimore area, it was my privilege to attend the dinner. I was very much impressed by Commander Meyer's remarks on the vital importance of sustained power at sea, and therefore take the opportunity to insert them in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the benefit of all Members of the Congress:

SUSTAINED POWER AT SEA

(By Comdr. Joseph J. Meyer, U.S. Navy)

It is an honor and a privilege, as a representative of the Chief of Naval Operations, and for me personally, to join with you this evening in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the successful defense of this city against a foreign invader.

And while we are about it, it seems to me, that it would be well to consider why it was necessary to defend Baltimore in the first place.

The War of 1812 is a classic example of what can happen when a nation is indifferent to its stake in the sea.

This was a war that was fought because the United States had become a great maritime power among the nations of the world. But, the growth of American commerce and trade on the high seas, did not, unhappily, carry with it the naval power needed to protect our shipping, or our country, from the ravages, the intimidation, and coercion of the British Fleet.

Baltimore sat in the very center of this young Nation's maritime prosperity. Indeed, Baltimore's very wealth and growth as a city stemmed from the sea. Baltimore was a city deeply involved. For the American privateer and our struggling young Navy represented our only means of carrying the war to the enemy—and carry it they did—all the way to the English Channel.

It was the only offensive power we had.

Our victories at sea gave the Nation heart—they gave the Nation a sense of unity. Is it any wonder then, that the British labeled Baltimore a "Den of Pirates" and were anxious to extract their revenge.

Our naval power under Perry and McDonough on the Great Lakes, brought about the collapse of the British effort in that part of the country. These victories kept northern Ohio, Michigan, the western territories and the State of Maine from falling under the sovereignty of the British Crown.

But our naval power on the Chesapeake and on the Potomac River was so weak, that the Royal Navy roamed at will—and Baltimore, that hotbed of maritime activity, was a target of the English torch.

And out of the successful defense of this city was born our national anthem—150 years ago.

A bit of research shows that a surprising number of songs were in contention for this great honor. Some of the other contenders certainly had merit, but one is at a loss to explain what prompted the supporters of "The Girl I Left Behind Me" and "There'll Be a Hot Time in the Old Town Tonight."

But because of the efforts and energies of the Star-Spangled Banner Commission, a commission formed in this city just 50 years ago this month, Key's immortal work was adopted by Congress in 1931 as our national anthem.

It is fitting too, in this the 150th anniversary year, that Mr. Paul Nitze, the Secretary of the Navy, has designated the 40th nuclear-powered Polaris submarine to be built by this Nation, to bear the name of Francis Scott Key. The keel for the U.S.S. *Francis Scott Key* will be laid in exactly 30 days, on October 10, at Groton, Conn. And it is most appropriate indeed that a ship, whose sole purpose is to defend this Nation, whose sole purpose is to keep thermonuclear peace on this planet, should bear his name.

For Key, who wrote our national anthem in a moment of supreme inspiration, also wrote it in a moment of great national stress and peril. And he expressed, for all time, and for all men, the characteristic feelings that his Nation had toward war. He described a nation determined, not to provoke war, but a nation determined to defend its freedom and national honor, whenever and wherever it is threatened.

Since Key's day in history, the world has undergone great changes. We are witnesses ourselves to the greatest social, economic, and technological revolution in history.

Yet, in spite of all this change, human nature is still pretty much the same. In all the history of the world—before and after the Fort McHenry Star-Spangled Banner—man has been involved in various forms of conflict with his fellow men.

The same is true of nations. Nations seeking to protect or further their own interests inevitably find themselves cross-threaded with other nations.

The result is conflict, and recorded history, beginning with the morning newspaper, tells us that this world we live in has seen very little real peace over the centuries.

Treaties are made and broken with remarkable regularity when nations consider their ambitions are being stymied, or their security is in jeopardy.

Another unchanging fact in this changing world is that every neighborhood has a bully. We need not look beyond World War II, Korea, or the sacking of Tibet to realize that a bully canot be dealt with from a position of weakness. Whether it be weakness of the national will, or weakness of the military muscle, weakness only encourages aggression—it has never stopped it.

The Bible tells us, "When the strong man, fully armed, guards his courtyard, his property is undisturbed."

Human nature has not changed. This is why America maintains strong military power. It is not only vital to our security, but it is essential to the resolve and determination of the entire free world.

This brings me to seapower, the need for sustained power at sea, and the role it plays in our national life. To begin with, seapower is more than naval power. Years ago, Admiral Mahan, America's first great geopolitician, made the point that, "It is not only the military strength afloat that rules the sea." Instead, he spoke of production, of the exchange of goods, and of the means by which the exchange is carried on. He made the point that naval power is the natural, legitimate, healthy offspring of a nation that has a highly skilled industrial base, is strong economically, and has crucial commercial interests.

It is clear that a nation that is strong on the seas has the ability to do some rather remarkable things. It is equally clear that no nation in history has ever regained a position as a great world seapower, once having lost it. The seas bring us strength and prosperity—or they bring us war and disaster—man must shape this destiny. The seas are indifferent.

"Power for Peace" is the watchword of the Department of Defense. This enormous complex of forces, military talent, and hardware keeps the watch to preserve freedom and peace in the world. The closely knit defense forces—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines—continuously demonstrate the uses of power for peace.

Do you realize that over 12 times last year the Navy responded to trouble? Our fleets are well fitted to the job, for theirs is a sustained power. It is already there. The precise power needed can be applied where needed, when needed, and before the fact.

Just as a nation has purposes, American power on the seas has purpose, based on those of the nation that created it. American power on the oceans is molded as American policy and purpose demand.

Each of us here tonight is a symbol of the strength of America. Our task of leading the free world demands projections of our national power in all its forms, to all the far corners of the earth. National power—be it economic, political, cultural, or military—seapower plays a special role in the projection of each of these forms of power.

What, then, is our means for oversea projections of power? How do we do it? How does seapower support our global policies? What are the factors of seapower? How does this power shape our very lives, families, homes, and jobs?

Let us look now at the oceans themselves. They cover nearly three-quarters of the globe. This is some 35 times the size of the United States. These waters belong to no single nation or group of nations. They belong to all nations. This is the general theory of international sea law. But seapower backs the theory with reality.

To learn more about the seas, we are in a race with time; for those who ignore the sea, history has shown, are doomed to suffer at the hands of other nations who do not ignore it. What we don't know can hurt us badly. This greater home of ours on earth is far more than the ground on which we stand. Today I hope to train your sights to sea—to the opportunity that lies beyond our shores.

The modern reality of seapower's dimensions is awesome indeed. We are forced into new ways of thinking, of looking at the world in terms of new potentials of commerce as well as warfare.

The ocean domain is millions upon millions of square miles of water—but many more millions of cubic miles beneath the surface—and above it.

We are just beginning to look at the crust of the earth beneath the ocean bottoms. We are just beginning to make maps of the great continents beneath the waves, of undersea Everests and Grand Canyons, of troughs and plains, of life on the move—inside this jungle of liquid space.

We are just beginning to explore this ocean space of our planet. We are just beginning to delve into the infinite waters that harbor both opportunity and danger.

Total sea strength also includes exploitation of the sea's resources. Our oceanographic studies of the sea's domain—still uncharted, hardly touched for the wealth that may lie beneath the waves. The oceans are a treasurehouse of minerals, a farmland waiting to be harvested.

But, let us now take a look at these United States.

We're not as big as we sometimes think. Only 2 percent of the earth's surface. A mere postage stamp on this map of the world—housing only 6 percent of the earth's people.

But what a country. Her responsibilities extend around the entire earth. It would be too bad for us if all our power were limited to our own territory. We would be vulnerable to disaster if that were so. Why? Just listen.

In economic terms, we depend on the sea to trade. We need 77 strategic materials to keep our industry going. We are self-sufficient in fewer than a dozen of them. Few of the things we use each day are actually home grown, neither our telephone nor refrigerators. Among the other 66 are the indispensable rubber and tin, even such significant items as manganese, without which our entire steel industry would be closed. Without minerals from overseas, factories would close, businesses would shut down, jobs would be destroyed, our standard of living, our power as a Nation would be sharply reduced.

Cargo is cargo. In war or peace, the overwhelming bulk of what we transport must go in the hulls of ships. That's not a theory—it's a fact. Why? Let's take a ton of cargo and send it to England by ship—here's your bill: $40. We can well pay the high price of air transport from time to time. It is pure gold for precious express but it would be extravagant even beyond our means to make a habit of it. In a hurry, ship it by air, but here's your bill: $2,000. This is why the bulk of our international trade is carried in ships, and how much is that? The answer is overwhelming: 98.25 percent.

In this sense, maritime power means the ships to carry our products overseas and to carry the products we need to us. That is the economic side of seapower. It keeps us prosperous as a people, strong as a Nation.

In these terms, seapower is truly everybody's interest, everybody's concern, everybody's business.

And this is one of the big "whys" of naval power, the military side of seapower, because naval powr is the protector, the policeman on the beat of the oceans—guards the 70,000 miles of trade routes that are like arteries to our national bloodstream, guards the some 7,000 ships that ply these oceanic highways every day—fighting seapower guards the very health and life of the American economy, which would falter and wither if the ships were not free to come and go. No seapower, no America as we know it, prosperous, powerful, and secure.

Thus, the Navy's classic role: to protect this shipping and these sealanes, to control the seas.

Cut these arteries and you will stop the heart.

There are those who may give it a try. Soviet submarines, over 400 of them, constitute 8 times the undersea fleet that Hitler had at the beginning of World War II. And Soviet-built submarines have been supplied to the satellite countries, to Communist China and also to Indonesia and Egypt.

Since the last war, the Communist empire has engulfed more than five times the population and twice the area of the United States in its drive for world power. We can see all too readily that the challenge we face cannot be met by words alone, however reasonable, however logical unless these words are supported by power and the will to use that power to the necessary degree.

Congress itself warns the American people of the Soviet maritime threat. For the Soviets pose a tremendous challenge to us. No nation has built up its merchant marine and Navy faster since World War II.

The Soviets, outdistancing us in the growth of their merchant marine, have plans calling for even greater growth in the 1970's. They are due to double the tonnage of their own merchant fleet while our merchant tonnage is declining.

The trend is serious. On a parity with us now, the Soviet Union soon will leave us in their wake. They have recognized the esseniality of seapower to their economic and military strength. The Soviet Union has embarked on a building program that makes our own shipbuilding effort look anemic. And I should add that their fishing fleets are so modern, so advanced, that one wonders why the fish need so much complex electronic gear. Perhaps they didn't set it up for the halibut.

Their oceanographic ships are the most advanced on earth.

Off our own shores, these Red ships move in tireless patrols on international waters.

In surface ships they have outbuilt all the free world navies combined. Their modern cruisers and destroyers launch seabased missiles just as their submarines do. Yet they have no carriers. This is a critical lack.

Their airpower at sea must depend entirely on land bases.

One of the great dangers we face comes from the modern missile-firing submarine, the threat to our continent from the oceans is mounting rapidly. Already, they have a most dangerous capability to strike us.

Soviet submarines can launch missiles—nuclear missiles—from off our shores. That is why antisubmarine warfare is one of the Navy's top priority missions. The capability of enemy subs to loft the bomb onto our cities and continental bases is increasing rapidly—Chicago, Kansas City, and Denver are all coming into their sights. Soon no part of America will be beyond range.

For America ends, as do all other lands, despite different laws, only 3 miles from the shore, but America's responsibilities, and her dangers know no border.

Though our naval leaders provide naval advice at the highest levels, the decision to fight or not to fight is the ultimate responsibility of the elected Government of the United States—the executive branch, and the legislative branch, the Congress. The Navy translates the decision into action; it enforces the decision, it does not make that decision.

For naval power is the military side of seapower. It is fighting power upon the domain of the sea.

And the unique thing that distinguishes naval power is its sustained mobility. It does not stand still. It appears in force when and where needed. It can hover as a helicopter, it can be tailored to fit the need; it can apply a punishment to fit the crime. It moves constantly on the waters of the world poised for all eventualities. Whether in balanced forces projecting American might across the seas or in its presence alone, ready for anything, task force or fleet, separately or all at once. Moving power,

sustained power, immediate power to keep the world open to America is the job of the Navy. On this we all depend for our personal prosperity, our national security.

It demands constant vigilance; not an easy responsibility to bear. The long voyage out means a long way from home. For weeks and months, sometimes for years, sometimes a bit tedious. But, protecting America is high adventure, high responsibility. You never know when the job explodes out of the routine into the spectacular. Things come up suddenly—the Navy-Marine assault teams are a key instrument in keeping the peace—to contain the trouble spot—to put out the fire before it spreads.

Whatever the trouble, whatever the danger, the Navy's job is to go into harm's way immediately, ready to fight on the way, and on arrival, if fight they must or to stand in wait to fly the flag to move into position, whatever is called for. By ourselves—the American people who built the Navy in the first place and man it now. The Navy performs the will of our people, nothing more and nothing less.

Strategic seapower meets the spectrum of the situation with a spectrum of response. The spectrum of response begins with showing the flag and ends at total thermonuclear war—it requires many and varied combinations of weapons and men.

For seapower is the Navy, Marines, the Coast Guard, our fishing industry, our oceanographic effort, and the merchant marine. This total power includes our entire effort upon the oceans—foreign trade, cargo-carrying ships, sea routes, shipyards, and the businesses that support them, the factories that depend upon them, the people who work in them. It encompasses all of the natural and productive resources of the United States.

Seapower projects the might and the purposes of America beyond her small territory to the four corners of the earth where dangers lurks. But a danger that can be kept far from our shores, our people, our industry—because naval power stands between the danger and our land. This is the mission of our modern Navy, which functions with its mere presence, with a little bit of force, or with a lot of force.

We are committed to a watch upon the waters.

For example, our antisubmarine forces conduct long-range surveillance over and under the world's oceans. Hunter-killer forces in concert with our attack submarines are capable of seeking out and destroying enemy submarines. They must be combat ready at all times. If submarine action is taken against our country, there will be no time to build such a complex and specialized weapon system.

The striking power of the fleet is spearheaded by task forces comprised of aircraft carriers and their cruisers and destroyers. A powerful package of problem solvers. Their mere presence is often the best guide to the hostile inspiring prudence where it might otherwise be lacking.

With seabased forces there are no problems of national sovereignty. No worries about base concessions. No lowering of our flag because a nation, however friendly, decides we must go.

Consider our amphibious assault carriers, built to transport and launch Marine assault troops and equipment. Used in the vertical envelopment assault tactics developed by the Marine Corps, troops scramble from the flight deck by helicopter to reach and hold the precious high ground—to fan out from there to get the situation in hand. For this too, is part of the long inland reach of power from the sea.

To support such fleet actions we need to base and deploy supply ships, oilers, minelayers, minesweepers, tenders, transports, they and many more form the configuration of power at sea. For the dangers that lie in wait are met not only by naval force, in all its majesty, but by naval work in all its tedious routine. Power at sea stands between the threat and America itself—the fleet is there to bear the brunt.

But let us take a look at some of the fleet actions called for by our Government in recent years.

Korea: Where the carrier striking forces of the 7th Fleet guarded the waters along this vital neck of Asian land directly threatened by communism.

Lebanon: Where the battle-ready marines were ashore a short 7 hours after the call, showing the importance of tactical timing in limited situation.

Cuba: 1962—pretty close to home. We could not tolerate Russian missiles only 90 miles from Florida. To back up our Government's diplomatic pressures we used the special persuasive logic of military force. We immediately sailed the 2d Fleet for quarantine action, and possibly for something more. Seapower was present—as a matter of fact, several battalions of marines were embarked and ready to hit the beach. The eloquence of that power was convincing—silent, but effective beyond the power of words alone.

And the most recent case, in the Gulf of Tonkin in southeast Asia, where naval force responded with the precise amount of power in answer to a specific situation. Where it was demonstrated once again, that the United States could not sustain itself in force in Vietnam, or anywhere else for that matter, unless it maintains supremacy over the seas and the sea lines of communications.

Let us now look at our modern Navy. It has evolved from revolutionary scientific progress in this, the 20th century. It is a product of the Navy scientific-industrial team.

Our Polaris fleet is not only ready for war, it has tipped the strategic balance to our favor. We now have the strategic initiative. This ballistic missile can be fired from a submerged submarine to targets 2,900 statute miles away. Now no place on earth is beyond the reach of this power from the sea. Polaris is truly America's great deterrent to a potential enemy.

Nonetheless, our total national security, and the means to insure it, remains too complex for any single weapon system or any single strategy to be the complete answer to the problems that beset us.

The news release of the world cruise of our nuclear-powered surface ships, Nuclear Task Force 1—Operation Sea Orbit—has heightened public interest in our modern Navy. This force began its circumnavigation of the globe about 6 weeks ago. From Gibraltar, it sped down the West Coast of Africa, around the Cape of Good Hope and into the Indian Ocean. After a goodwill visit to Karachi, these ships headed for Australia where more port visits were made. Now headed for the Horn, these ships will swing into the Atlantic and steam for the fabulous city of Rio de Janeiro. From there, these three ships will return to the United States, arriving in Norfolk, Va., during the first week of October.

These are the types of ships we must build for the future fleet, future opportunity, future security. The Navy must take advantage of the fruits of technology, and this includes the use of nuclear power in all of its major combatant ships.

The attack aircraft carrier in the Sea Orbit group is the *Enterprise*. Upon the waters of the world you will see nothing to surpass her. Our first and only nuclear-powered carrier, she is a permanent, moving airport for a hundred planes—bombers and fighters—for every naval task from reconnaissance to strafing, from missile firing to bombing, from incendiaries to the most devastating of weapons.

This mobile base for American power can stand well offshore and strike all types of targets well inland if need be—that can attack military forces of all kinds—factories, cities, or anything else.

The new Navy has tough cruisers. First among them is the *Long Beach*, a nuclear-propelled modern warship that contributes to the projection of power of the fleet. There are also 13 conventional cruisers whose turrets bristle with guided missiles. Computerized controls keep them zeroed on targets—these missiles are the Terrier, the Tartar, the Talos. They have different destructive powers, different purposes. These tactical examples of the spectrum of possibility, depending as always on what precisely we must do on a particular day at a particular place.

The virtuoso of naval power—the workhorse—neither too small nor too large; maneuverable, fast, deadly, this destructive fighting ship known as the destroyer. We have 231 of them, unfortunately many of World War II construction.

The feasibility of nuclear propulsion in modern destroyer types is demonstrated by the destroyer leader *Bainbridge*—and soon the *Truxton*.

The combination of nuclear power with advanced hull design has given us the fast attack submarine—a true submersible, capable of moving at speeds once thought impossible.

Not only to sink enemy shipping but to serve in the ASW role of detecting and attacking enemy submarines in the vast battlefield under the sea.

With resolute research, we must maintain the modernity and striking power of our fleet.

From nuclear propulsion to basic research into the exploration of space, from oceanographic expeditions to the quest for new types of ships and weapons, naval research has taxed, with frequent success, the best scientific minds the Nation has. Today we seek even greater scientific success. For the need is urgent, perhaps even more urgent than we think.

Based on research results the Navy will use space and space techniques when and where it will perform a mission better. Navy researchers pioneered much of the Nation's space effort. After 6 years, the Satellite Vanguard still is in near-perfect orbit. Satellites can give better worldwide fleet communications, better navigation, and provide better weather analysis for fleet commanders. By placing the right kind of eyes in them, the job of oceanspace surveillance may be made manageable.

Will the Navy measure up in times to come? It will depend upon people. Those who plan, study, design; who experiment, seek better ways—the Navy, in the name of the country, encourages leadership, inquiry, creativity—as well as courage. The source for all this is the American people themselves, who created their Navy by their will and by their work.

The worldwide strategy of American seapower depends upon the men and the ships and the weapons, for the plans are never greater than the flesh and blood that carry them out.

Navy men in ships, and planes, keep the watch upon the waters, beneath them, and above them, ready to take the action called for by our Nation's will. The Navy itself serves the national purpose in precise ways at precise times.

For the seas of the world, 35 times the size of America, are ours to use and to enjoy, along with men everywhere—if we are wise enough, if we are strong enough to command what is ours—if our actions are equal to our purposes.

America's might projected across the planet from the ocean bottom to the end of the atmosphere. Such is the mission.

A sound and flexible strategy for our times follows the fluid avenues of the seas. The magic of ocean mobility allows us to project discriminate power for peace instantly in the dimensions of the when, the where, and the how.

Seapower is a global function of the global concept of power for peace. It is worth the costs in sweat and tears. It is worth fighting for.

Seapower belongs to you. You own it. You pay for it. Yours are its dividends—in freedom.

The Easy Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE SKUBITZ
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, John McCormally, editor of the Hutchinson (Kans.) News, is a man who embraces the Keynesian theory of economics. But, recently, Mr. McCormally took an about face on the tax-cut bill. In my State of Kansas, this is real news; and Ray Call, a member of the editorial staff of the Emporia Gazette, seized the opportunity to expound on Mr. McCormally's thought.

For interesting reading, Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

THE EASY WAY

For a change, an editorial in the Hutchinson News makes sense. Whatever the reason, this bit of opinion is worth reprinting:

Government economists this spring were rattling their abacuses with one hand and scratching their heads with the other trying desperately to explain what Americans were doing with the income tax saving generous Uncle Sam had passed their way.

Now equally puzzled taxpayers are wondering if they really did get a tax cut or was it all just a dream.

Those Kansans who saved their few dollars-a-week bonanza for a "rainy" day discovered the rainy day had become a drencher.

On successive days Kansans were told: First, they will be paying more for their telephone service (if they are served by Southwestern Bell); second, automobile insurance rates are going up; third, the cost of home insurance coverage will increase.

All that on top of a cost-of-living hike in July, largest monthly rise in a year.

No wonder bewildered Kansans are turning pockets inside out trying to find some evidence of the tax windfall that had been jingling there earlier.

This can be carried another step. The obvious question to many people is this: How much further in debt will this Nation be because of the tax cut?

Those who have good recollection may remember that the high-powered economists predicted the tax cut would give a big boost to the economy. They reasoned next that the boom in business would bring in enough income tax to offset the tax cut, and the country soon would be in the black again.

The economy is booming, true. In fact, inflation has started again, as shown by the rise in the cost of living. No one doubted that it would. But the theory that the new business activity will bring in stacks and stacks of money for the Government appears to be as idiotic as it seemed when it was first proposed.

Many people have been fooled. They have been victims of another vote-buying gimmick. The administration seeks a tax cut to gain popularity. Men in Congress voted for the tax cut because it gave money to the folks back home who in turn will repay the kindness at the ballot box in November.

The tax cut brought a lot of votes. The public opinion polls show Johnson is running far ahead of his opposition in most States, Kansas included. The gimmick worked so well that there is talk of another tax cut this winter, and possibly a slash in excise taxes.

What the heck? Let's go all the way. Why not eliminate Federal taxes altogether? President Johnson could announce that he has unscrewed enough light bulbs to warrant an end to taxes; no income tax, no excise tax; no postage stamps; nothing. Think how nice it would be to have all that withholding put back into the pay envelope.

Next, let's give some Government money to all people. The poor folks can get paid under tte antipoverty bill; farmers will get more money for not raising crops; old folks can have help from the Treasury with their medical bills; kids who do not want to go on to college, or who prefer not to get a steady job, may find a home in the Peace Corps; Government employees can get a raise. There. That should take care of enough voters to get anyone elected.

In fact, voters would be ecstatic. Johnson would win unanimously.

Well, almost unanimously. Some crusty old diehard reactionaries (extremists) would stick to their silly old theory that a day of reckoning must come. They would vote against Johnson.

These narrow-minded fools would want to know where the money is to come from.

Little do they know that the national debt is unlimited. If the economy keeps moving ahead, the United States can go into debt more and more each year. Forget the future. We've been doing all right so far; why worry? If the theory of unending increase in the Federal debt is sound, then the United States should abandon taxes and dole out more money.

Now we ask you: what kind of fool would swallow all that bunk? Wait until November and see.—R.C.

The Old-Age Health Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WM. J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, like nearly every Member of this House, my mail has been very heavy the last few days on the subject of the amendments to the Social Security Act, providing for hospitalization.

Several days ago in the Kansas City Star in the lead editorial of Friday, September 4, 1964, there appeared an appraisal of the old-age health issue which I thought provided some needed emphasis of some of the things that might be of interest to the membership. Even if that is not true, this insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that editorial sets forth as a matter of general information the current position of a great newspaper of the midlands, on this important issue.

The editors believe the entire matter should be put off until the new Congress in 1965, when the country is not involved in the heat of an emotional presidential campaign. I think they quite rightly submitted that the issue should be left for calmer deliberation in 1965.

It was interesting to note that the Kansas City Star agrees the plan is misnamed and that it is not "medicare" at all, but is a hospitalization and nursing plan. I thought it was particularly noteworthy that this paper states editorially that the plan is not "socialized" medicine that provides every kind of health care for everybody. It is hard to make a choice as to which one thought in this editorial is more important than the others. Yet it seems to me the analysis of the problem is the keenest when the Star says editorially that eventually an old-age health plan is going to be passed and will be paid for either through social security or through general revenues from a Federal source, or through some combination of Federal or State taxes. In other words, it is not a matter of whether there will ever be a hospitalization and nursing plan, but only what is the best and most effective plan that can be passed, and whether the present proposals may be improved upon to be made more workable. The editorial follows:

THE OLD-AGE HEALTH ISSUE IS HERE AGAIN

The medicare issue died lingering deaths in other sessions of Congress but it has been resurrected in these waning days of the 88th. It could just as well have waited for the new Congress of 1965.

The whole matter has become so overblown—with wild statements on both sides—that it has taken on a life of its own entirely apart from whatever merits or faults it might have. Statements by the opposition lead you to believe that it would spell the end of freedom. Proponents give the impression that without it, the structure of civilization will crumble. So now, here it comes, smack-dab in the middle of one of the most emotional presidential campaigns in years.

The fact is, the plan is misnamed. It provides nothing for doctor's bills. It is a hospitalization and nursing plan. And in case you've lost your way in the welter of proposals and counterproposals, this, essentially, is what the Senate amendments would do:

As of July 1, 1965, provide hospital care for 90 days with a deductible sum ranging from $20 to $90, or 45 days with nothing deducted. For 180 days the deduction (paid by the patient) would be correspondingly greater.

Effective January 1, 1966, provide nursing home services up to 60 days after a patient left a hospital.

Provide up to 240 home visits in a calendar year for nursing case, therapy, and the like for a person under the care of a physician.

About 18 million persons past 65 years of age would be eligible including 15½ million now on social security. Costs for others would be paid from general revenue.

This is not socialized medicine that provides every kind of health care for everybody. The doctors who oppose it generally state that it is a foot in the door.

Neither are the benefits the full answer to health security in old age. This leads to a sad aspect of the political dispute. The old people are led to expect more from medicare than is proposed. Their hopes rise when the measure is introduced, amended and debated—and fall when the bill fails to get through. For too many of the debaters, medicare has become a political symbol in itself with the actual aims of the program a forgotten matter.

The fear of sickness and helplessness in old age is one of the greatest fears of man. The

proposal in the Senate would go part way toward alleviating those fears. The chief reason for opposition is the danger of loading too much on the present social security system. Certainly it would be unfortunate if the proposed social security benefit increase now before Congress should be lost in the wrangle. But, eventually, an old age health plan is going to be paid for one way or another—through social security, through the taxes that come from general revenue on the Federal level or through a combination of State and Federal taxes.

Maybe the 88th Congress will take the step. We believe that such a complex and emotional issue could reasonably be left for calmer deliberation in 1965. Within the next year, certainly, the issue ought to be settled.

The on-again, off-again frenzy of the last few years has been hard on everyone concerned—the legislators, the medical profession and above all, the potential beneficiaries.

Hempstead Elks Memorial Scholarship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. WYDLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I had the great honor recently to become a member of the Hempstead, N.Y., Lodge No. 1485, BPOE. Although I had heard of the many fine works done for the community by this great organization, the very night of my induction I was informed of a most outstanding program, the Hempstead Elks Memorial Scholarship Fund. As an effort by a single lodge, it is an inspiration worthy to be brought to the attention of my colleagues in Congress:

HEMPSTEAD ELKS MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP

For the past several years, the idea of a Hempstead Elks Scholarship has been the "dream goal" of the majority of lodge brothers. Although many very good thoughts were presented for consideration, none seemed to to fit exactly into our plans. Finally, in August 1964, a discussion with members of the Hofstra University Alumni Association led to the establishment of an excellent scholarship program, to be known hereafter as "The Hempstead Elks Memorial Scholarship Fund."

This fund was established at an initial value of $37,500, of which $25,000 has been granted to Hofstra University by the Hempstead Elks. The remaining $12,500 comes from matching funds earned by this gift, from the Ford Foundation Challenge Grant. Under the terms of this grant, every $2 raised by Hofstra is matched by $1 from the Ford Foundation. In order to earn $1 million from the Ford Foundation, the university had to raise $2 million by August 31, 1964. This drive has just been successfully completed and the Hempstead Elks are very proud to have played an important role in this worthy effort.

The objective of the Hempstead Elks Memorial Scholarship is threefold: 1. To perpetuate the memories of those members of Hempstead Lodge No. 1485 and their immediate families who have given their lives in the service of the United States of America, and to give recognition to the singular dedication and achievements on behalf of the Hempstead community rendered by the lodge. 2. To serve the youth of our community in seeking to attain higher levels of academic achievement and professional education. 3. To reward annually on the basis of merit at least one deserving student who (a) is a resident of the Hempstead lodge jurisdiction, or (b) has been a high school student in the Hempstead area and has earned a noteworthy record in both academic and service areas.

Hempstead Elks Scholarship is a perpetual fund, which will last as long as Hofstra University exists. The scholarship is not necessarily based on academic standards alone. The lodge feels that the well-rounded high school student with a good background in extracurricular activities, plus the academic qualifications should be the recipient. In other words, a student that we feel has the potential to make a real contribution to society in the future.

At present values the scholarship has a value of approximately $1,500 per year, however, with various anticipated increases in fees, etc., will eventually be worth about $2,400 annually.

The first of these scholarships will be provided beginning in the 1965–66 academic year and will cover the cost of full tuition fees, and books. Additional awards may be made as the value of the endowment increases. Each individual scholarship will be continued until the student graduates, provided he or she remains eligible. The university scholarship committee together with the exalted ruler of the Hempstead lodge will review applications from eligible candidates and will select winners who best reflect the ideals of the memorial fund in both their academic and personal accomplishments.

Hempstead Lodge feels that it has not only established a very fine scholarship program, but in addition, has erected a living monument to Elkdom in the Hempstead community.

THE HEMPSTEAD ELKS MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP FUND AT HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

The board of trustees at Hofstra University hereby establishes an endowment scholarship to be known as the Hempstead Elks Memorial Scholarship Fund.

This fund is established at an initial value of $37,500, of which $25,000 is a founding gift to the university by the membership of the Hempstead Lodge No. 1485, Benevolent & Protective Order of Elks, Hempstead, N.Y., and $12,500 is the assignment of matching funds earned by this gift from the current Ford Foundation Challenge Grant to the university.

I. OBJECTIVES

(a) To perpetuate the memories of those members of the Hempstead Lodge No. 1485, B.P.O.E., and their loved ones from their immediate families who have given their lives in the service of the United States of America; to give recognition to the singular dedication and achievements on behalf of the Hempstead community rendered by the Hempstead Lodge No. 1485, B.P.O.E.

(b) To serve the youth of Hofstra's total community in seeking higher levels of academic achievement and professional education.

(c) To reward annually on the basis of merit at least one deserving student who is either a resident of the Hempstead community, or has been a student in the Hempstead High School, and, who has earned a noteworthy record in both academic and athletic areas.

II. ADMINISTRATION OF FUND

(a) The Hempstead Elks Memorial Scholarship Fund is established on this date at a value of $37,500 as indicated above. The fund will be increased as futher donations and earnings accrue beyond the founding value.

(b) The fund will be administered by the university.

(c) The university scholarship committee with the advice of the exalted ruler of the Hempstead Lodge No. 1485 (or his representative) will make annual selections of award winners and will submit to the university president appropriate recommendations pertaining to any aspect of the fund's administration and the process for selection.

III. THE SCHOLARSHIP

(a) Income from the Hempstead Elks Memorial Scholarship Fund will provide at least one award comprising full tuition, fees, and books annually, beginning in the 1965–66 academic year. Additional awards may be made in similar amounts as the value of the endowment increases. Each individual scholarship awarded will be continued each succeeding year until graduation, provided the student remains eligible.

(b) The university scholarship committee, with the advice of the exalted ruler of the Hempstead Lodge (or his representative) will review applications received from eligible candidates and select winners who in their combined judgment best reflect the ideals of the spirit of this memorial fund in their academic and personal accomplishments.

(c) To be eligible for recommendation to the university scholarship committee, applicants for the Hempstead Elks Memorial Scholarship must meet at least three general requirements:

1. Academic qualification for any full time undergraduate degree program at Hofstra University.

2. Demonstration through superior academic and athletic performance, the potential for outstanding achievement at Hofstra.

3. Evidence of those personal qualities leading to effective citizenship as indicated by productive participation in co-curricular and community activities.

(d) All award winners will be known as Hempstead Elks Scholars.

IV. OTHER ELEMENTS

(a) Appropriate public announcement will be made by the university of the availability of these merit scholarships and the selection and progress of the Hempstead Elks Scholars.

(b) The Hempstead Lodge No. 1485, B.P.O.E., will be listed in the University Roll of Honor and in appropriate announcements of this award.

Approved on August 15, 1964.

DANIEL L. MONROE,
Chairman, Board of Trustees, Hofstra University.

LAWRENCE J. FITZGERALD,
Exalted Ruler, Hempstead Lodge No. 1485, Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks, Sponsor.

The 5th Special Forces Group (Airborne)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include herewith the material referred to in my remarks in the House earlier today:

THE 5TH SPECIAL FORCES (AIRBORNE)

The 5th Special Forces colors fly the streamers of 16 campaigns which were conducted during World War II and were accomplished in North Africa, Europe, and the Pacific Theater of Operations. The 5th Special Forces Group lineage derives from two units of World War II fame—the 1st Spe-

cial Service Forces and the 5th Ranger Infantry Battalion.

The 1st Special Service Force was activated at Fort William Henry Harrison, Mont., on July 9, 1942, where it trained until committed overseas. This unit was a joint American-Canadian force and first saw action in North Africa where they made the initial assault at Arzew, Algeria. From North Africa the unit participated in the Italian campaign and into France. At the end of the war, the unit was disbanded and the officers and men were reassigned or returned home by their respective governments.

The 5th Ranger Infantry Battalion was activated on September 1, 1943, at Camp Forrest, Tenn. After physical and combat training, the unit departed New York Harbor for England on January 8, 1944. Another phase of training was conducted in England and on June 1, 1944, the unit boarded H.M.S. *Prince Leopold* and H.M.S. *Prince Baudouin* where they remained until the assault landings on June 6, 1944, in France. The objective of the 5th Ranger Infantry Battalion on D-day was to join forces with elements of the 2d Ranger Infantry Battalion at Pointe du Hoe. The unit landed at H-hour on D-day and earned the Distinguished Unit Citation for their heroic and gallant action in securing their sector of the beachhead.

In addition to the Distinguished Unit Citation for their action on D-day the 5th Ranger Infantry Battalion earned three other Distinguished Unit Citations and the French Croix de Guerre with Silver-Gilt Star.

The 5th Special Forces Group (Airborne), 1st Special Forces, was activated at Fort Bragg, N.C., on September 21, 1961. The assigned primary mission of the unit was to train personnel for duty in southeast Asia in the Republic of Vietnam. To accomplish this mission the unit established a group area study section where study of the group's geographic area of operations and French language training was initiated in October 1961. Also, in October 1961 the unit participated in the post-wide demonstration for the President of the United States.

The year 1962 was the first full year of operation for the 5th Special Forces Group and during this year the group was increased to full T.O. & E. strength. In addition, Vietnamese and Thai language training was instituted. The goal of this program was limited fluency with primary concentration on speaking.

On September 9, 1962, one "C" detachment and four "A" detachments were deployed on 6 months' TDY to southeast Asia for duty in Vietnam and on September 24, 1962, additional personnel were committed.

On November 12, 1962, the group was required to organize and activate and staff a special forces operational base for ultimate deployment to southeast Asia. This unit departed this station for Vietnam on November 17, 1962.

On December 27, 1962, one "B" detachment and two "A" detachments were deployed for 6 months' TDY to southeast Asia for duty in Vietnam.

In addition to furnishing the above personnel, the unit participated in the following field exercises during the period indicated:

Operation Fanny, January 1962.

Operation Seneca Spear, April 1962.

Operation Guerrilla Road, April–May 1962.

Operation Iron Dragoon, May 1962.

Operation Swift-Strike II, July–August 1962.

Operation Devil Arrow, September 1962.

The year 1963 saw the continuance of mission training for deployment of personnel to southeast Asia. The training centered in and around 20 field exercises, demonstrations, and mobile training team missions. Premission training to all deployed units was conducted in the area study facility, language training, in both French and Vietnamese, and cross training of all deployed special forces personnel in various MOS's.

On July 27, 1963, the present commander, Col. Herbert F. Roye, succeeded Col. Lloyd E. Wills. The 5th Special Forces Group has had three commanders of which Colonel Roye is the third.

On September 21, 1963, the unit unveiled its memorial to those members of the unit who have lost their lives in the Republic of Vietnam. To date, there are 11 names engraved on the memorial stone. The fact that other special forces groups have deployed detachements to Vietnam and have borne the burden of sacrifice to the cause of freedom is not neglected.

Other special forces groups with personnel deployed to Vietnam include the 7th Special Forces Group, which is stationed at Fort Bragg, and the 1st Special Forces Group on Okinawa.

After the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, 13 enlisted men and 1 officer of the unit served in the ceremonies as honor guard, paying a last tribute to the Commander in Chief who authorized special forces its distinctive green beret.

The main exercise in which the group participated was Polar Siege which was conducted in Alaska during the period December 1963 to February 1964. The 5th Special Forces Group deployed personnel whose mission was to train the Alaskan Scouts in the principles of guerrilla warfare and the Alaskan Scouts trained the special forces personnel in arctic survival techniques.

In June 1964 the unit dispatched two "A" detachements to the World's Fair in New York City. Their mission was to display T.O. & E. equipment peculiar to special forces and demonstrations of techniques in rappelling.

Members of the 5th Special Forces Group have received or are pending award of the following decorations for service in Vietnam:

Award	Received	Pending
Silver Star	1	4
Legion of Merit		3
Soldier's Medal	5	6
Bronze Star	34	26
Air Medal	40	24
Commendation Medal	113	21
Purple Heart	71	9
Combat Infantry Badge	784	144

Uneasy Truce on Meat Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions over the past 2 years, I joined my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in efforts to curtail meat imports. These efforts have borne fruit and legislation has been enacted which provides the means to curtail these imports. I am sure that my colleagues share my feeling that this legislation does not embody all that we had been working for but its passage was still a significant accomplishment.

One of the Nation's outstanding livestock publications, the Stockman's Journal, Omaha, Nebr., had an excellent editorial on this legislation in its September 11 edition. So the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can benefit from this learned evaluation of this legislation and its political ramifications, with unanimous consent to extend my remarks I include the following editorial:

UNEASY TRUCE ON MEAT IMPORTS

While most cattlemen feel a sense of relief at having gotten a meat import quota law on the books this year, in view of the dim outlook for any such action through most of the summer, it would be a mistake for anyone to assume that they are happy over the compromise measure which Congress passed and the President signed.

It is no secret that in order to get any kind of a quota measure enacted at all, the cattle interests had to give up plenty. They yielded in order to get a quota law, rather than go along with nothing more than a State Department agreeemnt. There are many who say they gave up too much—that the meat import measure which was passed is so emasculated that it will never see action.

Actually, the cattlemen were up against almost impossible odds. From President Johnson on down through the administration, everybody was against a meat import quota law. The President, who owns a ranch had a herd of cattle in Texas and was presumed to have some natural interest in and sympathy for the cattle industry, made no bones about where he stood. He said from the first that he would not rescind the voluntary import agreements negotiated earlier with Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland and that he would veto any import restriction bill as being against the best interests of American foreign policy. He is reported to have told key lawmakers he wasn't going to have his foreign policy ruined by a "bunch of cowpokes."

Consequently, say critics of the compromise bill which was passed finally, the only reason he could sign it in good conscience was that it in no way interfered with his quota agreements and would not offend any of the nations shipping meat to our shores.

Congressman PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois, charged on the floor of the House during the debate on the bill that "this legislation is so constructed that he (Johnson) can let it become law and still do exactly as he wishes in regard to beef imports." FINDLEY said it was a "pure scheme to help the political position of Senators and Congressmen, particularly those on the Democratic side, who are embarassed and outraged at the way President Johnson has mishandled the beef situation."

State Department officials were quoted on August 18 by the Associated Press as saying they "do not expect quotas will ever be imposed under the new compromise legislation to curb beef imports." Thus there is some justification for agreeing with those who insist that its passage was a hoax which was permitted for political effect.

Obviously there were several good political reasons why Mr. Johnson accepted it as he did. First, he saw it as a way to get the cattlemen off his back without disturbing touchy Australia and New Zealand relationships. Australia already had warned him in no uncertain terms that if he permitted anything to interfere with its export meat business with the United States, it would retaliate dollar for dollar with restrictions against our exports on various items to Australia.

Second, it gave Mr. Johnson a chance to get Senator MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, who was in the doghouse with Western ranchers over his stands on meat import quota measures, off the hook. Mr. MANSFIELD is the administration's majority leader in the Senate, and some of his constituents were saying publicly that his chances for reelection were almost nil because of his role in the meat import quotas wrangle.

And third, it deprived the Republicans of a good campaign issue, involving the charge that the Johnson administration had insisted on a ruinous free trade policy at the expense of a basic and important U.S. industry (livestock and meat).

These are harsh charges, to be sure, but there seems to be considerable justification for them, in view of the facts.

What we in the livestock and meat industry must not overlook is the fact that an import quota law now exists, however, and as has been pointed out by livestock association leaders in recent days, it stands as a watchdog against extreme increases in foreign meat imports. It is easy to argue that the President would never invoke the quotas, but obviously he could if pressure were strong enough on him and the facts on the conference table indicated that he had no choice but to do so.

So, despite the rather uneasy feeling which many have about this legislation, it seems to us to be better than no law at all. And who is to say that new legislation, more to the liking of the livestock and meat industry, will not be enacted later to tighten up the fence?

The Profession You Don't Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the profession of politics, demanding as we all know it is, can bring great satisfaction and personal pride. To serve one's country and one's fellow man, honorably and diligently, can be as rewarding as any other profession that beckons to the young men and women of today.

I was very much impressed with the following editorial that appeared in an eminent newspaper in my district, Skokie Life, issue of September 10, 1964. Because it is so discerning, I believe it merits wide attention and therefore commend it to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE PROFESSION YOU DON'T WANT

Beg pardon, young man, what are you going to be when you grow up? Doctor? Lawyer? Pays well. Scientist? Oh, yes; very important. Social worker? Nice idea, but really, you wouldn't like it. Teacher? That is for others.

Professional athlete? Good profession; lots of money and lots of opportunity. Stock broker, business magnate, accountant, industrial psychologist—there are a thousand fields of endeavor young man, and you want 999 of them, from career Army officer to famous surgeon.

It is that 1,000th field that you don't want. Or say you don't want. It pays poorly, it makes incredible demands upon time, money and conscience, it offers little security, and you really can't take very many courses in college to prepare for it. So you don't think of it. After all it is "dirty," and you have to know the "right people," and all that.

So you don't want to go into government. Well, maybe you want a desk job in Washington or a position at Los Alamos, or with the T-Men—but public office, elected by the ballots of your peers, holds no interest for you.

Too bad, young man. In the Golden Age of Greece, the service of one's fellow man in public office was the highest honor that could come to those proud to call themselves citizen. We've come a long way, mostly down. Today, you wouldn't be caught dead in the political arena, would you?

You avoid it; you avoid political issues; political speeches. You avoid political labor, political contributions. You avoid politics, and thus avoid the art of the science that is government.

You know, young man, that history will forget you. It has nearly forgotten Roentgen and the great John L., Lavoissier and Insull, Jane Addams, and the Duke of Wellington. It has nearly forgotten Raphael and Scarlatti, Thomas Mann, and David Hume.

But, young man, it remembers Pericles and Hammurabi, Medici, and Robespierre, Jefferson and Disraeli, Lincoln and Gladstone, FDR and Sir Winston. History remembers its government leaders, its politicians practical and theoretical. History remembers those who sacrificed personal expediency on the altar of public service.

A laborer earns what an alderman does, and doesn't have to give $10 or $100 to every civic or charitable group that contacts him. An accountant earns what a state legislator earns, and doesn't have to pay transportation to Springfield and make contributions to political campaigns. A top broker or businessman earns more than a Congressman does, and doesn't have to spend tens of thousands on travel and reelection campaigns.

And the so-called professions don't have to come back to the people every 2, 4, or 6 years and place their future in the hands of the democratic majority. So, for your personal welfare, forget the 1,000th profession.

But for your pride, your conscience, your nation and the cause of humanity, young man, make the ultimate sacrifice. The Lord did spare Isaac.—ROBERT LERNER.

Address by Harold E. Gray, President of Pan American World Airways, on the Occasion of the Silver Jubilee of North Atlantic Commercial Aviation, Shannon Free Airport, Ireland, September 5, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have just read with enjoyment an address recently delivered in Shannon, Ireland, by Harold E. Gray, president of Pan American World Airways. It was my pleasure to have visited Ireland early this summer in the company of our distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable EDWARD M. "TED" KENNEDY. We revisited many of the places in the Emerald Isle that our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy toured during his sentimental journey to Ireland in the spring of 1963. A good deal of our travel, by a happy coincidence, was accomplished by Pan American World Airways.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gray's remarks on the 25th anniversary of North Atlantic commercial aviation to Shannon Free Airport are both informative and witty. I commend them to my colleagues for perusal, and ask unanimous consent that the text be printed with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REMARKS BY HAROLD E. GRAY, PRESIDENT OF PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, AT THE SILVER JUBILEE OF NORTH ATLANTIC COMMERCIAL AVIATION, SHANNON FREE AIRPORT, IRELAND

Standing here before you today brings to mind a little known story of our company's first association with Shannon Airport.

It happened in 1936 when Pan Am inaugurated its first service between California and Manila. Juan Trippe and his wife, Betty, were aboard this flight, which then continued to Macao and Hong Kong in anticipation of service to be inaugurated shortly thereafter.

From there they used China National Aviation, a subsidiary of Pan Am, and then Imperial Airways to fly to London.

Here they met up with Col. Charles Lindbergh and his wife, Anne, and accompanied by Woods-Humphrey of Imperial Airways, they flew to Dublin. Here they were joined by General Brennan, John Leydon, and others for a visit to western Ireland to look at potential sites for a transatlantic air base.

As I remember the story, there was a desire to get an airport as close to Newfoundland as possible so as to shorten the transaltlantic haul; but, also, it was recognized that the spot chosen should be as convenient to Dublin as possible. The fortunate and well considered choice was the spot on which we are standing today.

The rest of the story is that Mr. and Mrs. Trippe then boarded the Von Hindenburg in Germany and flew to Rio de Janeiro, then back to Miami on Pan Am, and by domestic carrier to New York, thus becoming, to the best of my knowledge, the first 100 percent by air round-the-world passengers, and the first of many to come through Shannon.

My first trip to your wonderful country came a year later on a survey flight. As we were flying east across the Atlantic, British Imperial Airways, now BOAC, was flying west to the United States under the command of Capt. Arthur S. Wilcockson.

This flight can best be described as routine—the application of navigational and efficient cruising techniques developed since 1935 in the Pacific. But I still remember the thrill of descending through the overcast when our star sights said we should, and suddenly breaking through to see beautifully green Ireland for the first time with the gleaming River Shannon wending its leisurely way below us, exactly where it was supposed to be. And I remember also the thrill of being greeted by your beloved President Eamon de Valera, your most capable Prime Minister Sean Lemass, and many others here today, with the words "Cead mile fáilte." And I will always remember President de Valera carefully teaching me later at lunch how to reply to this greeting with the words "Go raib mile mait agat."

Much has happened since then. I am referring, of course, to the widespread transformations that have been wrought by the solid accomplishments of transatlantic air travel.

Twenty-five years ago my main concern was centered in the technology of flight. As captain of the flying boat, the Yankee Clipper, I was charged with the responsibility of taking off from Port Washington, N.Y., and operating the first commercial airmail flight across the North Atlantic route via various intermediate points to Foynes on the River Shannon. In addition to the mail sacks, we had 20 special guests aboard. On that June day in 1939 my mind centered on the practical aspects of flying that air-

plane. In other words, my preoccupation—and occupation—was almost entirely operational. It is possible that I may have entertained some vague thoughts that a continuing transatlantic airline service would certainly grow and bring a few other changes here and there. But at that time, I did not dwell too long on such nonoperational matters. These are the things that Juan Trippe was thinking about and he was one of the few who foresaw the tremendous expansion to come.

Now, 25 years later, transatlantic air travel has become far more than another medium of transportation. It is an established way of life and has opened up new vistas never fully envisioned a quarter of a century ago. The consequences of international air travel are everywhere. The economies and social structures of countries have been enriched and, most importantly, the cause of international good will and peace has been strengthened.

What are some of the transformations that have occurred in commercial aviation and which, in turn, have caused beneficial ripples to reach ever-broadening dimensions?

Some 25 years ago, the Boeing 314 flying boat—the pride of the airways in its day—cruised at about 150 miles per hour. My flight eastbound from New York to Shannon took 23 hours and 28 minutes. Each of the 30 passengers generally carried on these flights was delighted to pay $337 as the one-way fare in a seating configuration designed solely for first-class service.

Today, a Douglas DC–8 cruises across the North Atlantic at almost 600 miles per hour and makes the same trip in 6 hours—about one-fourth that of the pioneer trailblazer—and it can carry as many as 161 passengers.

The lowest fare today is $191 compared to the $337 of 1939. However, after adjusting for the decline in the purchasing power of the pound, today's low fare is the equivalent of only $87 or 31 pounds, or about one-fourth of the 1939 fare.

By reducing travel time across the Atlantic from 5 days by sea to less than 7 hours by air, travel has been made possible for untold thousands of people. This compression of time from days to hours and the sharp reduction in fares has placed air transportation within the reach of the many and not only the privileged few.

We in Pan American are proud of our contributions in the pioneering and other developmental phases which are so much a part of the creative nature of air transportation.

Mind you, it took considerable imagination more than 25 years ago to start an air transportation service across the Atlantic. Looking back to that period, transatlantic sea travel totaled about 625,000 passengers annually. Of this total, the number of people who could be convinced to travel by air was minimal, and "why bother" was the attitude of many.

But this was a static view. It made no allowance for the needs, desires, and motivations of so many of the peoples of the world, nor of the tremendous advance in technical know-how that was sure to come.

The enthusiastic response to air service across the Atlantic is a familiar one to all of us. The North Atlantic is the blue-ribbon route of international travel—by air and by sea. While the air route was pioneered in 1939—the event we honor today—it was not fully opened up for commercial service until the end of hostilities in 1946. Then for about 5 years air traffic thrived under the momentum of pent up wartime demand and stimulation arising from the needs of European reconstruction.

Much of this momentum had spent itself by 1951. The airlines recognized that perhaps market limits had been reached for those who were willing or in a position to pay first-class fares which were necessary to maintain that type of operation, and great emphasis was placed on improved technology for reducing costs.

The tourist class of service, which had been successful between New York and Puerto Rico, was thus introduced on the Atlantic on May 1, 1952. Aircraft cabins were altered to accommodate more passengers per flight and many frills were eliminated. The initial tourist fare on the Shannon-New York flights was $241 one-way—a 30-percent reduction below the first-class fare.

The response to these lower fare services was most gratifying. Transatlantic air travel more than doubled from about 330,000 passengers in 1951 to 785,000 in 1956, 5 years later. In that year, too, for the first time—the airlines carried more passengers across the Atlantic than steamships, and have been doing it ever since.

As mentioned a moment ago, 625,000 passengers moved annually by sea in the 1938–39 period. Well, in 1963—25 years later—726,157 passengers were tabulated as moving by sea—only a 16-percent increase. And how many moved by air in 1963 across the Atlantic? More than 2,810,000 passengers—or almost a 4 times greater number than by sea. We would not be surprised to see the final 1964 tabulation reach 3,500,000 air passengers on the Atlantic.

Here you see a tangible illustration of the creativeness of international air travel—bringing to life new markets where none existed before. But in human terms, the implications are many and far-reaching.

Tourist and later economy fares have, in effect, opened "highways in the sky." International air travel has enriched the personal horizons and lives of so many people here and in the United States.

In economic terms, too, we can conclude that opening these "aerial highways" to and from Ireland has contributed to the magnificent growth of the Irish economy.

Air travel obviously is the underpinning for tourism. A recent U.S. Department of Commerce study revealed that U.S. residents spent just over $3.2 billion on foreign travel in 1963, an increase of 11 percent over 1962. All but just under $500 million of this total went to foreign countries, either as fare payment to foreign transocean carriers or as payment for travel expenses within foreign countries.

I hope all of you here have participated in this flow of gold. The figures from the same source, as a matter of fact, say that you have. Last year, for example, more than 80,000 U.S. travelers left nearly $16 million in your country. This comes to an average of over 2 pounds for each resident of Ireland. On a per capita basis this is much higher than for most European countries and is more than double the per capita tourist income of about 16 shillings for the citizens of Great Britain. Perhaps this is due to the obvious warmth of welcome and great friendliness that is always so apparent to Americans visiting Ireland.

The impact of tourism on your economy can be demonstrated in still another way.

I understand that the total export trade of Ireland in 1963 aggregated some 196 million pounds. Of this total, 56.8 million pounds, or more than one-third, was contributed by tourism. In 1939, your exports totaled but 26.9 million pounds, exclusive of tourism which was nominal in those days. So you can readily see that tourism bulks very large in your economy, and last year was more than twice that of your total exports in 1939.

It has been estimated that you expect to generate some 88.4 million pounds from tourism in 1970. I know that your economic forecasts have been very reliable and this one should be no exception.

There can be little doubt as to the greater breadth of understanding which exists throughout the world as the result of foreign travel by the citizens of the world. There has been engendered an increasing awareness on the part of Americans of the rest of the world and its problems, and of the peaceful aspirations of people everywhere. And visitors coming to the United States have, in turn, found exposure to our way of life and philosophies most enlightening, thus readily forming the basis for joining in common causes leading to international good will and peace.

When President John F. Kennedy made his heartwarming visit to Ireland last year he was honored by two of your great universities, a circumstance that he said would permit him at a football match to "cheer for Trinity and pray for National."

I want you to know that I am here today to cheer for Ireland and pray for America, to cheer for Irish Airlines and pray for Pan American, and to cheer for men of good will everywhere and pray for peace, for it is to all such men and to such a noble mission that both our nations, our peoples, and our lives and fortunes are dedicated. Thank you.

Fed Denies Tight Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's newspapers reported that the Federal Reserve Board has publicly taken the position that it is maintaining a policy of monetary "ease." Both the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times reported a speech by Mr. C. Canby Balderston, vice chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, in which he indicates that general inflationary pressures are absent from the domestic scene. It appears from Mr. Balderston's remarks that the Federal Reserve Board concurs with the administration in concluding that business growth will continue on an orderly basis and that there is no evidence of general inflationary movement in the economy.

Mr. Speaker, no one could be more pleased than I to hear this pronouncement from the Fed. On Monday of this week, I found it necessary to call attention publicly to the fact that the free reserves in the Nation's banking system had dropped to a minimal figure. In itself, this reflects a tightness of credit and I felt it my duty to express the hope that the reserve situation, which the Fed had allowed to develop, did not foreshadow a resumption of tight money policy which proved so disastrous in the 1950's. Moreover, interest rates are inching up, which is another sign of tightening money.

Both the Washington Star and the New York Times of September 14, among other newspapers, reported my warnings that the big banks and the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee are always looking for an excuse to tighten money and raise interest rates, and that tighter money at this juncture could cause a manmade recession. The Star article also indicated that some monetary experts believe, from available evidence, that the Federal Reserve may al-

ready have tightened money a little bit during the past few weeks.

Among these somewhat divergent signs, let us hope that Mr. Balderston's assurances about continuation of a policy of "ease" receives attention in the banking community and among his colleagues on the Open Market Committee. As I have said many times, we are at the mercy of a central bank which suffers from a proneness toward tightness in monetary policy. Right now, when we have enjoyed a continuing prosperity for 44 months, it would be a tragic mistake to let tight money and high interest rates choke off expansion of the economy.

Happy Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, for over 50 years the people of Pendleton, Oreg., have annually conducted one of the most colorful, exciting, and authentic Western pageants in the country. In mid-September, thousands of visitors from all over the world will thrill to a reenactment of some of the most dramatic pages from the history of the American West.

Mr. Virgil Rupp, writer for the Pendleton East Oregonian, the principal daily newspaper of the area, has written a brief article for the August issue of Air West. Because this article so accurately captures the full flavor of the spectacular Pendleton Round-Up and Happy Canyon Pageant, I recommend it to all who want a brief glimpse of the Old West.

The article follows:

HAPPY CANYON
(By Virgil Rupp)

The American cowboy isn't dead.

He dresses better, forgoes the comfort of a six-gun and has toned down his vocabulary. But a visit to the Pendleton Round-up will show you the cowboy is bigger and tougher today than he was 50 years ago. He still thrives on dust, danger, and ornery critters.

Back in 1911, the roundup's 2d year, Buffalo Vernon bulldogged steers in an average time of 53.6 seconds. Today the average time is 8 seconds, and in 1961 burly Harry Charters set a record of 5 seconds flat.

Spend an hour around the back door of the bucking chutes and stock pens during roundup this September 16–19. The cowboys speak in gentle tones. But their muscles ripple beneath the tight shirts and levis and no man could wear cowboy boots and walk humbly. When they ride into the big roundup arena that gentle touch disappears and all that shows is courage, skill, and power.

Let 'er buck is the ringing cry that will reign for the 53d year over this eastern Oregon city of 15,000 in September. The population is trebled by roundup fans but there never seems to be a shortage of bunks. Modern hotels and motels both in Pendleton and neighboring cities, and hundreds of private homes, take care of everyone.

Too, part of the reason might be that sleep tends to be ignored in favor of the spirit of Happy Canyon, once the name of a frontier dance hall but now the title of an epic staged nightly during roundup.

Roundup is really never over: the festival simply climaxes a way of life during those 4 days.

The miles-long westward ho parade of ox carts, horsemen, Indians, squaw men, covered wagons, travois—every form of pioneer conveyance—is an important part of roundup. The parade will be staged September 18.

Schools close for miles around. It's an area celebration and the area gets bigger all the time. Businesses relax. The clink of shod hooves, the cries of horsemen, the ring of trumpets and thump of drums are always in the air. Main Street is roped off for dancing and merrymaking and calliope concerts.

The robust flavor of roundup must have been toned down in the 54 years since the first horse tossed the first rider on a sandbar in the Umatilla River. But you won't think so after you've taken part. Roundup was suspended for 2 years during World War II, which accounts for any strangeness you may notice in arithmetic.

Start the day with a cowboy breakfast dished up by the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Stillman Park. Pancakes, eggs, ham and coffee never taste as good as when served with a side dish of frosty fall air.

The roundup stadium, a first-class sports arena with a seating capacity of 14,000, is constructed on the site of that first roundup, along the Umatilla River. It's a civic endeavor, with the Roundup Association, Happy Canyon, the city's schools and government all lending a hand in keeping the stadium clean and growing.

The show hasn't changed a great deal since 1910. Time limits have been put on bronco riding, and women no longer take part in the rougher events. The pace is said to be faster, more professional now. Cowboys from all over North America compete for thousands of dollars in prize money and it takes smooth programing to work in all the competition during roundup's 4 days.

Events include bulldogging, calf roping, bull riding, bucking horses both saddled and bareback, relay races, a wild horse race, Indian dancing and the antics of clowns. The funny men do more than clown—they offer protection to the daredevil riders of the vicious Brahma bulls. When the rider's dumped the clowns keep the bull occupied until the dusty cowpoke limps to safety.

Indians—Umatilla, Cayuse, Walla Walla, and other tribes—have been part of the roundup since its second year. They come to take part in the fun and action from as far as the Blackfoot country of Montana.

One of the highlights of roundup is a visit to the Indian village behind the big arena. Hundreds of teepees, most of them white but some candy-striped and others decorated serve as home to the Indians during roundup. Visitors to the encampment are welcome. The Indians ride in the parades, take part in the arena competition and play major roles each night in Happy Canyon.

It's a copyrighted pageant with a story as flexible as time and as changeless as a river. Written in 1914 by Roy Raley, the pageant traces the history of the West from before the coming of the white man to the days of board-front frontier towns.

Each night during the show a freshly killed buck deer is brought on stage in one scene. An arrow protudes from its chest. No questions are asked. Life was harsh but ordered in the long-ago days, the pageant says. With the white man comes chaos, and change, but, in Happy aCnyon, moments of comedy, too.

Horses gallop across the open stage. Wagons rumble and creak. The reports of six-guns, muzzle loaders, and repeating rifles, and twang of bow strings echo from the roof of the Happy Canyon grandstand and from the spectacular stage scenery.

The show ends with the setting of a riotous frontier main street. Then the audience, thousands strong pour from the grandstand, through doors in the stage setting into a hall where foaming kegs flow and dance music coaxes the most tender feet to stomping.

Roundup will convince you the American cowboy isn't dead. And by jumpin' Jupiter, you'll find new spring in your own step.

Let 'er buck.

A Labor Day Message for 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, Labor Day 1964 has just passed, but the messages told have meaning for every day of the year. Anthony Cama, a teacher, poet, and author who is the director of the Italian School in Lynn, Mass., wrote such a message for the special Labor Day edition of the Lynn Sunday Post. I am pleased, therefore, to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a condensation of this thought-provoking article, as follows:

(By Anthony Cama)

Unionism and the right of the working masses to strike for better wages and better rights of the individual as is granted by the constitutional laws of this land, nurtured and implemented under the magnificent, young leadership of President Kennedy. It is therefore, this writer's solemn dedication to show as clearly as possible how necessary and inseparable is the right of laboring man and woman to join a union. America has come a long way from the Columbian era of a savage unknown continent; a vast wilderness of vegetation and water that made millions of the old world gasp in wonderment and amazement at the fact that it took thousands of years for humanity to find the agelong existing continents of the two Americas.

AMERICA HOPE OF LABOR MASSES

This precious, sacred earth has long since been soaked with the blood, sweat and sufferings of the laboring masses. America, trumpeting its youthful and valiant music of human liberty and labor's dignity for all mankind, because for an inhuman period of time, its very self, a cesspool of slavery and the putrefying receptacle of human degradation. And this un-Christian stigma showed the greed and barbarianism of the southern plantation owners who bought humans on the auction block like animals and worked them and treated most of them worse than animals. We see in all the ugly, murky whirlpools of suffering, deprivation and servitude, the white men of all other races and creeds, exploiting the black working man as an inferior human being. This, we have been in the framework of our land how the holiness of man labor's was desecrated and violated. In our growing surge to attain nationhood and world recognition, the era of that immortalized emancipator Abraham Lincoln became a relentless fire which enveloped the States in a titanic Civil War; brother against brother; State against State; Americans against Americans. The great humanitarian Lincoln struggled and pleaded until the day of his assassination, for peace and for compassion; for unity and for the inalienable rights of every man.

And so, today, on this Labor Day of September 1964, when man races for the in-

finite skyways; when our Government spends billions for the contest of space supremacy, the torrents of labor surge and smash with increasing force against the dams of the enemies of unionism. American organized labor has come a long way and it will continue to march onward and forward, invincible, with justice and right on its side until the toil of the masses achieves its goal of a living wage earned with honor and dignity.

Said Franklin D. Roosevelt, "If I were a worker in a factory, the first thing I would do would be to join a union."

Stated Harry S. Truman: "The right to join a union of one's choice is unquestioned today, and is sanctioned and protected by law."

Dwight D. Eisenhower wrote: "Only a handful of unreconstructed reactionaries harbor the ugly thought of breaking unions and of depriving workingmen or workingwomen of the right to join the union of their choice."

In his brilliant eulogy to labor, the late President Kennedy said, "The American labor movement has consistently demonstrated its devotion to the public interest. It is, and has been, good for all America."

Abraham Lincoln thundered forth: "If a man tells you he loves America, yet hates labor, he is a liar."

At a testimonial dinner in November 1963 honoring A. Philip Randolph, IUE President Carey urged organized labor and the Nation's interracial groups to hold joint meetings. He declared: "The American labor movement is already close to the NAACP, the National Urban League, the Congress of Racial Equality, and other interracial organizations."

Carey praised Randolph as a man who "has given a moral climate and ethical tone to our labor movement matched only by a few in American unionism like Philip Murray."

The IUE president credited Randolph with providing the inspiration behind the march on Washington for jobs and freedom. Describing the march, Carey said: "I will always be proud that I was there and that our international union was one of the most prominent participants."

Speaking with quiet dignity and passion, Randolph, who is an AFL–CIO vice president and president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, said, "To discuss the civil rights revolution is to write the agenda of labor's unfinished revolution. The labor movement cannot degenerate into a mere protective association, insulating the 'haves' from the 'have-nots' in the working class. The labor movement traditionally has been the only help for the dispossessed, the despised, the downtrodden, the neglected and the poor. We must pledge ourselves to the social revolution which will bring all of them into labor's crusading fold—into the pale of dignity and economic well-being."

The AFL–CIO resolution of 1963 called on unions to eliminate "the last vestiges of racial discrimination" and to "cooperate with our neighbors in the general community to assure every American the full rights of citizenship."

LABOR AND UNIONS HOPE OF MASSES

In this presidential election year the AFL–CIO, with its 13.5 million members, stands at the very vanguard of tremendous power to help solve the problems of racial equality through its labor unions. Some local unions in the South have consistently and stubbornly resisted any compromise in the fair employment practices and most especially in the American Negro category. Many southern locals continue denial of rightful membership to Negro workers despite their proclaimed adherence to brotherhood and American philosophies of unionism. These are the very same brother members who salute the Star-Spangled Banner and recite the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States. This behavior and action is, in the opinion of this writer, not only un-Christian and prejudiced but also a stark act of denial against their own fatherland. These are truly the pseudo-Americans. These attitudes are truly the stigma and blotch upon our national and international image. They stand in arrogant confrontation with the civil rights laws especially title VII of the new act which specifically bars a union from excluding individuals on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, just as it enjoins employers from refusing to hire persons for the same reason.

The constant privation of the American Negro's right to vote and to take his rightful place in the ranks of labor and union membership has been like a growing cancer in the bloodstream of this Nation.

Let labor and its unions move forward inexorably, unequivocably this Labor Day of our presidential election cycle. Let labor be an overwhelming tide of Americanism and brotherhood for the thousands of American Negroes who valiantly served in our many wars and revolutions, who have died on foreign shores; who have come home broken in health and spirit from the struggles against the dictators and tyrants of Nazi and Fascist hordes. Let the ranks of labor be one indivisible front of decency and honor for the American Negro who has from his status of slave and second-class citizen, worked, suffered and wept upon this sacred democatic soil. Let labor bring to the millions of American Negroes who have worked at the most menial of tasks fulfilling millions of dirty, harsh, underpaid jobs, to earn, yes, earn, the right to equality in employment opportunities according to their abilities and capacities.

Von Steuben Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, today, by Presidential proclamation, is Von Steuben Day in the United States. Today is the 234th anniversary of the birth of Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben, a German by birth but an American by choice.

Von Steuben arrived in the United States in 1777 and became a real force in our fight for independence. He was the trusted adviser to Gen. George Washington and was our first inspector general.

It was my pleasure on October 18, 1963, to attend the ceremonies at Newport News, Va., when the Polaris Submarine *Von Steuben* was christened. It will be my pleasure to attend and speak at the ceremonies in Newport News on September 30, 1964, when this vessel will be commissioned. The naming of this submarine, a vital link in the defense of our Nation, for Von Steuben is a fitting tribute to the great contributions he made to our becoming a free and independent country.

On September 26, 1964, along New York City's Fifth Avenue, the Seventh Annual Steuben Day Parade will be held. This is a colorful and impressive parade and I invite my colleagues and their constituents who might be in the New York area on that date to come join us on this occasion.

Many Eligible Voters Not Registered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most precious freedoms that Americans enjoy is that of political freedom. Since the founding of our country many costly sacrifices have been made to preserve the right of American citizens to choose their officials in a free election and by a personal secret ballot. Yet throughout our great land there are today many Americans who fail to take advantage of this franchise.

A recent survey in Frederick County, Md., comparing the number of people of voting age to the number of registered voters, is a disturbing example of the number of citizens who shirk their responsibility to assist in preserving this basic freedom of self-government.

I include here the results of that survey as published in the Frederick News and call it to the attention of my colleagues:

MANY ELIGIBLE VOTERS IN COUNTY ARE NOT REGISTERED, SURVEY SHOWS

James Messersmith, the Republican Registrar in the Board of Election Supervisors, last night released a comparison of the population over 21 years of age as compared to the number of registered voters in every election district in Frederick County.

In Frederick City, there are 16,284 persons presumably eligible to register for the general election with 10,593 of them registered and 5,691 still not registered or able to vote in the election.

Messersmith warned the city and county district chairmen of both political parties that there was little time left to get out the remainder of the vote before registration ends on September 22.

Buckeystown district has 1,650 persons 21 years old or more with only 809 registered and more than half, 841, still unregistered, Messersmith said.

Middletown district has 1,604 persons eligible to vote with a majority, 972, registered but 632 still unregistered. Creagerstown district has 636 popualtion of voting age with 361 registered and almost half, 275, unregistered.

Emmitsburg district has 3,331 persons who could vote with almost an equal number, 1,653 to 1,673, registered and unregistered. Catoctin district has 778 potential voters with less registered, 342, than unregistered, 436.

Urbana district has 1,371 persons over 21 with a slight majority, 730, registered and 641 remaining unregistered. Liberty district has 770 potential voters, with 439 registered and less but a substantial number, 331, unregistered.

New Market district has 2,361 persons over 21 years of age with only a half-and-half registration record of 1,177 registered voters to 1,184 unregistered.

Hauvers district has only 1,237 eligible voters of which 593 are registered while more than that, 644, still remain unregistered. Woodsboro district has 1,315 potential voters over 21 with twice as many, 848, registered as the unregistered 467, who will lose their right to vote this November.

Petersville district has 1,099 possible voters with 727 registered and 372 remaining unregistered.

Mount Pleasant District has an even number of 700 residents over 21 about evenly split with 315 registered voters and more, 385, unregistered and unable to vote.

Jefferson District has 772 potential voters with a slight majority, 447, registered but with 325 still remaining unregistered to vote.

Thurmont District has 2,790 eligible voters with most of them, 1,577, registered but with a large number, 1,233, still unregistered.

Jackson District has only 931 persons over 21, but twice as many of them, 616, are registered to vote as the 315 remaining unregistered.

Johnsville District, with 791 eligible to vote, has less registered voters, 373, than those remaining unregistered, 418.

Woodville District, which has 965 persons over 21, has registered 604 with only half that number, 361, remaining unregistered. Linganore District, with 512 possible voters, has 325 registered and only 187 unregistered.

The Lewistown District, which has 1,043 persons over 21, has 625 registered voters and 418 still unregistered. The Tuscarora District has its 1,344 potential voters split into 826 registered voters and 508 still unregistered.

Burkittsville District remains almost evenly divided with 402 registered voters and 338 unregistered among its 740 total population of voting age. Ballenger District has 532 adult voters with a majority, 348, registered and 184 unregistered.

Braddock District, with 1,802 potential votes to cast in the election, will cast over two-thirds of them with 1,106 registered voters and only 696 unregistered.

Brunswick District, with 2,588 potential voters, has 1,506 registered and 1,082 persons still unable to vote. Walkersville District, with 1,216 potential adult voters, has 875 registered with 341 still unregistered.

Canoga Park, Calif., Citizens To Visit Sister City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1964

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 3, 25 of my west San Fernando Valley constituents from the community of Canoga Park will leave Los Angeles airport on an international good will visit to Taxco, Mexico.

Sixteen months ago the Canoga Park Chamber of Commerce elected to join the people-to-people sister city movement. Canoga Park, with a population the size of Harrisburg, Pa., and the space technology center of the United States was assigned Taxco, Mexico, a city of 20,000 people, located 100 miles west of Mexico City. Taxco is the silver capital of Mexico.

In June 1963, 20 Canoga Park residents traveled to Taxco and inaugurated the program. Gifts, pictures, and scrolls adorn the Canoga Park Chamber of Commerce office and Taxco City Hall. Canoga Park citizens have joined with the chamber of commerce in an organization known as the Friends of Taxco. Spanish classes, exchange of letters, library books, and participation in the Taxco school milk program are regular activities.

Last June Mayor and Mrs. Luis Tellez Bustamante came to Canoga Park as community guests of honor. The main program was a fiesta dinner attended by over 200 residents. At that time I presented a U.S. flag flown over our capitol to Mayor Bustamante. He told those attending that the flag would hold a place of honor in his community. The mayor also announced the naming of a John F. Kennedy Street in Taxco.

Chamber of Commerce President James Ross and his wife, Rosemary, will be joined by Honorary Mayor and Mrs. Francis Lederer, Messrs. and Mmes. Gallup, Benson, Charney, D'Agostino, Feddern, Harte, Lindeberg, Mazure, Patterson, Staley, and John Casey on the trip. The group will travel throughout Mexico visiting points of interest in Mexico City, Queretaro, Guanajuato, and many others. In Taxco they will be feted by the entire citizenry.

Mr. Speaker, such citizen groups are playing a significant role in greater international friendship. I know that the Congress joins me in congratulating Canoga Park and asking them to extend our very good wish to their sister city Taxco, Guerrero, Mexico.

Presidential Disability and Necessary Military Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months, a great deal of attention has been focused upon the problem of Presidential inability or disability. Hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee and included testimony presented by former President Eisenhower. Ike pointed out:

A disability could be of different kinds, once caused by physical or mental illness, or another by an absence from the seat of government of such a character that would preclude Presidential decisions and action in time of emergency.

Mr. Speaker, any reasonable person knows that the President's schedule demands that certain responsibilities must be delegated by him to individuals who are qualified to perform during that period of inability.

Under unanimous consent, I include at this point two excellent editorials on this subject:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star]

L.B.J.: POLITICS AS USUAL

President Johnson flew to Detroit the other day to again hammer away at the gimmick that "only the President" can "make the awesome decision" to release atomic weapons in the event of an attack, even, and that he and he alone must be the one standing with his finger on the button.

We spend millions of dollars a day to provide a system whereby warning of attack can be achieved in split seconds, and have spent billions to develop weapons that can be fired instantly. Millions were spent in research alone to compress our outer defensive capability into the 15 minutes that is all we would have to respond in the event of a missile attack.

Yet the President flew to Detroit to make this speech about his "awesome responsibility" without taking "the button" with him, apparently.

The whole system of national defense, and the billions spent on it, must, according to his stated policy so overemphasized publicly, await on him—and it has to act in less than 15 minutes in a real emergency—and yet he flew to Detroit without the code officer that always accompanies a President in modern times—his key to communicating with our national defense commanders.

Kennedy, like Eisenhower, always had such a communications capability at his side wherever he went, every minute.

Johnson shunted that key officer and his key codebooks off the plane to make room for his speechwriter and his family and his political cronies.

Either this is a shocking irresponsibility in the man who publicly charges himself with an "awesome responsibility," or else the whole issue on which he keyed the operations of a major advertising firm for this campaign on a claim that is malarkey in the first place.

Before election day the question may well be whether President Johnson's blooming ego and careless way is more dangerous than BARRY GOLDWATER'S clumsy tongue.

It isn't healthy to have let the Soviets know that there may be periods of time when they could incinerate us while our own ability to do the same to them was forfeit because of the inaccessibility of the President—and his insistence that nobody can do anything unless he gives the word.

And 15 minutes is, admittedly all they need.

This is an "awesome responsibility" indeed—maybe an impossible one. But some system is absolutely necessary, and carelessness or "politics, first" is a very dangerous answer.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 15, 1964]

MILITARY AND POLITICAL CAMPAIGN

(By David Lawrence)

The role of Pentagon high officials in the 1964 campaign is causing a good deal of wonderment. Did the administration authorize Adm. Harold Page Smith, Supreme Commander of NATO forces in the Atlantic, to issue a statement commenting on a subject that is a matter of widespread political controversy? If President Johnson did not do it, did someone in the Pentagon violate the longtime rule against participation by military men in politics?

Admiral Smith, according to a copyrighted article in the Norfolk (Va.) Ledger-Star, declared that any decision to use nuclear weapons should remain with the elected civilian head of Government. The admiral was reminded by a member of his staff that the subject "is probably the hottest political issue in the country today."

"That may well be," commented the admiral in reply, "but this is a situation that exists."

Admiral Smith, who is also commander in chief of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, has currently under his command 17 nuclear-powered submarines, carrying a total of 272 Polaris missiles. This, of course, involves a situation entirely different from the problems faced by the ground armies under the Supreme Commander of the NATO forces in Europe.

Recent newspaper reports inspired by the Pentagon, moreover, have misrepresented the true situation. Thus, it has been reported in some of the newspapers that those tactical nuclear weapons which are advocated for use in Europe to offset a land invasion have five

times the power of the first atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima in World War II. Some Pentagon officials, evidently for political purposes, have spoken of an average weapon as having a force equivalent of 100,000 tons of TNT. The use of the word "average" confuses the issue, as it lumps together all the nuclear weapons in Europe—the smallest up to the largest. The latter have the high explosive power.

Actually, what has been recommended for the defense of NATO ground forces is the use of small tactical weapons like the Davy Crockett, which has approximately 40 tons of firepower, as contrasted with the 20,000 tons of the atom bomb which was used over Hiroshima.

The tragedy of the whole debate is that there is really danger of a nuclear war arising, not necessarily from the use of small nuclear weapons such as Senator GOLDWATER advocates, but from the inability of NATO forces in Europe to respond successfully to a Soviet attack. The situation then could become so grave as to bring on the larger nuclear war which presumably neither side wants.

A most significant article appeared in the Washington Star on Sunday, written by Marguerite Higgins, who is familiar with such matters as a result of many years as a diplomatic and military correspondent, including coverage of combat operations in the Second World War and the Korean war. In the article, Miss Higgins wrote:

"Is there a gentleman's agreement between the White House and Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, supreme commander in Europe, that would permit this American general, or his successor, to authorize American troops at the front lines in Europe to retaliate against a local Soviet nuclear surprise attack employing Russian tactical nuclear weapons on the ground?

"Would General Lemnitzer be able to give such authorization without having to take ethe precious—and perhaps fatal—elapsed time of the hour minimum that appears necessary to refer the matter to Washington for instructions?

"The existence of such a gentleman's agreement has been persistently reported in recent weeks by high sources in NATO. And these sources claim to have been told of it, albeit somewhat obliquely, by high Defense Department officials.

"According to one of the highest ranking Europeans in the NATO structure: 'It does not seem realistic that any President of the United States would insist that American front-line troops must submit passively to nuclear Soviet attack on the ground, since these troops would almost certainly be obliterated before there had been time to check back with Washington and obtain the order to defend themselves and fire back.'

"This gentleman's agreement, according to NATO sources, applies only to instances where the Russians first employed tactical nuclear weapons in, for example, an attack on the city of Hamburg."

In a Washington dispatch in the New York Times on Sunday, Jack Raymond wrote:

"There is a widespread assumption in Washington that in certain types of contingencies, the orders to use nuclear weapons have in fact already been issued in advance. Thus, in circumstances that clearly fit an anticipated situation, the battlefield commanders would need no further instruction."

The Pentagon ought to tell the American people the truth, and it should certainly not allow its military officers or its civilian officials to become identified with the political campaign.

No Need for Medicare Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to the following editorial which appeared in the September 15 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times and which presents cogent and irrefutable reasons why the medical care provisions passed by the Senate should be rejected by the House as unnecessary and, in fact, prohibitive in cost to the workers and their employers:

NO NEED FOR MEDICARE BILL

Earlier this year the House of Representatives approved a straight 5 percent increase in cash social security benefits. The cost was pegged at $1.5 billion to be financed by increasing the tax base from $4,800 to $5,400 and increasing the tax rate by steps from the 1965 rate of 3.8 percent for both employer and employee to 4.8 percent for both in 1971.

The Senate has changed the House bill by advocating a straight $7 a month increase in cash benefits rather than 5 percent and adding a medical care-for-the-aged provision to be financed by social security.

The Senate bill would cost about $3 billion a year and would be financed by raising the tax base to $5,600, jumping the tax rate to 4.2 percent in 1965 and, by steps, up to 5.2 percent for both employer and employee by 1971.

In round figures: The Senate bill would increase the present individual maximum social security of $174 a year to $238 next year. This would more than wipe out the annual income tax reduction for a working man with a wife and two children voted earlier this year.

By 1971, under the Senate version of social security and medical care for the aged, the social security tax would be $291.20, an increase of $117.20 over 1964.

The Senate's bill leaves much to be desired. It is, for all practical purposes, a duplicate of the King-Anderson bill that met previous defeat in the Congress. It contains so many shortcomings that pressures to expand coverage would be inevitable and enormously expensive.

We have noted on this page in the past that no proven need for a mandatory Federal program of hospital care for those over 65 has ever been demonstrated. More than 60 percent of those who are over 65 now have their own private health insurance plans. For those who cannot pay for medical or hospital care the Kerr-Mills program for providing that care is available and is being used at an increasing rate.

In Illinois, for example, in the first 6 months of 1964 the use of Kerr-Mills funds to extend hospital and medical care to those aged who could not provide for themselves was up 36 percent over all of 1962. An average of $343 per person was spent on each of the 487 aged who applied for Kerr-Mills assistance in 1962. An average of $410 per person was spent on each of the 1,348 persons who asked for help from the Kerr-Mills program in the first 6 months of 1964.

The effort being made by the Senate to tack mandatory Federal medical care for the aged to the social security structure should be rejected by the House. The Senate bill provides extremely limited care. There is no demonstrated need for the bill and there is no sense in dumping the Kerr-Mills program, which is working well, for a lesser, more expensive scheme.

Politics and People or Welcome Senator Strom Thurmond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED FOREMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, last evening, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, Mr. STROM THURMOND, announced his decision to change his political party affiliation from Democrat to Republican. I have always believed that adherence to principle and basic American philosophy is more important than partisan loyalty, but I also recognize the need to work within the framework of one of the two major political parties.

Most folks, I believe, are not so much partisan Democrats or Republicans, as they are concerned, responsible, independent-thinking American citizens who are deeply concerned about their country and their children's future. But, today, we find the Republican Party is growing by leaps and bounds across the country, not so much because folks are leaving the Democrat Party, but because the Democrat Party has deserted them and the sound, responsible principles for which it once stood. The power-seeking, big Government, welfare staters have shocked the American people into an abrupt political awakening, and they are turning to, and working for, the Republican Party in an almost desperate effort to try to preserve their freedom, free enterprise, and individual dignity and responsibility.

If Americans do not arise to this challenge confronting us, our Nation can go down. But if we ever do, it will not be because the world developed the hydrogen bomb, it would be because we have developed a philosophy that says the individual is no longer economically responsible for his own welfare, or morally responsible for his own conduct.

We need more men in America, and in Government today, Republicans and Democrats, alike, who have the courage of their convictions. We need men who are willing, able, and unashamed, to stand up for principles, regardless of political popularity. We need stout-hearted men who are not for sale, honest men who can tell the truth and look the world straight in the eye, men who are

not too lazy to work, not too proud to be poor, men who are willing to earn their living, and wear what they have paid for.

America, and the world, needs more men and women, of every race, color, religion, and creed, who will say "No" to socialism and Communist aggression, and who will say "Yes" to individual initiative, fiscal responsibility, and freedom. We need more men like BARRY GOLDWATER, BILL MILLER, and STROM THURMOND.

I want to see the Republican team win this year, not so much because I want a partisan victory, but because I want an American victory for a change. I want to restore to America pride at home and respect abroad. I want to preserve a Nation that is proud and positive, not apologetic and appeasing.

We welcome Senator STROM THURMOND as a member of the Republican team. We respect him for his uncompromising principles, for his political honesty, and for his personal courage and integrity. Senator THURMOND'S forthright statement in announcing this decision is worthy of review by the Members of Congress, and under unanimous consent I include his statement at this point in the RECORD.

TELEVISION ADDRESS OF SENATOR STROM THURMOND TO THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ON THE 1964 PRESIDENTIAL RACE, SEPTEMBER 16, 1964

My fellow South Carolinians, it has been wisely said that "for evil to triumph, it is only necessary that good men do nothing." Particularly is this true in time of crisis. Seldom before in the history of our Nation have we faced so great a crisis.

The people of South Carolina have placed me in a position of trust in the National Government. From this position, I have observed at close hand the conduct and factors which have brought about this crisis. I would, therefore, be most derelict in my duty were I at this time to remain silent.

I have no choice but to speak openly, frankly, and fully to the people of South Carolina on the crisis that confronts us.

The Democratic Party has abandoned the people. It has turned its back on the spiritual values and political principles which have brought us the blessings of freedom under God and a bountiful prosperity. It has breached the trust reposed in it by the people. It has repudiated the Constitution of the United States. It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship.

The Democratic Party has forsaken the people to become the party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big businessmen looking for Government contracts and favors.

The Democratic Party has used the Government as a propaganda machine to distort the truth and deceive the public to the extent that a sub-Cabinet official can publicly defend the administration's "right to lie" and remain in office, unrebuked.

The Democratic Party has invaded the private lives of people by using the powers of Government for coercion and intimidation of individuals.

The Democratic Party has rammed through Congress unconstitutional, impractical, unworkable, and oppressive legislation which invades inalienable personal and property rights of the individual.

The Democratic Party has encouraged lawlessness, civil unrest, and mob actions.

The Democratic Party has violated its trust by using the power of government to suppress information on scandals and corruption of its leaders in government and party offices.

The Democratic Party has succored and assisted our Communist enemies through trade and aid at the expense of the American people.

The Democratic Party has established and pursued for our Government a no-win foreign policy of weakness, indecision, accommodation, and appeasement.

The Democratic Party, as custodian of government, faltered at the Bay of Pigs and in the Cuban crisis of 1962—at the very moment when victory was at hand—and thereby forfeited Cuba to Soviet domination, subjected our Nation to the peril of an armed enemy camp 90 miles from our shores, and opened the doors of the hemisphere to Communist subversion.

The Democratic Party, as custodian of government, has sent our youth into combat in Vietnam, refusing to call it war, and demanding of our youth the risk of their lives without providing either adequate equipment or a goal of victory.

The Democratic Party now worships at the throne of power and materialism.

The Democratic Party has demonstrated a callous disregard for sound fiscal policies and practices.

The Democratic Party, while hiding behind the deceitful gimmick of a darkened White House, has increased deficit spending and squandered, at home and abroad, billions of hard-earned dollars taken from the American people.

The Democratic Party has utterly disregarded the disastrous effects of the resulting inflation on people with fixed incomes, such as retirees, pensioners, social security beneficiaries, and those who have their savings invested in insurance.

The Democratic Party, as custodian of government, has adopted the practice of taking your money by taxation and then using that money to attempt to buy your votes.

The Democratic Party is attempting with alarming success to change the Congress from an independent body representing the people to an amen chorus for Presidential proposals.

The Democratic Party has endangered the security of the Nation by negative decisions on military preparedness, preoccupation with bilateral and unilateral steps toward disarmament, and by use of the military services domestically as instruments of social reform.

The Democratic Party has attempted to degrade and downgrade our men in uniform in order to discredit their warnings of the grave dangers to our security from the administration's weak and senseless defense policies.

The Democratic Party has nominated for Vice President a key leader of the Americans for Democratic Action, the most influential Socialist group in our Nation.

The Democratic Party has encouraged, supported, and protected the Supreme Court in a reign of judicial tyranny, and in the Court's effort to wipe out local self-government, effective law enforcement, internal security, the rights of the people and the States, and even the structure of the State governments.

The Democratic Party is converting our Constitutional Federated Republic into the same type of disciplined and submissive servant of an elite power group as it has made of the Democratic Party itself, as all who watched the Democratic Convention on television can bear witness.

The top leaders of the South Carolina Democratic Party have chosen to abandon the traditional independence of the State party, and to lead the people of South Carolina down the road to serfdom mapped by the National Democratic Party. The party of our fathers is dead. Those who took its name are engaged in another reconstruction, this time not only of the South, but of the entire Nation.

If the American people permit the Democratic Party to return to power, freedom as we have known it in this country, is doomed, and individuals will be destined to lives of regulation, control, coercion, intimidation, and subservience to a power elite who shall rule from Washington.

Fortunately, for those of us who cherish the traditional freedom entrusted to us by our forefathers, there is another choice this year. Although the party of our fathers is dead, the principles of our forefathers live now in the cause of a presidential nominee. The man who has gained the Republican nomination for President against all the odds and opinion polls, and who now has control of the Republican Party, is one who believes in and abides by our Constitution. He has demonstrated his fidelity to freedom, independence, and the Constitution by his actions and his votes in the U.S. Senate. I personally know him to be able and responsible. He is an honest man of courage and conviction, who trusts the American people to hold the reins of government and rule themselves.

I cannot foretell what success will reward Senator BARRY GOLDWATER'S efforts to return the National Government to its constitutional role and our Nation to its rightful place of strength and respect in the world. Nor can I predict with certainty how long those ideas and ideals of Senator GOLDWATER which I share will prevail in the councils of the Republican Party which he now heads. I do know that we have a fighting chance under BARRY GOLDWATER'S leadership and that we are welcomed to his banner.

I know also that the course for the Democratic Party has been set toward socialism and arbitrary rule. I know further that the Democratic Party's line of succession is HUBERT HUMPHREY and Robert Kennedy, with Walter Reuther and Joseph Rauh pulling strings behind the scenes.

I have worked within the framework of the Democratic Party, because experience proves it necessary to work within the framework of one of the two national parties to be effective. I have, nevertheless, maintained independence of judgment on issues and have conscientiously tried to represent the people of South Carolina, seeking to protect their rights and freedom. I shall always maintain my independent judgment and action and put the people of South Carolina first. To do this in the future I must work within the framework of the Goldwater Republican Party.

For me, there is no alternative. The future of freedom and constitutional government is at stake, and this requires that I do everything in my power to help BARRY GOLDWATER return our Nation to constitutional government through his election to the Presidency. This also requires that I join him in his fight, successful as of now, to make the Republican Party a party which supports freedom, justice, and constitutional government.

It will be a long and hard struggle, with many battles to be fought. At this time, one objective takes precedence over all others—electing BARRY GOLDWATER President. As we give the Presidential race our undivided effort, I hope all our people, and particularly our young people whose future hangs in the balance, will join this cause with enthusiasm.

To my friends who have conscientiously advised me against this step, because of a sincere belief that I could best serve the country by following a course designed to keep myself in office, I can only say that I fully realize the political risk involved in this step and that my chances for reelection might, because of this step, go down into oblivion. But in the final analysis, I can only follow the course which, in my heart

and conscience, I believe to be in the best interest of our State, our country, and the freedom of our people.

I have chosen this course because I cannot consider any risks in a cause which I am convinced is right.

Speaks Only to the Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Metropolitan Museum in New York City, one of the leading museums in the world, has received the highest compliment, Arthur A. Houghton, Jr., has agreed to be its new president.

No person in the country would have been a finer choice. Arthur Houghton is a doer. He is practical and sensible man and he believes in accomplishment. But most importantly, his doing of things is always measured and tempered by sensitivity—a sense of history, tradition and taste—and an ever-present willingness to listen to others. He is a man who gets to the point and never moves without having all the facts at his command.

On Wednesday, September 16, the New York Times published the announcement of Mr. Houghton's appointment, on its front page, and completed this with a profile which I am pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the edification of my colleagues:

ARTHUR AMORY HOUGHTON, JR.: SPEAKS ONLY TO THE POINT

Arthur Amory Houghton, Jr., is one of the most impressive joiners in town. The town president of the Metropolitan Museum of Art is a vice chairman of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts and of the fund for the advancement of education. He is a vice president of the Corning Museum of Glass and the Pierpont Morgan Library. He is board chairman of Cooper Union, and his trusteeships compare with those of the United Nations. He is a trustee of the Metropolitan, the New York Public Library, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Institute of International Education. He is also a director of the Philharmonic Symphony Society of New York, whose board he once headed.

Mr. Houghton does not join for sociability, status, or solvency—after all, he is president of Steuben Glass, Inc., a director of its parent company, the Corning Glass Works, and also a director of the New York Life Insurance Co., the United States Steel Corp., and Diebold, Inc.

He joins because he believes things should be done and because he is interested. He is quiet at meetings, his colleagues say, but when everybody has said his say, he speaks up softly and cogently, with thoughts on the subject that often form the basis of action.

"He doesn't speak much except to the point," a friend said.

"He is more at ease with personal friends than when he is in public," said another associate. "The unusual thing is that when he has an idea, he will carry it through, sketching it out on paper and saying specifically how it can be done."

There is general agreement that he is hard driving once he is convinced of where to drive.

In the light of all this, it is unproductive to ask about his hobbies. He travels a lot, although lately he has rarely been away for more than 2 weeks at a time from his headquarters in the Corning offices at 717 Fifth Avenue, one of the early glass-packaged buildings here. When he and Mrs. Houghton travel, they go to places that have not yet been overrun by tourists, such as Greenland and the remoter parts of the Middle East or Africa.

OF THE CORNING HOUGHTONS

The glass company executive was born on December 12, 1906, at Corning, N.Y., home of the Corning organization owned by the Houghton family. While an undergraduate at Harvard—class of 1929—he conceived a passion for literature and rare books. He entered the family business when he finished college and started collecting.

Mr. Houghton's business and collection grew. He stocked original manuscripts and letters of Samuel Pepys, Robert Browning and Elizabeth Barrett Browning, James Boswell and Samuel Johnson, and he had one of the largest collections anywhere of the works of John Keats, Edmund Spenser and Lewis Carroll. Today, he still has the manuscript of John Locke's "Essay on Human Understanding" and a selection of Elizabethan sonnets in the original editions.

In 1933, he welded an interest in the arts to an interest in his business and became president of Corning's Steuben division. One Sunday, he and John M. Gates, an architect and the company's vice president, smashed some 20,000 bits of glassware with a value on the books of $1 million in the company's warehouses. Then they started from the bottom to build a quality-glass business that would incorporate imaginative design in technically superb crystal.

The smashing of the old inventory was productive. The new designs were exhibited, hailed, and sold. They depressed the market in garishly colored glassware as cheaper lines tried to fill the demand for good-looking clear glass.

By 1940, business was fine, and Mr. Houghton submitted to the blandishments of Archibald MacLeish, then Librarian of Congress. He went to Washington and became curator of rare boks, a job he thoroughly enjoyed for 2 years until the United States entered World War II. Mr. Houghton left the Library, although he still holds the titles of honorary curator and honorary consultant in English bibliography there, and joined the Air Force as a captain. By the time the last shot was fired, he was a lieutenant colonel.

Returning to civilian life, Mr. Houghton plunged into the many affairs that have claimed his time ever since.

He advanced on business fronts, cultural fronts and educational fronts. He has gathered honorary degrees from 11 colleges. He was in politics—in 1960 he was chairman of the United Republican Finance Committee. He devised a plan for corporation presidents and board chairmen to put into party coffers fees received for attending board meetings, anywhere from $50 to $500 for a meeting.

The Plain Dealer Endorses Johnson and Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 16, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, throughout the country today the candidacies of President Lyndon B. Johnson for President of the United States and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY for Vice President of the United States are receiving enthusiastic support.

On last Sunday, September 13, 1964, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, in a front-page editorial, announced the endorsement of these candidates. The Cleveland Plain Dealer is an independent Democratic newspaper under the leadership of Mr. Thomas Vail, editor and publisher.

This forthright position by the Cleveland Plain Dealer is indicative of the great national esteem of the Johnson administration.

The editorial is as follows:

THE PLAIN DEALER ENDORSES JOHNSON AND HUMPHREY

The Plain Dealer supports the election of President Lyndon B. Johnson for President of the United States and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY for Vice President.

Our support of the Democratic candidates is based on one consideration alone, namely, what two men are best qualified to carry the awesome burdens of the greatest power on earth?

In keeping with the vigorously independent politics of this newspaper we have given no consideration to party affiliations.

Our decision is reached after the most thorough investigation, observation, and comparison with the Republican ticket represented by Senator BARRY M. GOLDWATER for President and Congressman WILLIAM E. MILLER for Vice President.

Our publisher and editor, members of our Washington bureau, and many other experienced staff members of this newspaper have talked to and observed the candidates under various conditions.

All have given serious consideration to everything the candidates for President and Vice President have said and written.

In our view President Johnson has demonstrated since the tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy, November 22, 1963, that he understands the Presidency and that he can cope with its responsibilities.

In less than 11 months the President has established himself as a leader in his own right.

He has proved to be amazingly effective in dealing with the Congress.

We feel this is an important relationship for a strong Chief Executive.

President Johnson's generally moderate stand on economic issues has reflected, in our opinion, the mood of the country and represents a responsible attitude during a period of unprecedented prosperity.

In foreign affairs where the slightest misstep can now mean the destruction of mankind, President Johnson has shown profound respect for the high stakes involved.

In a long political career Lyndon B. Johnson has been an effective prominent figure in the legislative branch of the Government, most recently as Senate majority leader.

The President's selection for Vice President of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, a nationally known personality and respected legislator himself, we feel adds strength and energy to the team.

In recent years Senator HUMPHREY has shown a capacity to grow and mature, indicating that greater responsibility outlined by President Johnson for the vice-presidency should further add to the growth of HUMPHREY's capabilities if the Johnson-Humphrey ticket is elected November 3.

While every democracy thrives on a vigorous and competent opposition, we do not feel Senator GOLDWATER and Congressman MILLER are up to the highest standards of Republi-

can presidential and vice-presidential candidates.

Senator GOLDWATER's record as a Senator does not impress us.

His statements during this campaign have been confusing and, more importantly, indicate lack of a thorough knowledge about the Government of the United States and the great issues of the day.

While most of Senator GOLDWATER's fellow Republican legislators worked for civil rights legislation and many other controversial but constructive measures, Senator GOLDWATER failed not only to go along with his fellow Republican legislative leaders, but also failed to offer constructive alternatives.

We do not think GOP vice-presidential candidate, Congressman MILLER, has established a record in the Government or a stature with the public high enough to recommend him for the great and increasing responsibilities of the vice presidency.

In keeping with the best traditions of American journalism we do not intend by our endorsement to support everything President Johnson and Senator HUMPHREY may do or say during the current campaign.

Nor will we discount completely everything Senator GOLDWATER and Congressman MILLER may do or say.

We will continue to give fair and complete news coverage to both tickets, regardless of our editorial opinion.

Based on what we think is best for the people of this country we believe the Government of the United States should be run by the two nominees most competent to do the job.

For this reason the Plain Dealer endorses Lyndon B. Johnson for President and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY for Vice President.

The Farm Planks—Take Your Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of misinformation is being spread throughout the Nation on the contents of the farm planks of the two parties. Many statements which have been made are nothing more than a blatant attempt to mislead the American farmer as to the Republican position. I have more faith in these great individualists and know that they will not succumb to a campaign based on innuendo. It is with this thought in mind that I commend the following editorial from the Stockman's Journal, of Omaha, Nebr., of September 11, to the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

THE FARM PLANKS—TAKE YOUR CHOICE

Right after the Democratic convention, President Johnson and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, newly nominated candidates for President and Vice President on the Democratic ticket in November, hastened to the LBJ Ranch at Johnson City, Tex., for a little rest and a lot of talk and campaign strategy planning. As is his custom with visitors at the ranch, the President was showing Mr. HUMPHREY the layout and the cattle.

As usual, also, a corps of newsmen and cameramen was on hand, and at one point in the weekend proceedings, the President and the Senator chased some cows within range of the cameras for an "atmosphere shot."

Suddenly Mr. HUMPHREY was noted to be wiping his soiled shoe on the grass and was heard to exclaim, "Mr. President, I just stepped on the Republican platform." The President, reporters said, "roared with laughter."

With political platforms thus neatly categorized by Mr. HUMPHREY, we are tempted to forego further mention of them. But since we did discuss the GOP platform's farm plank in this column, obviously we can do no less for the Democrats.

Briefly, the Democratic platform writers agreed that the party must "continue to recognize the significant role of agriculture and rural life." They pledged that a "three-dimensional program" would be carried on "to achieve the goals of higher incomes to the farm and ranch, particularly the family-sized farm, lower prices for the consumer, and lower costs to the government."

The "three-dimension" program was described as follows:

(1) Commodity programs to strengthen the farm income structure and reach the goal of parity of income in every aspect of American agriculture. We will continue to explore and develop new domestic and foreign markets for the products of our farms and ranches.

(2) Consumer programs, including expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the school lunch and other surplus food programs, and acceleration of research into new industrial uses of farm products, to assure maximum use of an abundance of wholesome foods at fair prices, here and abroad. We will also study new low-cost methods and techniques of food distribution for the benefit of our housewives to better feed their families.

(3) Community programs and agricultural cooperatives to assure rural America decent housing, economic security, and full partnership in the building of the great society. We pledge our continued support of the rural telephone program and the Rural Electrification Administration, one of the great contributions of the Democratic Party to the well-being and comfort of rural America.

In a companion plank, the party also pledged its continued efforts to conserve the Nation's natural resources—developing river basins, flood control, fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation, continue efforts to develop greater water supplies, continue TVA, etc.

This, then, is a general statement of official Democratic Party thinking with regard to farm matters. And despite Mr. HUMPHREY's joking reference and the general tendency of most folks to belittle political platforms, it is possible to size up the farm goals of both parties by studying the broad outlines of the farm planks.

In general, the Democrats under President Johnson would stick with the farm program now in effect. Federal price supports and controls are the backbone of it, with domestic and export disposal stepped up to equate supply and demand as well as possible.

The GOP, under GOLDWATER, offers an alternative choice for those who favor voluntary commodity programs and price supports held to minimum or disaster-avoidance levels. Mr. GOLDWATER favors letting natural market forces exert major influence, with the free play of open, competive marketing ruling prices and providing farmers the basis on which to make their plans, rather than move according to dictates from Washington. The GOP farm plank, it will be recalled, pledged "to provide our farmers who have contributed so much to the strength of our Nation, with the maximum opportunity to exercise their own management decisions of their own farms, while resisting all efforts to impose upon them further Federal controls." We believe Mr. GOLDWATER would do his utmost to achieve that.

Now comes the campaign. The lines are drawn and the opposing candidates will swing into action in an attempt to translate their stated views and policies into votes. We are sure farmers will want to watch the campaign closely. Truths which so far have been obscured may come out to add new basis for voting decisions. Already it is obvious that the farm voter will have a real choice in ths election, and he will want to be as well informed as possible in making that choice.

Humphrey Terms Johnson a Giant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an excellent speech was given by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY in my district on September 5. He spoke in Minneapolis where he had served as mayor and told the people of America that President Johnson is "intellectually and emotionally" equipped to lead America and the free world.

The New York Times, September 6 issue, gives a very good account of that speech.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 6, 1964]

HUMPHREY TERMS JOHNSON A GIANT—SEES LEADERSHIP AS MAJOR ISSUE—SAYS GOLDWATER LACKS RESPONSIBILITY

(By Earl Mazo)

MINNEAPOLIS, September 5.—Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY formally opened the Democratic national campaign today by declaring that there was "one major issue."

This, he said, is that President Johnson is "intellectually and emotionally" equipped to lead America and the free world and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER is not.

The Democratic candidate for Vice President singled out the key word in the campaign as "responsibility."

He depicted Mr. Johnson, his running mate, as "a giant of a man," who epitomizes "responsibility" in public office, and charged that Mr. GOLDWATER's "behavior" as Republican candidate for President was "the very repudiation of responsibility."

RALLY ON CAMPUS

At an enthusiastic rally on the University of Minnesota campus, where he studied and later taught political science, the Senator contrasted the presidential candidates in this way:

Mr. Johnson is "the man for America" by reason of his proven "strength, courage, responsibility, leadership, compassion and vision."

Mr. GOLDWATER "specializes in driving away those with whom he disagrees, scorns the path of moderation and accommodation, and sows the seeds of disunity and discord even within his own party," he said.

His campus address was the climax of a day of both partisan and nonpartisan welcome-home activities for the bouncy 53-year-old vice-presidential candidate.

WAS MAYOR AT 34

He started his political career as mayor of Minneapolis when he was 34, then moved on to the Senate 3 years later—in 1948.

The fact that Mr. Johnson assigned the kickoff address of the Democratic campaign to his running mate indicates that Mr. HUMPHREY will carry a major share of the party's electioneering load for the next 8 weeks.

The President, according to party tradition, will begin his formal campaign with a Labor Day address in Detroit.

Democratic officials who thronged to the HUMPHREY homecoming ebulliently forecast thta the Johnson-Humphrey ticket would sweep Minnesota and, in fact, most Midwestern States—by big majorities.

Minnesota's Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, who is seeking reelection, noted that Mr. HUMPHREY had been reelected as Senator in 1960 with 60 percent of the popular vote and he predicted that Mr. HUMPHREY should help Mr. Johnson win the State's 10 electoral votes by an equally impressive margin.

Mr. HUMPHREY clearly shared the optimism of his fellow Democrats and flatly predicted an "overwhelming vote of confidence" for President Johnson on election day.

But the vice-presidential candidate cautioned against overconfidence with the statement:

"We face a difficult and challenging campaign in the weeks ahead. We must take nothing for granted. We must wage the most intensive campaign in American history."

Among other things, Mr. HUMPHREY's talks today indicated the Democratic campaigners for the next 2 months will be seeking to put trigger-happy, extremism and irresponsibility brands on Mr. GOLDWATER, while depicting Mr. Johnson as a "can do" statesman whose leadership in the White House is above political partisanship.

Mr. HUMPHREY also pressed two campaign themes he introduced in accepting the vice-presidential nomination at the Democratic National Convention on August 27.

One was the contention that Mr. Johnson was truly the champion of moderate and liberal Republicans as well as all Democrats and independents, while Mr. GOLDWATER "temporarily" represented only a right-wing "Goldwaterite" faction of the Republican Party.

BUT NOT GOLDWATER

The other was a chant in which speaker and audience joined after each of a long list of issues on which Democrats and "most Republicans" agree—"but not GOLDWATER."

While politics was the keynote of the homecoming, there also was sentimental pride evidenced here by the crowds welcoming Mr. HUMPHREY as the first Minnesotan ever to be on a major party's national ticket.

The ceremonies began with a civic reception at the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport, where the candidate's chartered plane from Washington landed at 2 p.m.

After that came other receptions, press conferences, handshaking jaunts, and the rally tonight at the University's huge Northrup Auditorium.

Tomorrow, Mr. and Mrs. Humphrey and their four children will visit neighbors and supporters in Waverly, 38 miles west of Minneapolis, where the Humphrey family has its home.

Westinghouse Tests Driverless "Skybus"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the August 27 issue of the Wall Street Journal contained an article about exciting tests that are being conducted by Westinghouse Air Brake Co. in the mass transit field. It may well be that out of these tests will come the vehicle that will be of great help to all cities in solving our transportation problems. I recommend this article to the Members of the House:

TRANSIT AGENCIES TEST NEW DEVICES TO MAKE RIDES PLEASANT, FASTER—DRIVERLESS "SKYBUS," "MINIBUS" FOR SHOPPERS, TWO-SPEED CONVEYOR BELT STIR INTEREST—FEDERAL AID A BIG STIMULUS

(By Albert R. Karr)

In a park outside Pittsburgh, Allegheny County authorities are building an elevated track to test an electrically operated "Skybus" that is supposed to whisk commuters along at low cost—and without a driver. In the city, Westinghouse Air Brake Co. is testing components for a "rail-bus" that would carry suburban commuters into the city on a track, then roll off onto the streets like any other bus to traverse the downtown area.

Whether these unusual "buses" really will do what is claimed for them may take years to determiine. But they nevertheless typify a new spirit stirring in the transit field. After many years during which rapid transit changed little—except for getting more crowded and more costly—local authorities and transportation equipment makers are getting together to test a host of new vehicles and devices designed to make the commuter's ride swift and pleasant, and to lure him off traffic-choked highways.

Federal money has galvanized much of this activity. A 1961 law extended Federal help to "demonstration" projects testing new transit equipment; the United States thus is paying $2,872,000 of the skybus project's $5 million cost. And under a 3-year, $375 million program just enacted by Congress, Uncle Sam will pay up to two-thirds of the cost of new transit equipment and facilities. To get this aid, localities must come up with comprehensive transit improvement programs; development of new equipment is being written into many.

EQUIPMENTMAKER'S ROLE

Equipmentmakers, scenting a giant new market, are spending their own money to give the tests a further push. Westinghouse Air Brake (Wabco) has "spent $2 million in the past 24 months on research and development in urban transit, and we will be spending more," pledges Gene R. Schaefer, director of its mass transit center. The center coordinates the company's sales of transit equipment.

"I think there'll be more improvement of transit hardware in the next 3 years than has been made in the last 40 years," sums up Donald Hyde, general manager of the Cleveland Transit System. And Mr. Schaefer figures transit operators may spend $10 billion to improve urban transit in the next 15 years against the $500 million he calculates they actually spent in the past 20 years.

Not all the new transit-improving ideas now flooding into Federal offices are likely to work out. Indeed, some seem imaginative to the point of fantasy. After the new aid program cleared Congress "everybody came out of the woodwork" with "dozens of proposals for new kinds of things," comments William Hurd, an official of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which administers the program.

A FOLDING TRAIN?

Among these offbeat proposals, one individual suggested a "nonstop endless folding train" that somehow would fold up like an accordion as it passed slowly through a station, with passengers boarding from a moving belt, then open up and speed off. A consulting group suggested that, rather than leaving cars at home or driving into town, suburban commuters should drive their autos onto rail flatcars, which would haul them en masse into the city.

But such other plans as the Skybus appear highly promising to transit operators. Westinghouse Electric Corp. developed it for cities like Pittsburgh and Atlanta, which don't need and can't afford the big rail systems of Chicago or New York.

The Skybus is a boxy-looking car with an aluminum and glass exterior. It runs on rubber tires along grooves in an elevated concrete track, and seats 28, against about 80 for a typical rail car. Westinghouse and a dozen-odd equipment suppliers are paying $1,042,000 for its tests, with the rest of the non-Federal test money coming from the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce and the Allegheny County Port Authority.

COST-CUTTING PROSPECTS

The small driverless cars require less power to run than conventional rail cars, and can be pulled off the system more easily in off-peak hours, Westinghouse says. Also, since the Skybus weighs only 17,000 pounds, against up to 80,000 pounds for conventional rail cars, its backers say it can run on a lighter structure. Port Authority officials, who are building a 1¾-mile test loop for it, estimate the capital cost at $1.5 million a mile, against $6 million or more to build an old-style elevated railway system. Trial Skybus runs will begin early next year; when they're finished the test loop will be used for an amusement ride.

Westinghouse Electric says transit officials in Baltimore, Chicago, San Juan, Puerto Rico, and some New York City suburbs also are interested in the Skybus. And in addition to its Pittsburgh tests, the Skybus is one of three systems being considered for use in a new terminal complex at the Tampa, Fla., International Airport. Wabco, with a system similar to the Skybus, and Stephens-Adamson Manufacturing Co., Aurora, Ill., with a two-speed conveyor belt device, also are competing for that job.

Another test series for a whole range of new transit equipment will start next March near San Francisco. The Bay Area Rapid Transit District, preliminary to building a high-speed 75-mile transit system for the area, will operate a 4.4-mile test track for 1 to 2 years, trying out everything from new track to automatic train control systems. The Federal Government will furnish about $6 million, the District and suppliers $3 million.

"We hope to advance by light years the whole state of rapid transit technology," says B. R. Stokes, general manager for the district. A national technical advisory committee for the project, made up of representatives of major transit agencies around the Nation, will be fed information on how the new equipment is working out.

In the tests, three driverless rail cars will be run sucessively by separate automatic control systems furnished by Wabco, Westinghouse Electric, General Electric Co., and General Railway Signal Co., a subsidiary of General Signal Corp., Rochester, N.Y. New propulsion systems specially made for automatically controlled runs and more powerful than those used today, also will be tested.

One propulsion system, furnished by Louis Allis Co., Milwaukee, will use alternating current (a.c.) instead of the direct current (d.c.) generally used now in transit operations. In the past, a.c. technology wasn't advanced sufficiently for use on a transit line. But transit officials say its use would lower sharply the capital and operating costs of transit propulsion systems, because expensive equipment now used to convert commercial a.c. power to d.c. wouldn't be needed, and the braking action of transit cars actually could generate electricity for the operation.

COMMUTER REACTION TEST

The District further will test lighter, smoother suspension systems to be supplied by General Steel Industries, Inc., of Granite City, Ill.; Budd Co. of Philadelphia; and

Wabco. It also will solicit the reaction of bay area residents to a new car body designed by Sundberg-Ferer, Inc., a Detroit industrial design firm, and built by the St. Louis Car Division of General Steel Industries. District officials next spring will load onto a flatbed truck a half-length, but otherwise full-sized, model of the car, haul it around the area, invite passersby to climb in, and note their thoughts on how the car looks and how comfortable it is to sit in.

Another test going beyond the technical details of transit equipment has been underway since April in Chicago. The Chicago Transit Authority then began a 2-year experimental shuttle run from the northern suburb of Skokie to its Howard Street station in the city. It is trying out new equipment, including car-suspension systems and higher powered motors, and also checking whether patronage on the run is heavy enough to justify unusually fast and frequent service.

Patronage so far has been so heavy that the CTA, which began by shuttling three cars along the 5-mile line every 10 minutes during peak hours, has stepped up rush-hour service to six cars running 4 minutes apart. It's been pleased with the equipment, too, and is buying 180 new rail cars from the Pullman-Standard Division of Pullman, Inc., to incorporate the best features of the equipment tested on the run.

More specialized devices are coming, too. In Washington, the D.C. Transit System, Inc., since last October has been running along F Street new, small buses designed especially for shoppers. This minibus, built by Passenger Truck Equipment Co., Huntington Park, Calif., has wide doors, a low floor and steps, and lots of window area for summer ventilation; it seats 18.

Syracuse, N.Y., also is considering a Minibus tryout, and Rome, N.Y., may use the small bus for general service. Passenger Truck says that Minibus also is being used for transportation in some California senior citizen communities, by some hotel and airport bus services, and for movie studio tours.

Things also are stirring in the conveyor belt segment of the transit equipment industry. Several new systems are being developed, primarily for use at airports and in downtown business districts, and they generally go beyond the simple moving sidewalk concept.

TWO BELTS, TWO SPEEDS

The system Stephens-Adamson is building for the Tampa Airport tests, with equipment supplied by Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., is an example. It will have passengers walk onto a moving platform going at 1.5 miles an hour, then step into cars on a second belt moving at the same speed; when they're all aboard, the second belt speeds up to 15 to 18 miles an hour. The idea, of course, is that any passenger attempting to step from a stationary platform onto a belt moving at that speed would probably break his neck.

Ambitious new transit equipment plans haven't always worked out, of course. The monorail was once highly ballyhooed, but San Francisco and Los Angeles have both turned down monorail proposals for serving their metropolitan areas (though the Los Angeles Department of Airports is still considering a monorail for a 20-mile run from downtown to the airport). Transit officials cite such monorail drawbacks as objections to the look of its supporting structure, switching problems, difficulty in adapting to subway use, and what they regard as high construction and operating costs.

Some transit officials concede too that union fears of the elimination of jobs might pose some problems in connection with the automatic-control devices now being considered, even if they test out successfully. There's a precedent in New York City, where the New York Transit Authority some time ago installed an automated subway train on the Grand Central-Times Square shuttle run. The Transport Workers Union forced the authority to put a motorman aboard the train, even though he wasn't needed to operate it.

AFTER THE BLAZE, WHAT?

There have been reports of technical problems, too. At any rate, the automated train was put out of action by a fire that shut down the shuttle last April, and the transit authority hasn't made up its mind whether to put the automated train back on the tracks when service resumes.

But whatever happens to the new devices, conventional modes of transit also are being improved. City agencies are starting to buy new cars, some air conditioned, that are made of stainless steel or aluminum instead of the traditional carbon steel, and use other new features to trim weight. Chicago is buying 180 such cars from Pullman-Standard, and New York is buying 600 from Budd.

The Institute for Rapid Transit, a Chicago-based trade group, says some new transit vehicles weigh 800 to 900 pounds a foot of car length, against a typical 1,000- to 1,200-pound range about 5 years ago. San Francisco transit officials are aiming for cars weighing under 800 pounds per foot.

Kansas City Star Supports Lyndon Johnson-Hubert Humphrey Ticket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, for the first time since 1892, the Kansas City Star is supporting the Democratic ticket in a presidential election.

Ralph McGill sets out the reasoning of the Star in an article in the New York Herald Tribune, September 6, 1964.

My colleagues will want to give thoughtful attention to these comments.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 6, 1964]

CANDIDATE AT SEA

(By Ralph McGill)

Senator GOLDWATER, speaking from a yacht at sea, complained that President Johnson has withdrawn from foreign affairs. The charge was echoed by vice presidential nominee MILLER. While these accusations were being made, the Kansas City Star, referred to by Republican conservatives as "maker of Presidents," was preparing an editorial.

For the first time since 1892, a span of 72 years, the venerable, conservative, and highly respected Star is supporting the Democratic ticket. If Senator GOLDWATER is still not all at sea, he may have read the Star's reasoning:

"We are convinced that the cause of world peace would be better served by Mr. Johnson and his foreign policy, with its roots deep in both Democratic and Republican administrations," said the Star. "It would be safer to keep Mr. Johnson's finger on the nuclear trigger than to place the awesome responsibility on Senator GOLDWATER. We frankly fear the GOLDWATER philosophy, transformed into Presidential policy, might plunge the world deeper into the uncertainty of greater international tensions. We believe that to entrust the peace to a GOLDWATER administration would be an unnecessary and undesirable gamble for the Nation to take."

The Star noted, too, the unbending insistence on Senator GOLDWATER's part that he is, in all cases, absolutely right; that he has simple answers to all questions. The fact is that Senator GOLDWATER continues to reveal himself as an appallingly uninformed and superficial man. He talks of the Johnson administration as withdrawing from foreign, or international, affairs.

Senator GOLDWATER's naive indictment comes at a time when the President is more deeply involved in the inherited problem of Vietnam than ever before. An American fleet is in and near the Bay of Tonkin with an awesome supply of weapons—including the nuclear. The at-sea Senator apparently does not know that we still have some 400,000 troops in Europe, committed there as a block to Communist aggression, and that they have been there for 20 years. We have nuclear warheads for missiles at various European bases manned by U.S. troops. Our troops have been in Korea for almost two decades. The Senator blandly charges withdrawal at a time when a second U.S. fleet stands off Cyprus and our diplomats, and the President himself are deeply engaged in trying to work out a solution of that crisis. It is a dilemma that both Greece and Turkey could have solved or quieted long ago but for the independent, Communist-influenced ambitions of President (and Archbishop) Makarios.

Yet Senator GOLDWATER sees withdrawal. His description of the air strike on the North Vietnam naval base, following a torpedo boat attack on a U.S. destroyer, was that it was an example of "extremism." The Senator continues to reveal his superficiality, radicalism and lack of moderation and information. A New York Republican leader, who reluctantly had agreed to support GOLDWATER, said privately at the time of the New York State Convention to nominate Senator KENNETH KEATING, "The greatest job the Republican National Committee is going to have is to find a way to put GOLDWATER in a straitjacket and keep him away from press conferences or questions. He simply can't be left to his own thoughts and words. If he is, we will move toward a real disaster."

The American people are interested in world peace. The thought of perhaps 200 million persons being destroyed in about 60 minutes of nuclear exchange is a matter of concern. A Birch-type rightwing extremist has been quoted as saying, seriously, "Peace will begin when 400 million (Americans and Russians) are dead."

The thought of Senator GOLDWATER, as President, distributing nuclear weapons supplies to field commanders to use at their discretion, his woeful lack of knowledge about international affairs and politics, his almost smart aleck assumption that he does, as the Star noted, have all the answers and that he is absolutely right, all add up to decisions such as the Kansas City Star has made. There is nothing of moderation in the man and no concept of the values of patience and compromise. Certainly he does not draw Americans together.

The conservative Star's conclusion that we cannot afford a divided country is undisputable.

Distinguished Circuit Judge Says Anti-Court Measures Invalid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, as the House witnesses a once-in-a-generation procedure being used for the second

time in a month, on this occasion to force a vote on a constitutional amendment which will never pass, I think it is fair to say that Olympian detachment regarding the reapportionment issue is becoming increasingly scarce just when it is most needed.

While he may not have chosen his moment with this in mind, we are very fortunate to have a brief and measured statement by former Judge Henry W. Edgerton, describing with great simplicity why any legislation suspending Federal court jurisdiction over State reapportionment cases is a constitutional nullity. Judge Edgerton served the Nation and the Nation's Capital as associate and later chief judge of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. His letter to the editors, appearing in yesterday's Washington Post, deserves the attention of all Members:

APPORTIONMENT TANGLE

I have retired from regular active service as a circuit judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and am interested in apportionment only as a citizen.

The Constitution says "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." And "The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States," etc. In cases "arising under" the clause of the Constitution that forbids a State to deny to any person the equal protection of the laws, the Supreme Court has decided that both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned on a population basis so that each person's vote shall have equal weight with every other person's.

The House of Representatives has passed a bill that would nullify these Supreme Court decisions by (1) forbidding the Supreme Court to review cases concerning apportionment of State legislatures and (2) forbidding U.S. district courts to decide such cases in the first place. If this bill were to become law and were observed, it would remove such cases from the "judicial power of the United States." Because these are cases "arising under this Constitution," Congress has no power to do so. For the same reason, Congress has no power to require delay in such cases, as a different bill now pending in the Senate proposes to do.

The Constitution says "The Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make." And Congress may "ordain and establish" inferior courts. But these constitutional provisions no more authorize Congress to prevent the judicial power of the United States from enforcing the right to equal protection of the laws than the same provisions authorize Congress to prevent the judicial power from enforcing the right to freedom of speech, or trial by jury, or any other constitutional right.

Congress cannot nullify constitutional rights by the simple device of forbidding U.S. courts to decide cases in which these rights are involved. Congress may redistribute among U.S. courts the judicial power to enforce constitutional rights, but Congress cannot eliminate or reduce that power. The Constitution, like other documents, must be read as a whole.

The constitutional grant to U.S. courts of the judicial power to decide all cases "arising under this Constitution" is not subject to any implicit proviso to the effect: provided Congress is willing. The constitutional grant to Congress of the legislative power to determine what questions may be decided by what courts is subject to an implicit proviso to the effect: provided, that the judicial power conferred by the Constitution upon U.S. courts may not be abridged."

HENRY W. EDGERTON.

WASHINGTON.

A Picket of Yachts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently several yachts picketed in protest on the Hudson River. Their protest was aimed against the Consolidated Edison Co.'s plan to locate a powerplant in the north front of Storm King Mountain in New York State which would impair the natural beauty of the mountain and the Hudson River. The New York Times on September 8 published an editorial calling upon the Federal Power Commission to consider the esthetic values involved and the need to preserve the scenic beauty of the area. I hope the FPC will follow this sound suggestion and that all my colleagues will read the following editorial:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 8, 1964]

PROTECTING THE HIGHLANDS

Should esthetic values be considered by the Federal Power Commission in determining whether to grant a license to the Consolidated Edison Co. for its projected $160 million hydroelectric power installation at Cornwall, N.Y.? Con Edison says no. It maintains that under the law the FPC has no right even to take such values into account in making its decision. The Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference, which has been leading the fight against the installation, contends that the FPC has not only the right but the duty to weigh them.

Con Edison's plans call for gouging a giant powerplant into the north front of Storm King Mountain, with a huge storage reservoir high above it in the Hudson highlands. Water would be pumped from the river into the reservoir at night and released through tunnels during the day to generate power as needed for peak periods of New York City's insatiable demands. The current would be transmitted across the Hudson by submarine cables; then mainly by overhead high-tension lines to New York.

An examiner for the FPC has found in favor of Con Edison and against the conservationists, mainly on economic grounds. He has upheld the company's contention that its plans would not seriously impair the scenic beauty of the area, but has not ruled specifically on its claim that the Federal Power Act does not permit the FPC even to consider esthetic values. Now Scenic Hudson has filed a brief asking the full Commission to rule on this highly important point.

Under its broad powers to protect the public interest, the FPC certainly should accept its responsibility to preserve a great national heritage—a region of unspoiled natural beauty and historic national traditions dating back to the beginning of the Republic. Unless it does so, Con Edison's plea can become the entering wedge for despoiling the entire area. The yachts that picketed the Hudson Sunday in protest against the project spoke for a great army of Americans.

Getting Into Politics: Why and How To Begin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, our country's greatest asset is its informed, energetic citizens. Millions of Americans take part in our political affairs, as voters, and as active workers in political organizations. Once they have gotten started, volunteers find their activities exciting and rewarding. Volunteering for the first time, though, often seems harder than it is, and many people who would like to get involved in politics just do not know how or where to start.

Since 1959 the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York City has been offering encouragement and guidance to political novices through its public affairs program, a nonpartisan effort designed to promote more effective citizenship among members of the Chase Manhattan staff. The bank's most recent public affairs bulletin is titled "Getting Into Politics: Why and How To Begin." It offers excellent advice for would-be volunteers, emphasizing the importance of bread-and-butter local issues and directing citizens to the many clubs and candidates who "have an insatiable hunger for human skills and services." As the article states, "The password is, 'I want to help'."

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert this interesting and informative bulletin in the RECORD:

GETTING INTO POLITICS: WHY AND HOW TO BEGIN

"My most exciting experience of 1964." This is the reaction of one volunteer, a political novice 3 weeks ago, to the work he's now doing in an election campaign.

Along with his shirt-sleeved candidate, up from Washington for the day, he was mapping out the route for a motorcade. Other workers were ordering more campaign buttons, arranging for a fund-raising dinner, telephoning voters in the district, and planning for a door-to-door canvass.

During the next 2 months, 6 million other American will join these volunteers in doing some kind of active work for a political candidate or political party. These people will soon find out that participation in politics not only makes good sense, but is good fun as well.

PLENTY OF ROOM FOR EVERYBODY

Political work can be exciting and entertaining. In addition, the political volunteer makes new friends and personal contacts, and adds a new dimension to his life. Beside enjoying the competitive thrill of the two-party race, the political worker learns a great deal about human psychology and the art of government.

The political arena has plenty of room for everybody. From the local election district to the highest offices in Washington, political leaders and political parties are eagerly

looking for people to do something more than just vote—people who are able and willing to get out and work.

Many people have a hankering to get into politics, but do not know quite how to get started. Actually, it is simple. Almost any interested person can join a political organization just about as easily as he or she joins a civic group or social club. But the volunteer has to make the first move himself. If he shyly waits to be asked, he probably will never become active in politics. Though the political leaders want his services very much, the only way that they can discover his availability is if he tells them about it.

There are three ways of getting into the swing of a political campaign. The hopeful political worker can: (1) Join his local party organization, or (2) join a political club, or (3) volunteer his services directly to a candidate who is running for office.

As far as getting started with the neighborhood party organization is concerned, some succinct advice for the novice comes from U.S. Congressman NEIL STAEBLER, who was chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee in Michigan from 1950 to 1961. Says he: "Go to the smallest political unit in the place where you live. Go to the political meetings. See the opposition, too. Get acquainted with the whole operation. Volunteer for a job, but not too soon. People get suspicious when you move too soon. But when the right job opens up, volunteer for it. Stick with it. Politics is a lot like olives. Many people don't like the first taste, or the job of getting the first one out of the bottle."

The logical man to seek out first is the leader of his local election district. If he wishes to take on bigger game, the novice can call upon the party chairman of his assembly district or city or county. But he would be wise to begin at the lowest level; that is, at the election district level. Here he has the best opportunity to sharpen his talents and learn quickly.

The password is, "I want to help." Most political bodies—no matter how seemingly distant or closed to outsiders—have an insatiable hunger for human skills and services. The organization needs people to conduct door-to-door canvassing of the neighborhood in search of votes, to write and distribute publicity broadsides, to prepare card indexes, to drive sound trucks, and to watch the polls or babysit on election day.

THE CLUB AND THE CANDIDATE

If a person does not want to commit himself fully to the regular party organization, he can join a so-called political club. There are some 20,000 such clubs in the United States, both Democratic and Republican. Generally, they are adjuncts of the local political party organizations. But they are somewhat more independent than the regular organizations and less subject to the control of the local political leaders.

Political clubs meet regularly and often have their own clubhouses. They sponsor such programs as debates, discussions and forums at which guest speakers are likely to be city councilmen and State legislators. Clubs also sponsor many social functions—dances, parties, tours of the United Nations.

During an election campaign, the club members combine with the local party organization and are selected for various campaign jobs. To find out the name, address, and telephone number of a local political club, a volunteer can contact his party's assembly district leader or county committeeman. A good first step is to check the telephone book listings under "Democratic" or "Republican."

There is still another route to active participation in politics. That is the road taken by people who find themselves attracted to a particular candidate, but not necessarily to the political club or the regular party organization. These people volunteer to help their favorite candidate during a specific campaign.

One of the political leaders who favors this course is Congressman MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, who was chairman of the platform committee at the recent Republican National Convention. When people ask him how to become active in politics, LAIRD replies: "Work for a candidate. Work for a candidate at any level—local, State, or National. The type of campaign is not important, at least not at the outset. The important thing is to get into the thick of it, observe how it's done, and take an active part in the political process."

If a person with useful talents approaches the candidate or his campaign manager, he stands a good chance of finding himself placed in a challenging and exciting job. The candidate and his manager are constantly searching for skills and services beyond those made available by the regular party organization. They do not want to become dependent upon the organization, and they often feel that the organization has not assigned nearly enough volunteer workers to their individual campaign.

THE NEED FOR VOLUNTEERS

To build their own team, the candidate and his manager search for volunteers from many professional backgrounds. The candidate can always make use of lawyers, door-to-door salesmen, accountants, clerks, fundraisers or people with experience in money matters. Says Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, of California: "If a young law student writes me that he has an interest in politics, and if I have a place for him in my office, I hire him for 3 months during the summer."

The volunteer is, of course, much better positioned if his candidate wins. But victory is not always essential. Senator FRANK MOSS, of Utah, suggests that a good way for a novice to gain experience is to pick out a solid candidate in whom he has confidence and go to work for him without worrying too much about how the election will turn out. Says Moss: "Your credentials turn largely on how well you did your job and what enthusiasm you showed rather than on the candidate for whom you campaigned or how a particular election resulted."

Considering how relatively easy it is to become active, why don't more people plunge into the political swim?

One reason is that many Americans mistakenly believe that political activity is beneath them—a shoddy affair which ladies and gentlemen should avoid. Even if this charge were accurate, which it fortunately is not, it should not be sufficient to prevent truly alert, concerned citizens from becoming politically active. In other, less fortunate countries, good people have learned the bitter lesson that the surest way to surrender the political arena to selfish men is to shun it themselves. In other words, to avoid political activity is to court disaster.

While some people believe that politics is below them, just as many erroneously believe that politics is above them. They have concluded that only people who have highly specialized talents or great wealth are really wanted inside the political inner circles. But the truth is that people from all walks of life can and do make meaningful political contributions—and enjoy themselves while they are doing it. Leaders in both political parties report that some of their most effective volunteer workers are housewives, office workers, students, business executives and farmers.

In the high-level world of politics, the most pressing issues are those that come closest to affecting the lives of every one of us. When the ordinary citizen stops to ponder the great political questions of our day, he usually thinks in terms of such sweeping problems as the cold war, the future of the Western Alliance, and international trade or monetary policy.

But beyond these broad issues are scores of equally basic local questions that determine the quality of our every-day lives. If anyone thinks that politics involves only such seemingly distant questions as NATO and the tariff laws, let him look around his own neighborhood and make a personal checklist of local conditions: Like roads, schools, police protection, and transportation.

These are just a few of the bread-and-butter issues that affect our daily lives. If people wish to have a voice in those issues—a voice beyond a simple vote—then they should become active in politics. And the leaders of both political parties agree that the best time to get started is right now.

Says Senaor CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island: "Don't just talk about getting into poltics—get out there and do something. Get a list of names and go door-to-door. Stuff envelopes. Write letters. Raise money. But just get started and do something."

Ringing doorbells, stuffing envelopes, delivering publicity broadsides, even babysitting so that busy mothers can get to the polls—these may seem like less than romantic assignments for the beginner. Almost everybody would like to begin in some glamorous, policymaking position. But few do.

"Remember, volunteers don't start at the top," advises Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, a former chairman of the Republican National Committee. "Be willing to do the hard, routine work. You're really learning to help yourself, but right now you're helping someone else."

Whatever his position, an alert volunteer will quickly get a feel for the essentials of the whole campaign. He will learn how to wage a political battle—and that the tactics are much the same whether the race is for the school board or the Senate, the election district leadership, or the U.S. Presidency.

Equally important, the volunteer will become noticed himself. If the new political worker is bright and dedicated, he or she will soon catch the eye of the candidate, the campaign manager, and other political leaders. "In a matter of hours," says Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, "a really bright person will attract the attention of the politicians."

In political campaigns, the shortage of skilled workers is acute and the turnover of personnel is rapid. The rise from envelope-licker to master campaign strategist can be fast—provided the volunteer is energetic and wants to take on greater responsibility in the political arena.

The American system of competitive, democratic, two-party politics, is envied by peoples the world over. It is a basically sound and sturdy system, but it needs careful nourishing. Democracy, after all, is government "by the people" as well as of and for the people.

"A Communist," Nikita Khrushchev once remarked, "has no right to be a mere onlooker."

In our democratic society, it is up to the individual whether he becomes an onlooker or a participant. But in making this decision, he should realize that the success of a democracy depends, essentially and profoundly, on getting the best men and women into politics and government.

Labor Day—7th of September Brought Back Sad Memories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, sometimes in the busy lives we lead,

we are prone to forget the difficulties under which our soldiers have suffered in all of our wars.

A friend of mine in Pembroke, Ga., who served in World War I and is now the editor of the Pembroke Journal, wrote in a recent issue of his paper about an experience which he had.

[From the Pembroke (Ga.) Journal, Sept. 10, 1964]

LABOR DAY—7TH OF SEPTEMBER BROUGHT BACK SAD MEMORIES

(By Frank O. Miller)

Today, September 7, is a day that ye editor will never forget, for 45 years ago today, ye editor was on the SS *Persie*, a soldier headed for the battlefields of France, and on our 13th day at sea, when it was thought our ship would land the next morning at Liverpool, England, we had been given orders to take a bath, that was to get naked and get on deck and let them turn the hose on you, as they wanted all the soldiers to present a good appearance when they went ashore.

But, lo and behold, while sitting atop of our bunk, naked in the bottom of the ship, a German submarine hit our ship with a torpedo and tore a big hole in it, and of course we all surged to the top. We had places to line up at, while an inspection was made; finally an order was given to abandon ship, every man for himself. After being in the water some time we were picked up by the British destroyer *Spitfire*, and remained on deck all night, on a steel deck, barefooted and naked, and believe you me, it gets cold out on the water at night even in the dead of summer. It was the longest and most miserable night I ever spent.

Finally we landed at Plymouth, England, about 10:30 on Sunday morning. There must have been 25,000 people to meet the boats when they went into port with the survivors off the torpedoed ship, and about four-fifths of them were women. There we were, one of about a thousand naked men, but these people did not let it worry them. They finally gave us English soldier clothes, and we finally made it on up to the front.

But September 7 will always be a day that we will never forget.

Why We Are for Johnson and Humphrey—Editorial From Chicago PNYX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the text of an editorial giving the reasons the Chicago PNYX, an independent newspaper interpreting our country's Hellenic thought, is supporting President Johnson and HUBERT HUMPHREY.

The editorial was published in the Chicago PNYX on September 1, 1964.

The editorial follows:

WHY WE ARE FOR JOHNSON AND HUMPHREY

The following excerpts are from an editorial in the Chicago PNYX of April 19, 1958, written by Peter N. Mantzoros.

"To the Hellenes of America the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is well known for his opposition to the McCarran-Walter law. * * * He always works closely with Democratic Leader Johnson and has been vociferous in his demands that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles should resign. His prominence in national Democratic circles has endeared him to many leaders who see in him the very best material for the Vice-Presidency of the United States. * * * The citizens of Hellenic extraction have watched HUMPHREY's political ascendancy with admiration and see in him a great American political leader who is dedicated to erase the stigma of having second-class citizens among the foreign-born in America by working for the repeal of all laws which do not apply to all citizens alike."

A year later, in an article written for the Chicago PNYX, among other things, Senator HUMPHREY said: "In spite of terrible hardships, Greece provides one of the most spectacular examples of the value of foreign aid. Aid to Greece, a proven friend of the United States, has not only helped our own national interest, but it has greatly aided the cause of freedom generally."

In the opinion of the Chicago PNYX, the greatest statement ever made by the most outspoken Senator in the history of the United States, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, is:

"What the people of the world want today more than anything else is acceptance. They want to be respected. They want to be held in a spirit of equality. They want to be treated as equals. We have set ourselves up as some kind of superpatriots, so to speak, pointing the finger at people from all over the world who have helped make this Nation rich and powerful and saying to them, 'You are not clean.' I conclude by saying that any nation which closes its doors will close its mind and close its heart; or perhaps I should turn it around and say that when we begin to close our doors, the portals of this great Republic, then we have closed our hearts and closed our minds."

More recently, on August 3, the editor of the Chicago PNYX was among several newspaper publishers and editors who attended a meeting with President Johnson in the East Room of the White House.

In his faithful and tactful manner the President of the United States told us: "Your publications represent one of the most American of all American institutions. * * * You and your predecessors have done much to unify us, to bring us together—as one people and one nation. * * *

"This is a great hour in our national history. * * * America's leadership at every level is called now to work for America's unity—and to work against America's division. * * *

"This is the work we must always put first—if we are to keep faith with those who have come to these shores from across the seas. * * * A divided America cannot be a prosperous America—or a peaceful America—or a progressive America. A divided America cannot fulfill its promise at home—or accomplish its purposes abroad. * * *

"Our forefathers left the lands of their birth because cries for justice fell upon deaf ears—cries for peace fell upon closed and willful minds—cries for opportunity fell upon stony hearts. We do not want to turn back toward what we left behind. That is why we move with confidence, with courage, and with compassion to perfect our unity—to overcome our divisions—to fulfill the great promise of this hour in American history.

"And that is why I asked you here.

"The challenge of unifying America—of holding our land on a straight and sure course of success—cannot be met by the man in the White House alone.

"I need your help—and the help of every American. * * * Standing here—talking with you—I am very proud of America and what our unity has wrought for us * * *.

"This is a great moment for America—an hour of great opportunity. It is a moment to unite—and in that unity move ahead together to win the victory for freedom and justice throughout the world."

As in recent speeches to labor leaders, business leaders, and school officials, Mr. Johnson told us that: "As President of all the people, I intend to work to insure that every person enjoys the full constitutional rights and equal opportunity that are his birthright as an American citizen."

The President also reminded us that he began his public life from a congressional district whose people were from many lands. He alluded to his father's refusal, as a member of the Texas Legislature, to go along with moves to penalize Texans of German ancestry during World War I.

Finally, Mr. Johnson urged all of us to convey our respect for law and order and for human rights to all the Americans we serve through our newspapers.

As President, Mr. Johnson's most important contribution to humanity, so far, has been the passage of the Civil Rights Act which was instigated by his predecessor in office. He now stands as the embodiment and apostle of that principle.

It is not always easy to analyze the cause of a popular favorite's hold upon the masses. But to awaken the love and warmest admiration of a people, requires qualities which well nigh defy analysis. It has been Mr. Johnson's good fortune to be able to offer a very large class of his fellow citizens just what they seemed to need.

He has aroused and attracted their sympathies, and this tremendous logical fact is what will bring about an overwhelming ground swell which will sweep him into office in November.

Welfare "Rights" and International Politics Add Chaos to California Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1964

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, there are several minor developments which should be reported to the Members relating to the impending chaos in California agriculture upon the termination of the bracero program. Not one of the development is good—they are bad for agriculture, all related industries, and the U.S. taxpayer and consumer.

The September 14, 1964, issue of the Council of California Growers newsletter depicts these deplorable developments well:

WELFARE, POLITICS, LABOR, AND WELFARE—THE WHEEL COMES FULL CIRCLE AND THE CRISIS GROWS

With so much attention—political and otherwise—being focused on the unemployed, on the Nation's pockets of poverty, and on the need to match men with jobs, an incident that took place in Alameda County last week seemed a bit paradoxical.

It even bordered on the ironic. Particularly when it occurred at almost the same time that Governor Brown, citing the great unemployment problem, quoting the "unified feelings of organized labor," and the "position of the Mexican Government," stated that no extension of the bracero program would pass Congress this year.

And what made the Alameda incident even more amazing was the fact that as it

took place, California growers were being certified by the State and Federal Governments for the greatest number of temporary foreign workers, braceros, required so far this year. Not only as the big stoop labor peak in tomatoes approaches, but for work in peach harvesting in areas that haven't required braceros in years. For this year we had one of those little unforeseeable quirks that make agriculture a bit different than other industries. This one involved weather and rain. Weather which drove the domestics that historically pick peaches and other soft fruit elsewhere thus leaving tons of peaches on the trees unharvested.

What happened in Alameda? Just a little old sit-in, a commonplace incident these days, true. But this was a little different in that this particular group was protesting the Alameda County Welfare Department's agricultural employment program for able bodied, psychologically adjusted welfare recipients.

Led by a group known as the Welfare Rights Organization, and supported by CORE, the ad hoc committee (of San Francisco Auto Row and Sheraton Palace sit-in fame) plus a group called youths for jobs, the pickets, and later the sit-ins, complained that the department's agricultural employment program was degrading.

"Farm work is below our dignity" protested the sit-ins. "We're entitled to our welfare checks and no one's got the right to say that we got to take farm jobs to get those checks."

In spite of Welfare Director Harold B. Kehoe's explanation of the original and basic reasons for the welfare program plus his repeated announcements that even unskilled peach pickers were making an average of $2 per hour, the welfare righters were unmoved. So unmoved, in fact, that they staged an 84-hour protest sit-in.

Chanting, "we know our rights and we don't have to work to get them" interspersed with an occasional, "freedom now"—the sit-ins sat—the public officials looked harassed and embarrassed; growers around the State continued their search for workers and peaches fell to the ground.

Does this mean that the peach crop is lost? By no means. There will be plenty of peaches going through the canneries because, overall, the crop is being harvested. Oh, sure, some grower will be hurt. Others, including the owners of the orchards that we toured personally, will lose their shirts this year. But even that isn't the point.

What is the point? Well, really there are quite a few. One of which was rather succinctly analyzed by a newsman covering the Alameda sit-ins. A newsman, by the way, in good standing with his union and an old pro in covering the news beats of the bay area, and other metropolitan areas.

He put it this way—and we quote: "What a h— of a situation this is. The growers are breaking their necks to get workers, the politicians are talking about putting America back to work and these people—the very people the Government is saying need jobs, don't want jobs. And why? Because it's too easy to get something for nothing. Why get out in the fields and sweat, stoop, squat, or reach for d— good money, if you're willing to work, when you can sit back, do nothing, and get enough from uncle taxpayer to get along. Brother, now I've seen everything."

Well, as a matter of fact, he hasn't seen everything. In fact he hasn't seen anything yet. Wait until next year when there are no braceros to fill in as a temporary, supplemental work force. Wait until the thousands of workers in the allied industries who rely on these bracero harvested crops for their jobs are laid off those jobs. Wait until California's $12 billion per year agribusiness industry starts to fold in the middle. Then our newsman friend will have seen something.

And if you think this is an exaggeration, then you haven't been too close to the growing amount of correspondence between top officials in such closely allied industries as ice and refrigeration, banking, trucking, railroading, air and water transportation, canning, paper and carton manufacturing, printing and lithography * * * and more. Correspondence that indicates a growing concern over the farm labor situation. Correspondence that asks "after the braceros what?" Correspondence that indicates an increasing uneasiness over the pat answers from the Governor to the effect that "California growers will have adequate labor to harvest next year's crops." And * * * it would seem, there is reason for this uneasiness. Particularly since the ball has been thrown to labor * * * and they haven't provided the answer. And to the Governor * * * who, upon further questioning such as took place at his last news conference, admits that he doesn't know where the labor will come from.

Oh * * * to clarify the record. Organized labor is not "unified" in its opposition to some type of temporary, supplemental foreign labor. While top AFL–CIO officials publicly announce their opposition, others close to reality and their own people who work in the allied industries share the same concern * * * privately * * * as do the management people of these industries. And, of course, the Teamsters * * * very close to the problem and, it would seem, very realistic in their appraisal of the situation and the jobs of their members * * * have stated for months that they feel some kind of supplemental foreign labor will be required for at least 5 years.

Also * * * for the record * * * while the Governor said that "Mexico itself doesn't want an extension" and "probably wouldn't sign a new treaty," there's more to that story too. The Mexican Consul General in San Francisco, Senor Adolfo G. Dominguez, told newsmen questioning him on this matter that it was his understanding that his government felt that the bracero program was a mutually beneficial program for the two countries and that as long as the United States felt this way, then he was certain that his government would agree to continue the program. Dominguez concluded the interview with a statement to the effect that his country would certainly not initiate the termination of any such mutually beneficial program.

However, there is one other factor that comes into play. And * * * as one observer put it, maybe this is what the Governor was thinking about when he made his statement about the Mexican Government's alleged, or at least "reported," feelings on this matter. That thought is simply this:

While both countries benefit a good deal under a bracero-type program, Mexico would certainly benefit a great deal more if there were no supplemental labor for California farms. Why? Because then Mexico would really be the producer, processor, and supplier for the Nation's table foods. California surely wouldn't be. And the Eastern States can't possibly produce the volume of quality farm products we produce here. So it would have to go to Mexico. As indeed a great deal of our fruit and vegetable production and processing already has.

And what a kick in the teeth that would be to the economy of California * * * to the allied industries involved * * * to the investors in those industries and * * * to their labor force. Then we would have an unemployment problem. But then there's always welfare.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

West Virginia Strengthened by Fort Martin Power Generating Station—Ground-Breaking Ceremonies and Morgantown Luncheon Mark the Beginning of Construction

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Appalachian Regional Development Act is being weighed and considered by Members of both Houses of Congress, and will, I hope, be acted on favorably in the Senate before adjournment. This legislation is a vital element in our Nation's drive to develop programs to advance West Virginia and areas of surrounding States.

The Appalachian bill is in no sense a handout, but rather an investment in the future prosperity of all Americans. We cannot permit one large section of our country to lag economically; to endure conditions of unemployment which substantially exceed the national average; we must not ignore the plight of thousands of our fellow citizens who are without adequate educational and health facilities. It is obvious that from a humanitarian standpoint, and in our own enlightened self-interest, we must act to end these damaging conditions.

Mr. President, the people of Appalachia are far from content with the status quo. They are working with diligence and imagination to improve their way of life and to strengthen the region.

Evidence of this spirit of cooperative effort can be readily found in West Virginia. One such example is the activity being carried forward in conjunction with the construction of the Fort Martin power generating station, at Fort Martin, W. Va., near Morgantown.

The generating station will consist of two units, the first of which is now being built by Monongahela Power Co. and the Potomac Edison Co., both subsidiaries of the Allegheny Power System. The initial facility will have a capability of approximately 540,000 kilowatts and its estimated cost is $53,500,000. It will be the largest ever installed in the Allegheny System, and is expected to be in operation by 1967.

It was my privilege to participate in the ground-breaking ceremonies for the Fort Martin station on September 11, 1964. Presiding on this notable occasion was Don Kammert, the energetic president of the Monongahela Power Co. Following the invocation by the Reverend William Wolfe, pastor of the Fort Martin Methodist Church, Mr. Kammert introduced J. Lee Rice, Jr., the progressive president of the Allegheny Power System.

In brief remarks Mr. Rice made reference to the cooperation at National, State, and local levels which his organization has enjoyed during the planning of this important power complex. He also expressed the belief, to which I subscribe, that the Fort Martin project is indicative of the enthusiasm and civic interest which is evidenced in West Virginia and Appalachia.

At a given signal, a laser ray was activated, which in turn detonated fireworks officially breaking ground for the Fort Martin power generating station. Taking part in this portion of the program were: Hon. W. W. Barron, Governor of West Virginia; Hon. Harley Staggers, U.S. Representative from the Second District; Robert G. MacDonald, president of the Potomac Edison Co.; Mr. Kammert, Mr. Rice, and myself.

The proceedings were later adjourned to the Hotel Morgan, Morgantown, for a luncheon. Governor Barron addressed an appreciative audience, commenting on the degree of cooperative effort which has been evidenced between Government, industry, labor, and education. He pointed out that:

In West Virginia, these forces have learned—during the past three and a half years—the benefit of sitting down together to study problems. When we do this, we understand the problems and their interrelationship to all other segments of our society. Whenever we come to understand each other and the scope of economic, political, and industrial need, then we truly define "the common good" in modern, cooperative terms. From this basis we develop sound and positive action programs.

Mr. Rice then spoke of the implications of the construction of the Fort Martin station, and its impact on the Morgantown trading area. He correctly stated that this new transmission capability is but one among many steps toward progress and prosperity which have been encouraged by the citizens of Morgantown.

Especially informative were the remarks of Dennis L. McElroy, executive vice president of the Consolidation Coal Co. From the northern West Virginia mines of this firm will come the coal to heat the boilers which produce the steam to drive the turbines from which will come the vast electrical power of the Fort Martin station. Mr. McElroy indicated that the manpower requirements of this coal production would provide employment for 200 miners near range, and when the second unit is complete that figure will grow to almost 500.

Prior to these remarks it was my privilege to speak, in part, as follows:

Here in our beloved highlands we are heartened to see progress by the American society and private-investor economy. Our growth has its roots in the energy, intelligence and integrity of leadership exemplified by those business, industrial, and political leaders gathered here.

West Virginians are being increasingly recognized as people who are friendly, ambitious, and progressive. The impression is being rapidly dissipated that West Virginia has been sidetracked by automation and forced out of the mainstream of the national economy. The events of this day demonstrate that is not the case.

The beneficial effect of the Fort Martin power generating station has been cause for new optimism among private sectors of the economy. A lucidly written editorial in the September 11 issue of the Morgantown Post emphasizes the public awareness of the positive forces which will accrue.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix, together with proceedings at the ground-breaking ceremonies for the Fort Martin power generating station, and the luncheon which followed, September 11, 1964.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD,

[The Morgantown (W. Va.) Post, Sept. 11, 1964]

LOOKING BIGGER ALL THE TIME

This community is beginning to get a little better notion of what that new Fort Martin power station down the river will look like after more than $50 million has been spent in the next 2 or 3 years to bring it into actual being.

But even the speeches at today's formal ground-breaking ceremonies can scarcely convey a general awareness of the total significance to this area of this power-generating project and the whole interconnected system of which it is to be a part.

Immediately upon going into operation, of course, the Fort Martin station will provide a large and assured market for Monongalia County coal and steady round-the-year employment for a substantial number of miners.

But while the economic soundness of putting so much money into a power station was found in the ability to transmit electricity over longer distances than ever before, it does not necessarily follow that the availability of Fort Martin's power will not serve to bring new industry closer to the powerplant as well as to take its power to distant customers.

No wild promises are being held out that Fort Martin will bring industry to Monongalia County and other parts of the upper Monongahela Valley. But it would be most unusual if that result did not occur, especially if the area can otherwise qualify as a good place for new industry to locate and operate.

Such a prospect rises far above the more limited satisfaction to be found in the increased tax revenue the county will receive from this large investment within its borders even though there is no need to ignore this substantial element in the project.

In the near future, as Fort Martin begins to take visible shape, its full significance will increasingly be recognized and appreciated.

PROCEEDINGS AT THE GROUND-BREAKING CEREMONIES FOR ALLEGHENY POWER SYSTEM'S NEW 540,000-KILOWATT FORT MARTIN POWER STATION AT FORT MARTIN, W. VA., SEPTEMBER 11, 1964

Donald M. Kammert, president of Monongahela Power Co.: "This ceremony will begin with the pronouncement of the invocation by Rev. William Wolfe."

Rev. William Wolfe, pastor, Fort Martin Methodist Church: "Let us pray. Our Father and our eternal God, Thou who are most hallowed, most holy and all powerful, we pause in the midst of this day and in the midst of our labors to invoke Thy blessings upon this piece of earthly work. Be pleased our Father to bless these officials of these companies, the representatives of our government, and all interested parties who have come here today. We ask furthermore our Father that you would bless those who take an actual part in the construction of this great plant. Keep them from harm. And as we have come to depend upon the power from these companies and the light, may we also learn to depend upon Thee and Thy Son, Jesus Christ, for the inward light and the inward power. These blessings and these favors we ask in the name of Thy Son and our Savior, Jesus Christ. Amen."

Donald M. Kammert: "Thank you for joining with us on this momentous occasion. This is an event of importance to this community, to the companies comprising the Allegheny Power System, to the States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, and to the area known as Appalachia.

"It is my privilege to introduce to you the man who will formalize this ground breaking. My friend, and a friend of this geographic area, the president of Allegheny Power System, Mr. J. Lee Rice, Jr."

REMARKS OF J. LEE RICE, JR., FORT MARTIN OVERLOOK SITE

On behalf of Allegheny Power System and its three operating companies, Monongahela, Potomac Edison, and West Penn Power, I wish to express our sincere appreciation for the participation in this event by these distinguished public servants here on the platform with me. Their presence is indicative of the cooperation we have received from them at the national and State levels. I think it further indicates their dedication to the economic development of West Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania.

It is also gratifying to us in the investor-owned electric business to see such a fine turnout of business, news media, and government leaders from local and regional levels. We are honored by your presence, which again underscores our long-held contention that there is a good and healthy climate for private industry investment and growth in our three-State area.

There are several things I may be able to point out that will give you a better on-site understanding of our construction program here at Fort Martin. As you see, quite a bit of dirt has already been shoved around. The huge hole that has been excavated (pointing) will house the base of the cooling tower and the balloons indicate the height of the tower. The main building housing the generating facilities is to be in the area now being graded. Expansion of the generating station to two units is planned for some time in the future.

The stacks that mark all steam generating powerplants and the cooling towers will reach high above the place where we are now standing. Again we have balloons to indicate the height of the stack.

Huge quantities of coal will be barged down river to the plant site from Consolidation Coal Co.'s Arkwright and Humphrey preparation plants above Morgantown.

I have already talked long enough. Let's get on with the job we came here to do.

In the event any of you have jumpy nerves, let me set them at rest. We are going to set off an explosion down on the plant site, but this is a fireworks—not a dynamite—explosion.

The fireworks we are almost to see will be set off by remote control—by a Laser ray. For those of you who are not familiar with the term Laser ray, let me explain that it is a means of concentrating energy into a light beam. This ray, aimed at a target on the moon, missed the bull's eye by less than 500 yards. It will drill a hole through a diamond or a steel plate and I'm told it has been used to weld a detached retina back in place in the human eye. We have here a battery of buttons, inasmuch as this new plant is symbolic of the push-button age. When all buttons have been pushed, a ray of light directed at a target on the plant site below will set off the fireworks and ground will be officially broken.

I will need some help, so have asked the following people to join me in this pleasant task. They are: Senator Jennings Randolph, Governor Barron, Don Kammert, president of Monongahela Power Co.; Bob MacDonald, president of Potomac Edison; and Hon. Harley Staggers, U.S. Representative.

Gentlemen, man your buttons.

Well, now we are all fatigued from our strenuous efforts. Let us adjourn to the Hotel Morgan for another type of exercise. The buses are ready for boarding.

REMARKS BY GOV. WILLIAM WALLACE BARRON, OF WEST VIRGINIA, SEPTEMBER 11, 1964

The beginning of the Fort Martin power station is another great step forward in West Virginia's recordbreaking economy. It's an example of the Monongahela Power Co.'s continuing interest in the progress of our State and its people. It's a real pleasure to be a part of such impressive activity.

The Monongahela Power Co. and the Potomac Edison Co., as well as the parent Allegheny Power System, have always been close partners with the State government. We work together in planning and achieving economic growth. Also, these companies have cooperated in every way possible to help Government help other industries—to improve the overall picture of progress for our people. We in the Government are grateful for this fine cooperation.

Today, West Virginia is experiencing an awakening unparalleled in all of its history. We are not satisfied that our State established alltime high economic records in 1962 and 1963, and is headed for still another record this year. We are setting new goals and new ideals for ourselves. It is not merely a matter of trying to speed up development as we have understood it in the past; we are, rather, providing new directions for development and expansion.

Our new motive force is toward more opportunity, more employment, and more security for more people. The direction is geared to many and varied types of cooperative endeavor. Cooperation is the key. Government, industry, labor, and education become involved in almost every new decision we must make.

In West Virginia, these forces have learned—during the past 3½ years—the benefit of sitting down together to study problems. When we do this, we understand the problems and their interrelationship to all segments of our society. Whenever we come to understand each other and the scope of economic, political, and industrial need, then we truly define "the common good" in modern, cooperative terms. From this basis, we develop sound and positive action programs.

We should not waste our time staring backward at our past. Today, in West Virginia, we are planning, building, and enjoying a greater prosperity than any generation of West Virginians before us experienced.

People grow and move ahead as they work together to solve their own problems and as they develop a sense of direction over their own progress. Today's program is proof that we are doing just that.

REMARKS OF J. LEE RICE, JR., GROUNDBREAKING LUNCHEON, MORGANTOWN, W. VA., SEPTEMBER 11, 1964

We are now within a very few minutes of the end of what has been a most enjoyable occasion for me. My trips to West Virginia and this area are always marked by the warm hospitality I encounter. This day has been no exception.

The readiness of our small city residents of West Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania to open their hearts to visitors, has always impressed and delighted me. It is one of the many reasons Allegheny Power System has solid faith in the economic future of the region it serves. We know that other people—especially industrialists—who come into this region will find this built-in hospitality to be contagious. They will want to become a part of it.

And I think anyone visiting Morgantown today woud have to be impressed by the potential of this area. This city is literally humming wih activity.

Here are some of the things I have observed in my few hours in Morgantown:

Dramatic expansion of West Virginia University and its facilities—extensive grading for construction of a new four-lane highway into the city—development of the old Morgantown Ordnance Works into a valued and job-producing industrial park—and expanded and highly attractive airport—development of an outstanding recreation area around beautiful Lake Lynn—preparation for construction of a new national training school for boys—extensive building of new homes and apartments—beautification of the downtown area—and I could go on and on.

Gentlemen, my numerous business visits here and the reports I receive indicate that the Morgantown story is one being repeated in towns throughout the territory served by Allegheny Power System. And most of our territory is in that section of the Nation sometimes referred to as Appalachia.

It is my contention that any objective person visiting Morgantown—and other bustling communities in this region—must come away with a feeling of optimism. There is no air of defeatism here.

The officers and directors of Allegheny Power System, and its operating companies, have strong faith in your future—and consequently—our future.

We are expressing this faith in a concrete manner—in the investment of large sums of dollars. One of the more effective tools we have developed is the creation and operation of an area development department in each of our operating companies.

These departments are manned by a number of specialists. Their basic function is to undertake any and all activities which can contribute to the economic development of the area we serve. I think the purpose should be obvious. Only as the economy of our territory grows and prospers can we grow and prosper.

And the economy can only grow and prosper as new jobs, bigger payrolls and larger profits are created. Through our area development staffs we are working closely with our railroads, local, State, regional and Federal agencies; factory locating services; colleges and public school systems; chambers of commerce; industrial development organizations and all other interested agencies, organizations and persons.

This business of area development is highly competitive—particularly in the indus-

trial end. But I am pleased to announce that our companies report that they are engaged in one of the busiest periods in their histories. In fact, they are working on more active industrial projects this year than ever before.

Gentlemen, we are moving forward in our part of Appalachia. And the Allegheny Power System is proud to play an active role in the overall team effort that is bringing about these dramatic results.

Of course we are also demonstrating our confidence in Appalachia's future by the very groundbreaking we held today and the construction work that is to follow at Fort Martin in coming weeks and months.

Let me run through some figures I think will interest you:

In the years through 1970 Allegheny Power System will spend nearly $350 million on new construction in the coalfields of West Virginia and western Pennsylvania and in adjoining Maryland. That expenditure will be for the two-unit station at Fort Martin and the extra high voltage transmission line to carry power to major markets throughout the East, and also for regular transmission and distribution facilities.

By 1970 our powerplants, including Fort Martin, will be burning over 9 million tons of coal each year which even under modern mining methods will mean steady employment for some 2,500 miners.

Let me give you some more figures to round out the contribution to the economy of Appalachia for the same period through 1970 by all of the investor-owned electric companies, including Allegheny Power, which serve the region.

They will spend over $2 billion for plant and equipment to be located there.

Steam electric powerplants having a capacity of 7 million kilowatts are under construction or planned.

Those plants and other plants to be built outside the region will burn around 28 million tons of coal mined in Appalachia.

All of you are certainly aware that this huge additional consumption of coal will mean many more coal mining jobs as well as heavy construction payroll.

There can be no question that Allegheny Power System and its neighboring investor-owned electric utilities care about the future of Appalachia and its people. And we care enough to invest our dollars to make that future a bright and prosperous one.

It has been a sincere pleasure to have you with us on this occasion. As a memento of this groundbreaking day, to further demonstrate our appreciation, we have a specially inscribed gold shovel for each of you. You will receive them as you leave the room. Incidentally, they were made in West Virginia.

REMARKS OF DENNIS L. MCELROY, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, CONSOLIDATION COAL CO., MORGANTOWN, W. VA., SEPTEMBER 11, 1964

Consol is happy to be a part of this Fort Martin industrial development, particularly with our old friends the Allegheny Power system. We are glad to be large users of their electrical energy and most happy to be a substantial supplier of their fuel needs.

The Fort Martin plant is the conclusion of the planning and aggressiveness of Allegheny Power.

To supply the fuel for this plant—northern West Virginia coal—will bring to this area 400 to 500 jobs. This is being done without the use of the ARA or any other Government handout. The economic push this plant and the attendant coal mining are giving this territory is 100 percent private financing, planning, and execution; and adding taxable income to local, State, and Federal Governments—in reverse of Government financial support.

The mine employment to produce the fuel for Fort Martin means about $3 million per year in wages and salaries plus roughly $750,000 per year in fringe benefits of one kind or another.

This coal production will require approximately $2,200,000 per year for materials, power, and supplies.

It has been my pleasure as well as many others in Consol to have not only business but personal friends in both West Penn and Monongahela Power. In days past, Joe Buchanan, Ord Lough, Clint Spurr, Phil Powers, and Don Potter did much to help me and educate me in the ways of the business world—just have the present officers of these companies.

The very best wishes of Consol go to Allegheny Power in this, which I am sure will be a successful venture. Also our congratulations to all the people of this area on getting this most important industrial development. Any area would be "tickled to death" to land such a plant.

We have been and certainly plan to continue to work as partners of Allegheny Power to get the maximum sound industrial growth of the whole western Pennsylvania area and the northern and central part of West Virginia which they serve. Thank you all very much.

Tribute to the Honorable Donald L. O'Toole

SPEECH
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned of the passing of the Honorable Donald L. O'Toole, one of the truly great public servants to occupy a seat in this House.

Donald O'Toole was a close, personal friend of mine. He was my Representative in this body for 16 years. For the past four it had been a great distinction and privilege for me to serve as his Representative. In fact, election to the former 12th District of New York, which my constituents bestowed on me in 1960, was a goal Donald O'Toole sought for both of us.

It would be impossible at this time to enumerate the major legislative accomplishments of Donald O'Toole while a Member of Congress or measure the great influence he exerted among his colleagues, some of whom are present here today. He served with sincerity, devotion, and dedication the people of Brooklyn, the people of New York, and even more important, the people of America.

Donald O'Toole will long be remembered as a champion of the social legislation enacted during the turbulent and eventful years he served in this House. Although a progressive in the truest sense, he never hesitated to exercise an independence of judgment or oppose legislation, which though popular in the public's view, he regarded as undesirable or deemed detrimental to the well-being of the Nation as a whole.

A man of unusual foresight, Donald O'Toole was among the first to recognize and warn against the threat of Nazi Germany to the world; to introduce legislation restricting the exporting of strategic materials to the Axis powers; and to recommend a severance of diplomatic relations with the totalitarian countries.

The borough of Brooklyn, the State of New York, the country, and the world is a better place in which to live because Donald O'Toole was once among us.

To his father, "Cap," a man who has given his life to community service, to his wife, Mary, his sons Donald and Thomas, and his daughter Mary, I extend on behalf of our family our deepest sympathy on our common loss of an uncommon man.

These Wars Are Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, this body has repeatedly shown its concern for the repeal of the retail excise taxes which have persisted year after year beyond the wartime conditions which caused their imposition. My bill, S. 2644, which is still in committee, calls for a limited degree of excise tax reform. The question has been under study by the House Ways and Means Committee; and I gave testimony there, favoring repeal. I also testified on this question before the Democratic platform committee; and the platform, as adopted, includes an excise tax plank which I trust we shall see implemented in the next Congress.

A good editorial on this subject was recently published in the Pierceton (Ind.) Press, one of Indiana's leading weekly newspapers. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "These Wars Are Over," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THESE WARS ARE OVER

At long last it looks as if something constructive may be done within the foreseeable future about those Federal excise—or sales—taxes that are a hangover from World War II and the Korean war.

A House committee has been studying them with a view to ultimate revision. It is expected that reductions—if not total repeal—will come within 2 years or less.

If this turns out to be the case the Government will be just about 20 years late in getting around to this particular kind of tax reform. When the excise taxes were imposed, everyone expected that they would be ended with the wars that were responsible for them. But Congress took the easy road and kept them alive year after year.

The taxes are often called luxury levies. But that, to most minds, is a misnomer. The toilet articles used universally by women hardly fall into the luxury class in our kind of society. Nor do handbags, wallets or wedding rings, all of which are subject to the tax. Nor does a coat with a little fur trim which is another tax-soaked item.

This emphasizes an often overlook fact—that we need to pay close attention to taxes other than the income tax. And we need to pay special attention to taxes which are

imposed, supposedly, for the duration of a real emergency and then are continued long after that emergency has passed into history. This is the status of the Federal retail excise taxes.

The Space and Shipping Program in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, when I first went to work with some of my colleagues and with a committee of distinguished citizens in New Orleans, headed by Mr. James J. Coleman, to bring the space age to south Louisiana, I knew of the vast potential of the program but the realities are now exceeding the expectations.

It was just a short 3 years ago when Mayor Schiro made the first announcement about the reactivation of the Michoud plant. At that time few of us realized that this program would constitute the single most important industry that has come to south Louisiana since we were admitted into the Union in 1812.

Its impact almost defies imagination as will be shown by some statistics which are included herewith.

However, let me first point out that all thoughtful students of history and political science know that government is best when it is closest to the people. That is why I have voted over the years to strengthen our city, parish and State governments and to support our basic concepts of city, parish and States rights. Some thoughtless critics, however, would have us believe that our U.S. Government has no role in our 20th century space era. This, of course, is untrue.

Common sense dictates otherwise. To give a few examples: we all know that it required the U.S. Government to perfect the nuclear defense system upon which all of us depend for the preservation of our freedom and liberty from our Communist enemies. We all know that it took years for us to convince the U.S. Congress of its responsibility in flood control, navigation, shipping, and shipbuilding. And we all know that an undertaking such as the space program, with its limitless promise for the future to our beloved Louisiana, requires the direction of a National Government. These are matters that all sensible Americans agree on.

Recently, Mr. James Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, met with Chairman Coleman and here is what he said as reported on that day, September 15, 1964, in the Times-Picayune. The article follows:

ON MOON BY 1969 WEBB FORECAST: SAYS MICHOUD PLAYS TOP ROLE IN GOAL

U.S. scientists' progress in the development of moonshot vehicles were described Monday as very good by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"If things work well, we'll be there by late 1969," said James Webb of Washington, D.C. "This would not be possible if it were not for Michoud."

Webb was in New Orleans to meet with former members of the NASA New Orleans Coordinating Committee, which was formed in 1961 by Mayor Victor H. Schiro to assist NASA in establishing the Michoud operations.

He predicted that the Michoud operation will remain a center of space activity for many years. "The South is the focal point of assembly and tests for our space exploration vehicles."

Michoud has been responsible for vast growth in the area, Webb added. He pointed out that 70 apartment buildings have been constructed in the New Orleans area, there are 36 new subdivisions with 1,346 new homes and 176 new businesses have resulted.

The Michoud operation and Mississippi test site are critical areas in rocket development, the NASA Administrator stated. Some $170 million in wages will be paid to the employees at Michoud during the 1965 fiscal year.

At present, he said, 11,505 persons are employed at Michoud and $927 million in contract work has been let at the plant since operations began.

Editorial comments were, of course, in order as a result of his statement. I quote below the Times-Picayune editorial, "High Expectation" of September 15, 1964, and another from the New Orleans States-Item, of the same date, entitled, "Gauge Michoud's Worth":

HIGH EXPECTATION

New Orleans and the national space program have come a long way together. And in the optimistic view of James Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, we will continue the mutually beneficial journey far into the future and the reaches of space.

Visiting here, Mr. Webb said: "The South is the focal point of assembly and tests for our space exploration vehicles."

In other words the world's most powerful rockets are being assembled here and soon will be undergoing static tests in Mississippi for the leap to the moon.

New Orleans and surrounding areas have accepted their roles in this effort, striving to welcome and accommodate the influx of specialists who have come here to plan and build the mammoth boosters. Local resources and manpower have been marshaled to the effort.

The return to the New Orleans area has been in equally generous measure. Mr. Webb noted that $927 million worth of contracts have been let at the Michoud plant; 11,505 persons have been employed there which will bring $170 million in wages into the area during the current fiscal year. This has meant an economic boom to New Orleans of considerable proportion, measurable in 176 new businesses, 1,346 new homes, and 70 new apartment buildings.

And there still is a long way to go, before the first astronaut sets foot on the moon about 1969. This will require continuing and expanded efforts on the part of the community, of which the Michoud operation has become an integral part.

But the rewards—both in terms of scientific accomplishment and economic reward—make it a journey to be anticipated with high expectation.

GAGE MICHOUD'S WORTH

Assessing the value to New Orleans of the Michoud Saturn moon rocket plant, James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, trots out facts and figures that are indeed impressive.

First, he articulates what has been apparent for several years now—that the rocket assembly facility will be a local fixture contributing enormously to the area's economic well-being for a long time to come.

Mr. Webb discloses that 11,505 persons are currently employed at Michoud and that they will earn some $170 million in wages during the current fiscal year.

At the same time he notes that $927 million in contract work has been let at the plant since operations got under way in 1961.

Including other than major contracts for production of boosters, however, NASA arrives at a figure in excess of $1 billion. And New Orleans firms have shared heavily (to the tune of 76 percent of total value) in contracts for modiying existing facilities and constructing new ones.

Mr. Webb, here to confer with local officials, touched on the current building and business boom, which he said stems largely from Michoud activities:

"Since the present operations have been underway, a tremendous growth has taken place in the New Orleans area. Seventy apartment buildings have been built. There are 36 new subdivisions, with 1,346 new homes, and 175 new businesses have resulted."

His observations complement a NASA news release issued last week on the occasion of Michoud's third anniversary. The agency described the space plant's impact on the community as "exceeding even the most liberal estimates of 3 years ago."

The report attributed 27,000 new jobs to the Michoud operation and said these workers are now providing an additional $4.5 million each year in city and State sales and income taxes.

It is noteworthy that the impact of Michoud has been more profound than previously imagined. And, as the United States moves more fully into the space age, guesses as to the plant's ultimate worth to the community will likely continue to be inadequate.

Prior to Administrator Webb's visit to our south Louisiana installation I was concerned about a letter which had been directed to the editor of the New Orleans States-Item derogating the value of the space program in our area, and I thereupon wrote a letter to the editor outlining what the program means to us. That letter follows in full:

AUGUST 14, 1964.

The EDITOR, NEW ORLEANS STATES-ITEM,
New Orleans, La.

DEAR SIR: A fortnight ago one of our citizens, in a letter to the editor, quoting a news magazine, purported to show that Louisiana is only obtaining $75 million as a result of the space program.

This misinformation was corrected in your lead editorial of July 25.

In order that our people may fully understand the tremendous impact of the space program, I have gathered from the most reliable public and private sources the following verified facts:

1. Total employees at the Michoud plant—August 13, 1964—11,155.

2. Estimated total number of jobs created in the New Orleans area, including both employment at the Michoud plant and the nearby telecomputing center at Slidell, La., and the added employment in the area firms doing subcontract work, 26,000.

3. Estimated total increase in personal income per year as a result of salaries and wages at the Michoud plant and at area firms doing subcontract work, $170 million.

4. Estimated total salaries and wages per year at the Michoud plant, $85 million.

5. Estimated total increase in effective buying income as a result of salaries and wages at the Michoud plant and at area firms doing subcontract work, $114.6 million.

6. Estimated total increase in effective buying income as a result of salaries and wages paid at the Michoud plant alone, $72.3 million.

7. Total number of subcontracts awarded to New Orleans area firms as an outgrowth of the prime contract space work being done at Michoud, 258 (as of July 1, 1964).

8. Total dollar value of the 258 subcontracts awarded to New Orleans area firms as an outgrowth of the prime contract space work being done at Michoud, $31,724,709 (as of July 1, 1964).

9. Grand total dollar value of subcontracts awarded to all firms as an outgrowth of prime contract space work being done at Michoud, $41,545,205 (as of July 1, 1964).

10. Grand total number of subcontracts awarded to all firms as an outgrowth of prime contract work being done at Michoud, 306.

11. Total percentage of subcontracts awarded to New Orleans area firms as an outgrowth of prime contract work being done at Michoud, 76.4 percent.

12. Estimated total revenues to the State of Louisiana per year by virtue of sales taxes from employees at the Michoud plant and their families, $2,336,000.

13. Estimated total revenues to the city of New Orleans per year by virtue of sales taxes from employees at the Michoud plant and their families, $1,168,000.

14. Estimated total revenues to the State of Louisiana per year from State income taxes from employees at Michoud and their families, $758,000.

15. The program has already accounted for 1,300 new homes, 36 new subdivisions, and 70 new apartments and many more will be required.

16. Total value of all contracts (both prime contracts and subcontracts to New Orleans area firms) awarded for space work at the Michoud plant and related work in conjunction with the prime contract work, almost $1 billion.

Thus it is shown that this program is one of the most important things that has happened to our State in its entire history, and I am proud that I played a leading role in making it possible for our people.

Sincerely,

HALE BOGGS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not dwell on the many programs which this Congress has enacted such as the tax reduction bill—resulting in the greatest period of employment at the highest wages in history in my section of Louisiana, or the recently passed trade acts bringing record business to our port—but I must mention the Avondale Shipyard. That shipyard, located on the banks of the great Mississippi River in Jefferson Parish, La., is now the largest in the United States. Its productivity compares favorably with any shipyard in the world. It is building the most modern ships in our merchant fleet as well as some of the most complex vessels in our nuclear Navy.

This shipyard is providing about 5,000 jobs and an annual payroll of about $40 million. This program combined with the implementation of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, giving life and energy to such magnificent steamship lines as Lykes, Mississippi Shipping Co., and so forth, means at least $100 million a year in payrolls to our area.

These programs have greatly strengthened our free enterprise system so that today more of our people are gainfully employed in private enterprise, owning their own homes and enjoying the blessings of freedom than ever before.

These projects will return many billions over their cost to industry, to our business community, to our port and shipping, to professional and working people, to our homebuilders, contractors and real estate developers, to our farmers, fishermen, cattlemen, timbermen, and to our citizens generally of south Louisiana.

When one also considers the almost explosive growth of the petrochemical industry in the great parishes of St. Charles, St. John the Baptist, and St. James—fast becoming the Ruhr Valley of America—it is no wonder so many of my colleagues say to me, "How does Louisiana obtain so much?" I like to feel, Mr. Speaker, without being immodest, that the answer to that question lies, at least in part, in the hard work which I have been privileged to do for my district over the years, because of the sustaining confidence and friendship of the people that I represent.

South Dakota Young GOP Convention on August 27–29

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it was my privilege to attend and address the convention of the Young Republicans of the State of South Dakota. The convention was held on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, in the city of Aberdeen. It was the largest and most enthusiastic young GOP convention in the history of our State.

Under the able leadership of President Stan Adelstein, of Rapid City, S. Dak., the Young Republican League of our State has been steadily growing, both in size and in significance. Two of our present State candidates for the offices of secretary of state and attorney general are young Republicans, as is the executive secretary of the regular South Dakota State Central Committee of the Republican Party.

Instead of adopting a formal Republican Party platform for the Young Republican League, the convention endorsed and embraced the State and national platforms of the party, and then unanimously adopted a set of resolutions dealing with some of the subjects in which these Republicans, who are below age 36, are vitally interested.

SOUTH DAKOTA YOUNG REPUBLICAN CONVENTION RESOLUTIONS

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolutions adopted at least week's State convention of the Young Republican League of South Dakota.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE CONVENTION RESOLUTIONS, SOUTH DAKOTA YOUNG REPUBLICAN LEAGUE, 1964, ABERDEEN, S. DAK., AUGUST 27, 28, 29

South Dakota Young Republicans proudly endorse the State and national Republican platforms. We wholeheartedly support the national ticket of BARRY GOLDWATER and WILLIAM MILLER, and the South Dakota congressional delegation of Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Representative BEN REIFEL and Representative E. Y. BERRY. We also enthusiastically support Nils Boe and Lem Overpeck for the offices of Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the State of South Dakota, and the outstanding slate of constitutional officers selected at the State convention.

We commend the Archie Gubbrud administration for its progressive administration over the past 4 years and commend it for its sound fiscal policy. We also commend it for its aid to State education, an increase from $5.2 million to $10 million per biennium, and for the establishment of a teacher's retirement program on the college level. We urge the further supplementation of South Dakota education opportunity.

AGRICULTURE

We deplore the lack of concern of the Democratic Party for the continual decline of farm prices to 74 percent of parity, the lowest level since 1938. We particularly resent the displacement of millions of acres of our productive lands through importation of cheap foreign beef and other red meats, and for surrendering to the State Department philosophies in forcing through Congress an ineffective beef import quota law as a substitute for the effective type of legislation which is so badly needed.

ASK REPLACEMENT FOR SECRETARY FREEMAN

We suggest that this administration replace Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman with Billie Sol Estes, who is apparently the only man who fully understands the farm program of this administration well enough to make it pay.

OPPOSE CARPETBAG CANDIDATES

We condemn the drive toward excessive power by the executive branch of our Federal Government and the manifestation of this attitude by the administration sending carpetbag candidates into strategic States to run for the office of U.S. Senator.

GOLDWATER BEST BET FOR PEACE

As young Americans we place our faith and confidence in the Republican Party with its policy of firmness supported by strength, which has always kept us out of war, rather than in a party whose policies of vacillation and indecision have repeatedly blundered America into foreign wars. We place our faith in the Republican Party and its leadership, which will regain the support and confidence of our friends and allies and restore the respect our enemies had for the determination and military might during the Republican years of Eisenhower and Dulles.

RECREATION

As young South Dakotans, interested in our unequaled recreational, fish and wildlife opportunities, we deplore and condemn the recent statements by the Democratic candidate for Governor, John Frank Lindley, revealing a desire to put the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks back into partisan politics.

MORALITY IN GOVERNMENT

The YGOP feels that the people of the United States deserve the guarantee of morality, honesty, and integrity in government which the people of South Dakota have enjoyed with the Gubbrud administration and which will be continued by the Boe-Overpeck administration. All Americans can achieve this type of government only by election of the Goldwater-Miller ticket, "a team you can trust," which is in sharp and refreshing contrast to the scandalous, un-

ethical, and immoral "fast deal" of the national Democrat ticket.

The South Dakota Young Republican League expresses its appreciation and thanks to the citizens of South Dakota and to the senior Republicans for their acceptance, support, and encouragement of the many young people who have entered into political activities of South Dakota.

The convention further thanks the host city of Aberdeen and the Brown County Young Republican Club, Steve Smith, convention chairman, and also those persons and businesses who have helped to make this convention a success.

Salute to Luis Muñoz-Marín

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, the announced retirement from the governorship of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico by Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín has caused widespread comment in the Nation's press as an example of democracy in action. The great love and respect for the Governor by the people of Puerto Rico would insure his reelection for another term if he chose to be a candidate. The Governor felt, however, that it was in the best interest of democracy that no one man allow himself to be perpetuated in office. Thus, he declined to be a candidate for reelection, although his party urged him to reconsider his decision.

Because of the Governor's decision in the face of his tremendous popularity and great record, the press has devoted considerable editorial space in his praise. I desire to include six additional editorials which I consider representative and which I am sure my colleagues will find of interest.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 19, 1964]

TRIBUTE

Luis Muñoz-Marín has quietly stepped down as Governor of Puerto Rico. The man who modestly led the greatest single success in the underdeveloped world of today simply declined renomination.

We refuse to be quiet about it. Twenty-one blasts from the biggest guns would be inadequate. This man led a country from deepest colonial poverty and humiliation and intolerable population pressure into democratic dignity and spreading affluence. He and a few colleagues proved to a fearful developing world that it could be done. They had the advantage of what Muñoz created as commonwealth status within the United States, but the miracle was still largely their own.

Largely his own, since leadership is so great an achievement must have its due. He will not leave the scene. He plans to serve in the Puerto Rican Senate and as active elder statesman. But now is the moment to ring the big bell. He is one of the few in today's world who have earned it.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Aug. 20, 1964]

MUÑOZ MARÍN: A RARE POLITICAL TYPE

All hail the most unsusual kind of politician of all. Or perhaps the word should be "statesman."

Anyway, Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín of Puerto Rico has declined to seek a fifth term although his reelection would be almost as sure a thing as there is in politics.

Instead he will run for the Commonwealth senate, and, as he put it, resume his role as teacher to the Puerto Rican people.

It was an emotional moment when Mr. Muñoz announced his decision to the Popular Democratic Party convention. There had been rumors he might decline a fifth nomination, but it was assumed that he would accept a draft.

News accounts say the 3,000 delegates made such an uproar when he announced his refusal that they fell silent again only after the Governor's wife rose to plead for respect of his wishes.

Mr. Muñoz' is a proud record. He was president of the island's senate from 1940 until 1948, when he became Puerto Rico's first elected Governor.

In 1940 per capita income in Puerto Rico was about $120, today it is more than $700, largely because of Muñoz' economic and social development programs. Life expectancy has risen from 46 to 68, and literacy is close to 90 percent.

The situation of Puerto Rico is not exactly comparable to that of the Latin American Republics, since the island is a Commonwealth of the United States, but its record of progress surely provides some inspiration south of the border.

Governor Muñoz has been elected again and again. In 1960 local bishops of the Roman Catholic Church attempted to forbid voting for him because his administration was tolerant of birth control measures and refused to allow religious instruction in public schools. Though the island is overwhelmingly Catholic the Governor won reelection with 58.34 percent of the total vote.

Why resign now? Well, he said he didn't want his people to become dependent on a man. Rather, he said, he wanted Puerto Ricans to look to themselves and to the democratic processes. In his role as "teacher" he plans to travel throughout the island speaking to the people on this subject.

Rarely since George Washington has a man in American politics resigned at the height of his popularity. Mr. Muñoz is quite a man.

[From the New York World-Telegram, Aug. 19, 1964]

SALUTE

In their obstinate refusal to move over and give some of the younger fellows a chance, even college presidents, movie stars and opera singers don't hog spotlights as tenaciously as politicians.

Whether it be a Roosevelt, an Adenauer, a De Gaulle or a lesser politico with his hand on a smaller throttle, the elected official sees only one thing, when he looks in the mirror. He sees the indispensable man.

Today, therefore, we give an especial salute to Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín of Puerto Rico, who has just announced he won't run for a fifth term, even though everyone agrees he'd be a shoo-in.

Don Luis first took charge of the island in 1940, became its first elected Governor in 1948, engineered Puerto Rico's present Commonwealth status, and is the architect of Operation Bootstrap, the free-enterprise and cooperative self-help effort that succeeded so dramatically that the island has been the wonder of the poverty-ridden Caribbean, and indeed the Western Hemisphere.

And now, with grace and thoughtfulness, he steps down, saying that the continuing development of the democratic process demands he do so.

The nominee of the Popular Democratic Party in next November's election is Muñoz' hight-hand man, Roberto Sanchez Vilella, presently the Commonwealth's secretary of state.

Sinch Sanchez likely will win the Governorship, little or no change in basic economic or social policies is forecast, or any alteration in San Juan's policies toward Washington.

Doubtless Muñoz' decision will cause greater efforts on the part of the island's growing Statehood Party, but this increasingly vigorous debate about status is a healthy thing, too.

Don Luis is something more than a politician; indeed, a good deal more. He is a poet, a philosopher, a lawyer, a masterful writer in two languages, a brilliant, kind, reflective and modest man.

That's why, probably, something of selfless greatness rather than mere personal ambition always has tinged his public actions, including his most recent one.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, Aug. 19, 1964]

ONE OF THE GREAT ONES RETIRES

An emotional people, it could have been expected that Puerto Ricans of his own party would protest vociferously and tearfully—as they did—when Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín announced that he was through as Governor of the island.

The reason was typical of the man. He had been Governor for four terms, since 1952. It was time, he said, for him to return to the senate, and to go out among the people "as a teacher." It was clear that he felt democracy was not compatible with one-man rule.

Yet those who tried to holler down his announcement—reluctant to believe that an era was ending—were quite correct in appraising this particular one man as being as close to indispensable as any political leader can be.

It was Muñoz-Marín, more than anyone, who led Puerto Rico to its unique Commonwealth status, and who has fought for it since against vigorous minorities who favor either statehood or independence. The proof that his was the right formula for a once poverty-stricken island lies in the statistics.

Since he and his Popular Democratic Party came to power, the life expectancy of Puerto Ricans has risen from 46 to 61 years, per capita income is up several hundred percent, the budget for education has quadrupled and then kept on going.

Puerto Ricans justifiably regret the retirement of so successful an executive. But Muñoz-Marín is probably right again. At 66, he can retain the role of adviser while passing on the reins to Roberto Sanchez Vilella, who has been his right-hand man. The latter's election, with the Muñoz-Marín backing, is almost a certainty. The Puerto Rican miracle, under the benign help of the United States, is likely to continue.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Sept. 7, 1964]

TEACHER OF DEMOCRACY

The cries from the convention floor would have been music to any politician's ears. But Puerto Rico's Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, 66 years old and four-time popularly elected chief of his island's fledgling democracy, knew it was time to step aside. He grabbed

the microphone and said, "No, no," in answer to the unanimous chant of "Four More, Four More," from delegates of Puerto Rico's Popular Democratic Party assembled last month to nominate a gubernatorial candidate.

The persistent party leaders went ahead and voted 2,734 to 90 to renominate the reluctant Mr. Muñoz. As the man wielding the convention speaker's gavel with all the guile and seeming hearing difficulty of a John McCormack or a Sam Rayburn, Governor Muñoz vetoed that note and instead accepted nomination as an at-large candidate for the island senate. "You must have confidence in yourselves. It is now time for the teacher to return to the class," a happy Governor Muñoz told his followers who knew "the class" meant the countryside from whose peasant peoples his political strength came.

Strange doings indeed in America's Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, a land free only 66 years from Spanish rule, once derisively termed the trash can of the Caribbean, and now the booming envy of the hemisphere with a per capita income of $740—second only to oil-rich Venezuela. All this accomplished during the 25 years since Senator Luis Muñoz founded his Popular Democratic Party.

It was in 1939 that the bearlike, chain-smoking young senator went campaigning in the hills and villages of his country. He carried one message to the largely illiterate, cane-cutting peasants: You have a vote ("a thousand times stronger than your sugar machete"). Use it. Don't sell it. Vote for me and the party I am making. If I fail you, vote us out and put someone else in. "Keep doing it until you get the right man running your government." This was the single campaign speech he delivered with gusto over and over again.

They elected him and his party then and overwhelmingly since. He proved to be their right man. Today his land is known as a workshop of democracy. No wonder the teacher wants to withdraw to the sidelines and observe how firm the roots.

Operation Bootstrap, the necessary economic program for his country's new life, began in 1949 after Mr. Muñoz was inaugurated as Puerto Rico's first popularly elected Governor. Previously the territorial Governors were appointed by the U.S. President. Governor Muñoz was both the chief architect and administrative dynamo of "Bootstrap's" three-pronged goals: education, industrialization, and agricultural diversification.

Today the literacy rate has risen to near 90 percent. Some 700,000 are in elementary schools and superior institutions of higher learning flourish. With the help of tax exemptions (up to 13 years for establishing in more remote sections), Puerto Rico now has some 700-odd booming factories making everything from Maidenform lingerie to Paper Mate ballpoint pens. The goal for 1975 is 2,500. The agricultural story is equally successful.

What a magnificent legacy this "teacher of democracy" leaves. All because, on his return in 1926 from youthful years spent in the United States, he was "sickened and disgusted" by the poverty he saw everywhere. He and his electorate can be justly proud of their showplace island which in all probability ultimately will be our 51st State.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Aug. 30, 1964]

AMAZING LEADER

Men in power so seldom step aside of their own volition and at the zenith of prestige that the refusal of Luis Muñoz-Marin to stand for election to a fifth 4-year term as Governor of Puerto Rico is startling, so interwoven are those two names. Yet, he has done that very thing.

As one reflects on his withdrawal from his people's highest post, his action befits the man. For Mr. Muñoz is a dedicated advocate of democracy; to the point, no less, of relinquishing the authority his adherents fervently hoped he would continue to maintain indefinitely because he staunchly believes no one man should continue in that power in perpetuity in an elective democracy.

And Puerto Rico is exactly that. In commonwealth association with the United States, and holding citizenship in the United States, Puerto Ricans are autonomous in the conduct of their internal affairs.

Mr. Muñoz-Marin, author and director of Operation Bootstrap, has brought Puerto Rico from social and economic depths to improving living standards and to continuing industrial progress. Vast numbers of Puerto Ricans live in the States. Crowds from the States surge to Puerto Rico's vacation allurements.

It would be deplorable if Mr. Muñoz-Marín's withdrawal from gubernatorial authority were attended by retirement from public service. But he will return to the Puerto Rican Senate in which he attained legislative renown. He will not intrude upon his successor, but Puerto Rico will be comforted to know that withdrawal is not retirement. He will be an elder statesman.

The strong amity characterizing relations between Washington and San Juan undoubtedly will continue in full pace. The popular Democratic Party, which Mr. Muñoz-Marín founded, has nominated Secretary of State Roberto Sanchez Vilella for Governor. Though others seek the office, his election in November seems certain. This presumably would mean a continuity of policy.

For Mr. Sanchez and Governor Muñoz-Marin are of the same school of political thought. They have been collagues in statesmanship for many years and the candidacy of Mr. Sanchez, who has a strong record of high public service, has the blessing of Governor Muñoz-Marín.

The oracles predict that all will continue well with Puerto Rico.

Conservation for Long-Range Good of Agriculture and the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks by Horace D. Godfrey, Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at a special field day in Fort Leavenworth, Kans., September 15, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

It's good to be with you at the beginning of a tour that will let us see conservation at work * * * let us see how the farmers of Leavenworth County are keeping the soil in place and licking the problem of making water work with them instead of against them.

The tour will show how conservation works for the long-range good of agriculture and the Nation, and how its benefits can be used today for one of the pressing needs of our people—outdoor recreation.

Farmers in Leavenworth County have been concerned for years about the problems of water and soil conservation. What's more, they've been very active in trying to solve those problems. Through the agricultural conservation program, they have especially promoted practices which conserve water, such as detention dams, flood control, terraces, grass and legume seeding, and contour farming. Figures compiled to show agricultural conservation program activities in Kansas rank Leavenworth County at the top or near the top in all water conservation practices.

It's timely, then, that the people of this area have a chance to see what has been done, and how conservation can contribute toward recreational opportunities.

CONSERVATION IS POPULAR

It's hard to find anyone nowadays who is opposed to the conservation of natural resources. This positive attitude toward conservation is reflected in the work of the present Congress, which may go down in history as the "Conservation Congress" if editorial writers have their way.

For 28 years now, the Nation's farmers—with the Nation's help—have been saving water and soil for the future through the agricultural conservation program. The work they've done is phenomenal, but the work that still needs to be done is staggering.

WHAT'S BEEN DONE

With agricultural conservation program help, farmers have built enough miles of terracing to reach seven times to the moon.

They've constructed enough sod waterways to go around the world a dozen times.

They have planted a tree for every person living on the earth.

They've built 2 million farm ponds.

They have stripcropped an area almost equal to Michigan, Georgia, and Florida combined.

They have improved almost 275 million acres of rangeland—equal to the combined areas of Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah.

And they have established or reestablished an acreage three times that size in grass and legume cover.

A LOOK AT KANSAS

I could go on indefinitely, recounting accomplishments of the Nation's farmers through the agricultural conservation program. But let's look closer to home.

A needs survey shows that, in order to do a proper job of conservation, Kansas needs 478,000 acres of permanent sod waterway, 66,500 farm ponds, 762,310 miles of terraces, and 130,500 erosion-control dams.

In the years from the birth of the agricultural conservation program through 1962, the last year for which figures are complete, Kansas farmers have built 125,656 acres of sod waterways, 51,526 farm ponds, 162,907 miles of terraces, and 19,103 erosion dams.

CAN MORE BE DONE?

From this list, you can see that Kansas farmers are serving the needs of the Nation and of future generations at a pretty good clip. But there's a lot to be done; and in conservation work, today's efforts are at least a day late.

Can we expect the farmer to do more and do it faster? I think not.

Generally speaking, the farmer hasn't had the financial means to carry out conservation programs on a larger scale.

THE REST OF THE NATION MUST HELP THE FARMER IN CONSERVATION

Most conservation will boost income in the long run and the farmer knows it. But, if there's not enough income for the short run, there's no use worrying about the long run—and the farmer knows that, too.

It's only after the farmer has fed his family, made arrangements to handle his farm-

ing activities for next year, and made payments on his loans that he can find money for his share of conservation work.

Any truly big-scale conservation must be done on our farms, for 90 percent of the land in the continental United States is used for agricultural purposes by private land owners.

But, if there's to be an increase in the rate of conserving natural resources, the people of the Nation must increase their participation. The farmer can't carry the load—even with the help of agricultural conservation program. Agricultural conservation program helps the farmer through cost sharing, but the farmer must always put up his share.

HOW THE NATION CAN HELP THE FARMER

The rest of our people can increase their participation by assuming a greater share of the cost—in effect, letting the farmer's money buy more conservation. That is being done to some extent through special agricultural conservation program projects.

Or the people can increase their participation by insuring that the farmer has an adequate income, that the jaws of the income-cost vise don't squeeze any closer.

The farmer's average net income per person is only 60 percent of the average per capita income in towns and cities. He's now investing 5 percent of his net income in conservation; and it's conceivable that if his income equaled that of the city family, the present level of private investment in farm conservation could be nearly doubled.

Efforts to improve farm income over a number of years have included support programs which help farmers keep supplies of major crops nearer demand, and so keep his income disadvantage from growing worse.

COMMODITY PROGRAMS IMPORTANT TO FARMERS

And, during the past 3 years, as a result primarily of commodity programs enacted since 1961, net farm income has averaged $900 million a year higher than the annual average of the 1957–60 period. Gross farm income has averaged $4 billion higher, and net income per farm has averaged $600 a year higher.

Without commodity programs for the major grain crops, farm income would take a devasting drop—net farm income, according to impartial studies, would drop by 40 percent.

Farm programs—and improved farm income—of course have a decided effect on local business, and the fact is that the rise in gross income since 1960 has poured an additional $8.5 billion into rural communities—above what would have been the case under a continuation of 1960-type programs.

A great deal of this rise was due to new and improved farm programs. These programs have been successful, and they have conformed to the standards laid down by President John F. Kennedy early in his administration when he said any new program must (1) strengthen farm income, (2) reduce surpluses, (3) place no undue burden on the taxpayer.

WHEAT PROGRAM WAS SUCCESSFUL IN 1964

I want to say a few words about the 1964 wheat program, which has been extremely successful, despite a great deal of misunderstanding and misinformation.

Some, it would seem, blame the market price on the certificates that are being used in the program.

Actually, the wheat price traditionally follows the loan level—it has for over 10 years. And with supplies as high as they have been in recent years, and with the new 1964 crop coming on and no effective production-marketing program in operation, there was no reason to believe that this year's price would do anything but follow the legally directed support price to a low level. There was every reason to believe that the price would drop near the support level.

At the same time, it was apparent following last year's referendum that the prices of bread and the other end products of wheat would not decline. Farmers would lose from the low price. Consumers would not benefit from the low price. So someone else would benefit from the cheap farm price for wheat.

It was for this reason that we sat down last winter to draft a new wheat program. With this program, wheat prices dropped near the loan level, as they would have in any case. But the difference is that—with the program—farmers are now getting the loan price plus the certificate value for wheat used domestically for domestic food and for export.

Without the program, the Nation's wheat farmers would have found themselves $450 million poorer today. In Kansas, the wheat program has meant the difference this year of $107 million more in farm income. In Nebraska, it has meant an additional $29 million; in South Dakota, $18 million; in North Dakota, $52 million.

Many have referred to the miller's price for wheat as including a "bread tax." This is what they tell consumers. And it is untrue because the cost of wheat to millers has not increased enough to justify in itself an increase in bread prices. A representative of the American Bakers Association, testifying before the Senate Committee on Agriculture early this year, pointed out that: "If the price of wheat were the only cost consideration in a loaf of bread, an increase per bushel of approximately 60 cents would be required to raise that value by another cent."

Some of the same people then turn around and tell farmers that if it were not for the certificates millers have to buy, they would be paying a higher price in the market place. They have even labeled the market price as the "Johnson-Freeman" price.

Secretary Freeman used a term which I think is much more appropriate. He pointed out that, if you left it to certain groups, there would be a market price of only $1.26—and no additional payments or certificates at all. Since one farm organization has been the chief advocate of this position, it seems appropriate to call it the "Farm Bureau" price.

As a result of the wheat programs since 1962—and with aggressive work to take advantage of export markets—we have been able to achieve a substantial drop in wheat stocks. The carryover was below 750 million bushels on August 28, compared with almost 1.2 billion bushels on July 1, 1963—and a record carryover of 1.4 billion bushels in 1961.

This reduces taxpayer costs, and puts the whole wheat situation on a sounder footing.

THE 1965 WHEAT PROGRAM IS A FREEDOM PROGRAM

The 1965 voluntary wheat program is the most flexible farm program ever. It offers the Nation's wheat farmers a wide freedom of choice.

A wheat farmer can: (1) grow wheat up to his allotment; (2) substitute wheat for feed grains or feed grains for wheat; (3) grow 50 percent more wheat than his allotment and store the excess production for later marketing; (4) divert additional acreage into an approved conserving use and receive additional income; (5) decide now what he wants to do, then change his mind next spring; (6) stay out of the program, grow all the wheat he wants, and take his chances on the open market.

THE 1965 WHEAT PROGRAM WILL BENEFIT FARMERS FINANCIALLY

Cooperators can expect a return advantage of almost 34 percent over noncooperators for each allotment acre. Gross returns to cooperators in 1965 are expected to be the same or little higher than in 1964.

One of the goals of the new wheat legislation is to reduce Government stocks. And so the program is designed to encourage farmers to participate to the maximum degree—in other words, to divert for payment 20 percent of the 1965 allotment.

Additional diversion is the key to the success of the 1965 program, and farmers will be paid at an increased rate for their diverted acres. But, regardless of the degree of participation cooperation farmers will enjoy a decided income advantage.

The cooperating farmer, of course, will get the free market price plus the value of the wheat certificates. The noncooperator will get the free market price.

FEED GRAIN DIVERSION REQUIREMENTS ANNOUNCED

To help farmers decide which provision of the 1965 wheat program is best for an individual farm, the Secretary has announced minimum and maximum diversion requirements for the 1965 feed grain program.

The maximum and the minimum are the same as for the 1964 program.

The maximum diversion is 50 percent of farm's feed grain base or 25 acres, whichever is larger.

The minimum diversion is 20 percent of farm's feed grain base.

Other details of the 1965 feed grain program can't be announced now because drought in many parts of the country may affect yields, and accurate forecasts of next year's needs can't be made at this time.

This is the fourth year of the voluntary feed grain programs, which reversed the surplus uptrend of the 1950's. When the feed grain program was put into effect in 1961, feed grain carryovers had risen for 9 straight years—to an alltime high of 85 million tons.

The feed grain program reversed that trend for 2 straight years. Record yields in 1963 prevented a further reduction in the carryover this year, but the October 1 carryover will still be 15 million tons below the high of 3 years earlier.

The reduction in feed grain stocks since the high point of 1961 is resulting in a saving of better than $200 million a year to the Government on storage handling and other costs. In addition, farmers are benefiting from the feed grain program—not only because of diversion payments, but also because the price of feed grains has gone up. Milo, for example, was $2 a hundredweight at markets in this area yesterday.

BEEF SITUATION IMPROVED

Now, a word about the livestock problem we've been worrying about recently, Department of Agriculture efforts to help the livestock industry are paying off. Due primarily to a change in supplies, fed cattle prices began going up in mid-June after a long slide.

Between March 2 and September 4, USDA purchased better than 203 million pounds of beef at a cost of $115 million for the school lunch program and for distribution to needy persons. That purchase program is continuing, and it has accounted for between 3 and 4 percent of commercial beef production.

Other supply changes came from an export development program, sales of beef to other countries under foreign assistance programs, and industry-government domestic beef promotion programs. And imports of beef and veal for the first 7 months of 1964 are down 112 million pounds from the same period last year.

FUTURE OF FARM PROGRAMS

And what about the future? Feed grain and wheat programs expire if they are not renewed in the next session of Congress.

No longer is there a "farm bloc" in the legislative halls. People on farms are down to les than 1 in 12. In the House of Representatives, only 51 districts had as much as 20 percent "rural farm" population in the

1960 census—less than 1 district out of every 8. One district in every three has a rural population of as much as 10 percent.

The future of farm legislation depends on unity among commodity groups, cooperation among farmers' organizations, realization of the importance of agriculture to the Nation's economy by "city" Congressmen, and an administration that sincerely believes in farm programs. Without all of these elements, farm legislation is impossible.

Further—and I want to emphasize this—no farm legislation could be passed without the support of the President. Certainly this was demonstrated in the enactment of the new wheat-cotton legislation in the Congress this past spring.

It is not my place or my purpose to discuss partisan matters or candidates. But as a public servant in the field of agriculture, I do not hesitate to say that choices of vast importance to the future of agriculture are being made in 1964.

This year, as in every year, ASC committeemen are being elected. The work they do is vital to every farming community and vital to the Nation's economy. It's important to get the very best men and women to serve.

And, in the other elections, the choices made by the Nation are of even greater importance. Some candidates frankly do not believe in farm programs. Some would terminate them.

I regret that the future of the farm programs is an issue in this election. I am sure that many of you regret it also. But regret does not keep it from being so. The choices must be made, and they will have far-reaching effects.

There are many issues in the 1964 elections. Some are real. But some are intended to divert attention from the real ones. You can be sure of this: The real issue in agriculture is not what kind of program we will have, but whether we will have a program at all.

This occasion is devoted to conservation. This is not a controversial subject. It is a matter of good land use. And good land use is largely a matter of economics. And the agricultural economy of the future is being determined now.

As I said a few moments ago, there are two ways to increase conservation activity by farmers themselves. One is cost sharing by a Government agency. The other is through an improvement in farmer income. One thing is sure: If we want to increase income, we must retain the programs we now have. We must add to them—not do away with them.

That's something to think about as we look at the land and water resources of this area, and as we continue to ponder the future of this great land of ours.

Self-Determination Only Solution for Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in the belief that the principle of self-determination for all nations is in the best tradition of American democracy, I have followed the recent tragic events on the island of Cyprus with grave concern. Recently I was asked for a public statement of my views on this issue by Rhode Island members of the Order of Ahepa, which is a well-known national organization whose members are American citizens of Greek descent. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include that statement:

Almost four-fifths of the people of Cyprus are Orthodox Greeks. Today, as in the long centuries of their past history, they are Hellenistic in culture and ethnic character. Though Cyprus has been overrun by many foreign invaders—including the Moslem Arabs, the Franks, the Venetians, the Turks, and the British—her people have remained steadfast in their adherence to their religion and their ancient Greek heritage.

As a result of their determined struggle for freedom, they gained a guarantee of independence from Britain in 1959. Under the international agreements made in Zurich and London, however, the autonomy of Cyprus was nonetheless limited when Britain, Greece, and Turkey retained certain privileges of intervention. Consequently Cyprus has not yet attained its true independence.

This situation has been attributed to a desire to protect the interests of the Turkish minority which continues to live on the island as a residue of the colonization policies of the Ottoman Empire, which dominated the area from 1571 until Britain took control in 1878. Actually, the present arrangement, because it denies the will of the majority, has resulted in nothing but increasing hostility and violence.

It is now increasingly evident that no solution short of true self-determination can resolve the Cyprus situation, which remains not only as an unjust compromise that the Cypriot Greeks cannot accept but also as a threat to world peace. It may eventually prove necessary to arrange an exchange of the Turkish minority with Greeks living under Turkish rule. But I believe that this is a last resort which could be avoided if the Greek majority were given true independence with the establishment of constitutional guarantees of the rights of the minority.

The source of the present disorders is the frustration of the just aspirations of the Greek majority for true freedom. Americans, whose nation was born out of a hard fight for self-determination, cannot fail to appreciate the struggle of the Greek Cypriots, who are bound together by a common faith, a common desire for liberty, and a common devotion to the culture of ancient Greece where the ideal of democracy was first born.

Department of the Interior Study Reveals Possible Use of Coal as Water Purifier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the problems which have beset the coal industry have been a continuing concern in this country for several years. Since World War II, this product has lost a large portion of its traditional consumer market, due to the switch of railroads to diesel locomotives and the increased use of fuel oil in commercial enterprises and private homes. In addition, high transportation rates further aggravated the situation.

These challenges have taxed the capability and ingenuity of leadership in the unions, management, and government. But extensive progress has been effected. Mechanization of the mining process has decreased production costs, and other procedures to reduce movement expenses have been instituted. It is hoped that research and experimentation in the transmission of coal-generated electric power by means of extra-high-voltage lines, and shipment of coal by pipeline in slurry form or gaseous state will lead to improving the prospects for diversified markets. When fully developed, these measures will enable coal to continue to compete with other fuels.

As a Senator from West Virginia, where the mountains abound in this natural resource, I am always keenly interested in new ideas, techniques, and projects affecting its utilization. Early this month Mr. Glenn E. Johnson, a chemical research engineer in the Bureau of Mines, of the Department of the Interior, presented at the American Chemical Society meeting in Chicago, Ill., a report on a potential use of coal. Mr. Johnson had prepared this study in conjunction with Mr. L. M. Kunka and Mr. J. H. Field, both of the same organization. They pointed out that promising results have been obtained from the application of coal to the removal of impurities from water. It was stated that batch tests of coals and flyashes were made, to determine their effectiveness in eliminating organic contaminants from the final effluent of secondary-treated waste waters. The adsorptive capacity of flyashes coals of various ranks, and pretreated coals was ascertained, and was compared with that of activated carbon. The coals, though less active than carbon, are relatively inexpensive and can be burned as fuel after use in this treatment.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that excerpts from the presentation entitled "Use of Coal and Flyash as Adsorbents for Removing Organic Contaminants From Secondary Municipal Effluents" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM "USE OF COAL AND FLYASH AS ADSORBENTS FOR REMOVING ORGANIC CONTAMINANTS FROM SECONDARY MUNICIPAL EFFLUENTS"

(By G. E. Johnson, L. M. Kunka, J. H. Field)

The object of this study is to evaluate the various ranks of coal and flyashes as adsorbents for the refractory organic contaminants in effluents from secondary sewage treatment plants.

(During intensive tests with four type coals, activated carbon, flyash, and pretreated coal.) The pretreated coal was not appreciably better than the same coal untreated and not as efficient as other raw coals. The flyash was a fair adsorbent, removing greater amounts of contaminants with increased dosages. This pattern was not true of all the coals, in some cases with increased concentrations of coal, contaminant removals decreased. The more consistent results obtained with the flyashes are believed to have occurred because the flyashes were more homogeneous and of smaller particle size than the coals, and the samples selected for testing more uniform. The data obtained

eliminate coal rank as a factor in adsorption of waste water refractory contaminants. One coal of a certain rank can be a good adsorbent, while another of the same rank is ineffective. Nor could any rational correlation be made—with volatile matter, ash content, or carbon content of the coals. Both high and low contaminant removals were obtained with coals of high and low volatile matter, ash, and carbon contents.

A preliminary cost estimate was made for treating the final effluent of a 100-million-gallon-per-day secondary sewage treatment plant with coal. The overall investment cost for a 100-million-gallon-per-day plant amounted to $4 million. The cost of treating, including drying of coal for combustion, amounts to about 2 cents per 1,000 gallons, and with a 13-percent return on investment (20 percent capital charges) 3.5 cents per 1,000 gallons. No charge was made for coal as it is assumed that the spent coal will be consumed in a powerplant.

At least one coal of all the ranks found in this country has been tested for its adsorptive capacity to remove COD (Chemical Oxygen Demand—materials that consume oxygen) from secondary waste water. Many of the coals and flyashes possess some degree of adsorptive capacity for final waste contaminants. Because some coals contain constituents that contribute to the COD content during treatment, careful selection must be made in choosing a coal that will give satisfactory absorption. Attempts to identify the particular property of coal that influences its adsorptive capacity were unsuccessful.

Although the best coals tested were only one-quarter as efficient for COD adsorption as activated carbon, use of coal has inherent advantages over other adsorbents: (1) Coal costs about 0.25 cents per pound, while granular activated carbon sells for about 25 cents per pound; (2) the coal after use in waste water treatment can be burned along with the absorbed wastes with no loss in fuel value, thus also solving the problem of ultimate disposal of the removed wastes.

Batch tests have indicated that some of the more effective coals would have the adsorptive capacity of removing COD to about 4 percent of the weight of the coal. Further testing using continuous flow of waste water through fixed beds of coal is planned to establish the performance at more realistic conditions. Estimated cost of 2 to 3.5 cents per 1,000 gallons of water treated using coal compared favorably with the published estimated cost for treating with activated carbon. There is sufficient basis to indicate a place for coal as an adsorbent for final waste water, if not in competition with activated carbon, at least as an adjunct to it.

Jim Farley's Views of the Republican Convention and Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, there is no man on the current scene who commands greater respect for his political knowledge and acumen than the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and Democratic national chairman.

Delegates and others in attendance at the recent Democratic National Convention in Atlantic City, and the millions who followed the proceedings via television will not soon forget his stirring and inspiring memoral tribute to the late Speaker Sam Rayburn.

Following the extravaganza at the Cow Palace in San Francisco in July, Mr. Farley offered his cogent views on the proceedings and results of that affair. When he speaks on such matters, every American—Democrat or Republican—would do well to give careful and serious thought to his remarks.

Even though the campaign of 1964 is presently in its initial stages, many of Jim Farley's views have already been vindicated. In order that my colleagues in the Congress and the American people may have the benefit of this great man's insight, his remarks are printed below:

STATEMENT BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

It is time—while there is still time—to call a spade a spade. The country has not been watching a Republican Convention at San Francisco. An appalled world has witnessed an outrageous putsch.

The disgraceful proceedings at the Cow Palace do not represent the views of the vast majority of the Republican Party. On the contrary, the will of the rank-and-file Republicans was throttled in full public view. I am not elated as a Democrat, because I am far too concerned as an American.

I agree with the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, Republican Governor of New York. In 50 years of American politics, I have never witnessed a more frightening performance. When a so-called convention refuses to repudiate an organization which called Dwight David Eisenhower—a Republican nominee who was elected by 33 million Republicans and Democrats and is beloved by 195 million Americans—a conscious Communist agent, then I say that such action is not Republican, and comes close to being un-American. When a Republican Governor of the State of New York charges that his followers received death threats and that ruffians attacked his meetings, then I say that the Governor of New York is not making a Republican request for fairplay but is giving an earnest American warning to all of his fellow citizens that the Bill of Rights is under attack. When a Republican Governor of Pennsylvania charges that his followers were roughhoused and barred, and that the galleries were rigged, then it is obvious that there is something of most sinister intent and of dangerous proportion abroad in our country.

The country is now being subjected to the tragic farce of the extremist candidate attempting to hide behind the dictionary. The backing and filling in the defense of extremism clears up only one thing and that is that such statement is one of the most irresponsible and incendiary utterances in the history of this country. It is a mistake for the responsible Republicans now searching their consciences to believe that the fanatical followers among the Goldwater forces can be controlled. Indeed, it may well be the tragic illusion of Senator GOLDWATER himself that he can control them. In any event, it is far too late for BARRY GOLDWATER to attempt to explain away with his lips the hatred and bigotry some of his followers carry in their hearts. Can it be that he does not know that there are those among them who would change the American White House to their Brown House?

It is more painful than I can easily say to note that a responsible New Jersey Republican leader has voiced fear of civil war. I do not share such concern. I believe the American people will reject those who would convert the Goldwater candidacy into a gold shirt movement as they repelled the philosophy of the brown and black shirts of nazism and fascism. But I can understand his alarm because Hitler's beer putsch and Mussolini's march on Rome started with less momentum.

The problem which confronts the conscience of the responsible Republican leaders is one which most certainly should weigh heavily upon the consciousness of BARRY GOLDWATER. By this time, even he should realize that his extremist followers are not campaigning in the ordinary sense. The stark fact is that they are dangerously close to inciting insurrection and civil disorder.

Peace Corps Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as one who voted for the creation of the Peace Corps, and who, as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, has consistently supported it, I read with a heavy heart a recent editorial in my hometown newspaper—the Madison, S. Dak., Daily Leader—recounting the experiences of a South Dakota farm youth who, according to the editorial, "gave all he had in effort and prayer to the Peace Corps, and is returning to Lake County disillusioned."

Of late, there have been other disturbing reports indicating that the Peace Corps, after a most creditable beginning, has been expanding too fast, and that its administrative controls have grown too lax and too inadequate.

I ask that this editorial, entitled "Peace Corps Tragedy," be printed in the Appendix of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the hope that Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver will cease trying to spread himself out so thin that size, rather than the type of achievements we all hoped would eventuate from this undertaking, becomes the symbol of success.

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

PEACE CORPS TRAGEDY

The story of David Amert, Madison farm youth, who gave all he had in effort and prayer to the Peace Corps and is returning to Lake County disillusioned, is a dark commentary on the ill-planned Peace Corps venture which has cost the United States so much in the efforts of dedicated young men and women, and in money, and has returned us nothing but ill will.

Amert should have succeeded in doing big things for the downtrodden people of Guatemala. He had what it takes—youth, strength, a will to help others, practical and technical training in farming.

So he was assigned to Guatemala, where the big difficulty was, the farmers who had recently been granted land, taken from large estates, couldn't make a go of it. They couldn't raise enough food to feed their own families, much less have some for market, to buy the necessities of life.

This should have been just his dish, for he knew exactly how South Dakota farmers

were able to wrest a living from the soil. All he needed was to get them to use some farm equipment, raise more and better crops, build up herds of swine or cattle, flocks of chickens, etc.

But he was faced from the start with utter apathy and unwillingness to work. They didn't want the help of the United States, they hated the United States.

So David Amert has come back to Lake County, a disappointed young man, whose good intentions, earnest effort and ability have been wasted on an ill-advised, poorly organized effort which has cost the taxpayers of the United States millions of dollars.

Appalachia Program Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, there is a dire need for the passage of H.R. 11946, called the Appalachian Regional Development Act, and I most sincerely urge the leaders of this Congress to schedule this bill for debate on the floor of the House of Representatives, and respectfully submit to the Congress, as a whole, that this is a worthwhile, realistic approach to the needs of the people and communities in the Appalachian area.

This bill is a program for physical resource development of the area and not the usual approach of Federal handouts. Its purpose is to assist the region in meeting its special problems, to promote its economic development and to establish a framework for joint Federal, State, and local efforts toward providing the basic facilities essential to its growth.

This measure, in contrast to the war on poverty bill, retains the historic concept of Federal, State, and local participation.

I believe in and have always believed in fiscal responsibility, particularly on the part of Government, and I consider the provisions of this act to be consistent with these views. The additional funds which will be spent in Appalachia represent a positive investment in the region's economy. These funds will be used to build the types of facilities which can generate employment and economic growth. It is my hope and expectation that the kind of expenditures called for in H.R. 11946 will inevitably mean reductions in the enormous amounts of money the Federal Government now spends for public assistance in Appalachia.

Almost 6 percent of Appalachia's total population are receiving welfare payments as against 4 percent in the rest of the Nation, and the price tag for Appalachia has been running at almost $500 million per year. As the President's Appalachian Regional Commission has aptly pointed out, the cost of welfare relief is high in these areas where the roots of free enterprise have been undernourished.

This bill will make Appalachia more attractive to industry, to recreation seekers, and to its own people through such provisions as the construction of sewage-treatment plants, restoring strip-mined lands, and construction of adequate highways.

It has been said that this program creates highways looking for traffic rather than the usual approach of constructing highways to take care of existing traffic. I must agree in part with this, but this is one of the basic problems of the Appalachian area. It is inaccessible, in its present state, to industry and recreation seekers and it is because of this inaccessibility that many of the communities are not keeping abreast of the growth of the Nation.

In an effort to make it accessible to industry, recreation seekers, and others, this road construction program is greatly needed. Surveys by industry and highway users have indicated that economic growth and industrial growth usually generate around areas readily accessible by highway and adequate roads, and it is for this reason that the road program was placed in the Appalachia bill.

Being near a good highway and access to markets are factors of increasing importance in the location of today's industrial plants.

Highways assist in developing new and vacant land, improve production efficiency because of better access to markets and are shaping the locational patterns of today's industry much as rails and water did generations ago.

The highways and access roads provided for in this legislation should enhance the industrial development of the Appalachia region.

Among the most sensible and most essential sections of this act are those which will provide direct benefits to the communities of Appalachia in the form of flood control works, hospitals, vocational education schools, and other necessary public facilities. Economic development at the local level has been difficult in Appalachia—not because the people lack either the desire or the know-how, but because they do not have sufficient financial resources.

I respectfully urge this Congress to pass this needed, worthwhile legislation.

Improving Traffic Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the highway death toll is climbing again this year. There are ever more cars and drivers on the roads; and although safety belts have made a contribution, their use is only a small part of the answers that must be found.

Improved roads are one means of reducing accidents. There is no question that for every hundred miles of new four-lane interstate highway opened, the removal to it of cars which otherwise would be traveling on inferior roads is saving accidents and preserving lives. That is why I have not only supported the Interstate Highway System, but have urged its more rapid completion; and that is why I am urging expansion of the system by the addition of more mileage.

But this is only one aspect of highway safety. Another is the design of automobiles, which needs far more attention than it has so far received; and perhaps the addition of further compulsory safety design items, such as the safety belt requirement. Still another is the improvement of driver education.

Driver education is the subject of an editorial published a few weeks ago in the Putnam County Graphic, of Greencastle, Ind. The editorial describes the traffic simulator developed by an insurance company to present a more realistic "road test" for drivers, under traffic conditions, while measuring their reactions. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

DRIVERS WRITE OWN TICKET

There are still those drivers, who, when a crash seems inevitable, let go of the wheel and close their eyes—in prayer, perhaps.

So we can pity, among others, the insurance company that is expected to make things right. And we can understand that the company has a vested interest in reducing claims, that the best way to reduce claims is to reduce accidents; and the best way to reduce accidents is to improve drivers.

Following this line of reasoning to an ingenious conclusion, Liberty Mutual—which last year insured over a million drivers—has developed a machine in which a subject in a simulated automobile "drives" a simulated highway (shifting real gears, turning a real steering wheel, pushing on real brakes and giving her the simulated gas) avoiding, or failing to avoid, simulated traffic hazards. And all the while, a tape is recording the driver's reactions—right or wrong—which are not simulated at all. They are the real thing.

Liberty's driver evaluator is not to be confused with earlier devices in which a student sat behind a wheel and "drove" a busy highway projected by a movie at a predetermined speed, and presenting stereotyped traffic situations that could be memorized in two or three "trips."

No, no. In the Liberty simulator, the speedometer needle climbs as the driver presses the accelerator, and the scenery approaches faster and faster. Hit the brakes, and the illusion of slowing and stopping lacks only the squeal of tires—and maybe they're working on that. Turn the wheel for the curve ahead, and around you go; or swing out to pass a truck. You are making the decisions—the major factor in traffic accidents and their avoidance. And the electronic tape is recording the speed and correctness of your reactions. And since the highway you seem to drive is laid out on a turntable whose speed is controlled by your accelerator, and the "traffic" consists of miniature cars and trucks and buses, the problem possibilities are infinite and can be changed in a moment.

In presenting this mechanized world with the first scientific instrument for measuring both driver competence and accident proneness, Liberty Mutual has opened the door—a crack at least—on the mystery of why drivers do like they do. And any progress in solving it should help to dry up the blood on the pavement—and reduce the cost of insurance.

Congressman Pillion Reports to Citizens of 39th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to report to the citizens of the 39th Congressional District of New York upon the actions of the 88th Congress—years 1963 and 1964—and upon the administration of the affairs of the Nation.

During this term of Congress, our Nation suffered a most tragic loss in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. The House of Representatives set aside December 5, 1963, as a day for the payment of tribute to the memory of President Kennedy.

I quote from my eulogy:

President Kennedy was truly great. He had a grandeur of spirit, a nobility of mind, a generosity of heart and the courage of action. He sought to sublimate and to activate this Nation toward higher concepts. President Kennedy was, at all times, motivated by an urge to improve the lot of mankind.

On September 10, 1964, in a letter to the Chief Justice Earl Warren, Chairman of the President's Commission To Report Upon the Assassination of President Kennedy, I expressed the conviction that Lee Harvey Oswald's assassination of the President was wholly influenced and motivated by his Communist ideology, training, associations, and objectives.

I quote from my letter to the Warren Commission:

The circumstantial evidence is sufficient to exclude to a moral certainty, any other hypothesis, except that Lee Harvey Oswald assassinated President Kennedy to advance the world Communist plan designed to ultimately destroy the United States and the free world."

President Kennedy's last sacrifice will have been in vain if the true cause of his death is not identified, so that the American people and their government can be fully alerted to, and informed of the sinister, secret, complex, universality, and immedicacy of the dangers of the Communist world apparatus.

The 39th Congressional District contains almost a half-million persons. I am proud of the patriotic and knowledgeable interest these citizens have shown in the many current, important, often critical, domestic and international issues. The tens of thousands of letters and telegrams sent to me each year indicate a close and mutually beneficial communication for the betterment of this Nation and its people.

This review and evaluation of our Federal Government's operations is limited to those matters that most directly and deeply affect the citizens of the 39th Congressional District of New York.

FOREIGN IMPORTS—UNEMPLOYMENT—TARIFFS

Western New York industries employing more than 40,000 wage earners are suffering from foreign imports. The principal industries include steel, pig iron, cellophane, dyes, cement, electronics, copper, and brass.

The United States is now engaged in tariff reduction negotiations at the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs—GATT—Conference at Geneva. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 delegates to the President the power to reduce U.S. tariffs on foreign imports up to 50 percent.

The United States announced, last spring, its policy to negotiate sweeping 50 percent across-the-board tariff reductions. Both industry and labor immediately recognized that these arbitrary tariff reductions would cause further flooding of U.S. markets with cheap labor foreign imports.

Additional foreign imports would cause severe injury to employment and industry in western New York. New York State is considered to be a high production cost area for manufacturers. Due to the St. Lawrence Seaway, Buffalo is now a seaport, and is particularly vulnerable to foreign imports. A number of industries in Buffalo are operating on a marginal basis. Any sizable increase in foreign imports would close a number of plants, and reduce employment in other plants.

RECIPROCAL TRADE—BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

I favor international trade where economic benefits are mutual. But, the State Department's proposed sweeping tariff cuts are based upon political and diplomatic considerations rather than economic.

Due to cheaper labor costs, Japan and Europe would increase their exports to the United States far more than any increase in U.S. exports, if a 50-percent tariff reduction is agreed upon.

Tariff reductions should be carefully selected, based upon minimum job and industry dislocations and a maximum of mutual benefits.

The proposed U.S. tariff reductions would not only damage U.S. industry and eliminate jobs, but would also further increase the U.S. deficit in its international balance of payments. The United States has been running an annual deficit of more than $2.5 billion. The increasing drain upon our dollars and the increasing surplus of U.S. dollars held by foreign nations is a continuing threat to our gold reserves, to our international credit, and to the stability of the U.S. dollar in world commerce.

JOBS—FOREIGN STEEL AND IRON

The prospect of a flood of foreign imports has alarmed industry and labor across the Nation. At recent public hearings before the U.S. Tariff Commission and the State Department, more than 800 industries filed objections and briefs substantiating the injury to industry and labor that would result from further tariff reductions.

Steel and pig iron are large employers in western New York. These industries are seriously suffering from foreign imports.

Mr. David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, recently stated that the United States exported only 1 ton of steel to the European Common Market for every 10 tons they export to the United States.

The U.S. steel industry estimates that increased foreign steel imports would displace 70,000 American steelworkers' jobs over the next 3 years.

The U.S. tariff on foreign heavy structural steel is $2 per ton. European tariffs on the same steel from the United States varies from $13.84 per ton in the United Kingdom to $46.30 per ton in France. Canada's tariff on the same steel is $33.25 per ton.

MERCHANT IRON

Employment in the pig iron industry in western New York has been severely depressed. Foreign imports have almost doubled from the year 1960 to 1963. The U.S. tariff on foreign pig iron is 20 cents per ton, while most foreign nations impose a $7-per-ton tariff.

U.S. production costs for pig iron average about $70 per ton. Foreign pig iron is being sold at prices from $50 to $65 per ton.

Foreign pig iron from Communist East Germany is being imported and sold in the United States as low as $35 per ton.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS TO PROTECT U.S. JOBS AND INDUSTRY

In order to protect U.S. jobs and industry, I have taken the following actions in this Congress:

First. On July 1, 1963, I introduced legislation to strengthen the Buy-American Act by requiring the Federal Government to give preference to U.S. steel in governmental steel purchases.

Second. On July 1, 1963, I introduced a bill to require the U.S. Government to purchase U.S.-manufactured steel for its foreign construction needs.

Third. On July 1, 1963, I introduced legislation designed to strengthen the Antidumping Act, and to protect U.S. jobs and industry from foreign goods dumped into the United States at less than the foreign market price.

This bill would give labor a voice in antidumping hearings by requiring the U.S. Tariff Commission to consider injury to labor as a separate criteria from injury to industry.

Fourth. On April 14, 1964, I drafted and introduced legislation to further tighten the antidumping law. Instead of the present requirement that U.S. industry must prove injury, my bill would require the importer to show there is no injury, after a finding by the U.S. Treasury Department that foreign steel or other products were being imported at below world market prices.

Thirty-five other Congressmen joined me in introducing the same bill as a bipartisan measure.

Fifth. On April 28, 1964, 73 Congressmen, including myself, addressed a letter to President Johnson, urging him to reserve synthetic organic dyes from tariff reductions.

Sixth. On May 28, 1964, I wrote to President Johnson and to Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Mr. Christian A. Herter, asking them to reserve steel products from tariff reduction negotiations.

Seventh. After a long series of conferences, I drafted and introduced H.R.

11797, designed to protect American jobs, industry and agriculture where a definite criteria of injury exists. This bill prescribes levels of damage to industry, agriculture, and labor, under which a substantial segment of labor would be protected from tariff reductions.

The following is a partial list of industries to be protected from tariff injury: steel, dairy products, beef, copper and brass, glassware, brick, electronic products, cement, dyes, chemicals, auto parts, cellophane, pig iron, rubber.

Following the introduction of my bill, H.R. 11797, 76 other Representatives, of both parties, introduced identical legislation in a bipartisan effort to protect American jobs and industry.

Eighth. On August 18, 1964, six other Congressmen, including myself, joined Congressman THADDEUS J. DULSKI in a letter to President Johnson, urging him to reserve cellophane from the pending tariff reduction proposals.

Since the introduction of these bills, the State Department has indicated some modification of its previously stated objective to negotiate for indiscriminate 50 percent across-the-board tariff reductions.

COINAGE—SILVER

Businessmen, banks, and citizens have been seriously inconvenienced by the acute shortage of coins. Many factors have contributed to this shortage. Although vending machines, toll roads, and so forth, are partially responsible, the principal and cause for the coin shortage is the uprecedented increase in collectors, hobbyists and citizens who are holding large numbers of coins as a hedge against inflation, anticipating an increase in the price of silver.

The normal average annual new coin requirement for the past 5 years has been about 3.5 billion coins. In the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the two U.S. mints at Denver and Philadelphia have produced 4.3 billion coins.

The explosive increase in the demand for coins overtaxed the capacity of U.S. mints. Corrective action has been taken by reopening the San Francisco mint, and by substituting purchased metal strips and blanks in place of their manufacture by the mints.

Stepped up production in our present mints will produce 8 billion coins in fiscal year 1965, which began on July 1, 1964. This immense coin output is expected to completely satisfy all public demand. A completely new mint is in the process of design and construction at Philadelphia. This mint will begin production by 1967, with an annual capacity of 9 billion coins.

SILVER—PRICES—SUPPLY—DEMAND

The price, supply and demand of silver is closely related to this Nation's coinage problems.

The present price of silver is $1.29 per ounce. This ceiling price is maintained by the U.S. Treasury selling silver out of its reserves to manufacturers. The world annual supply of silver is about 150 million ounces short of the world demand. If silver prices were to be freed to follow normal supply and demand prices, it would probably increase in price to somewhere between $1.50 and $2 per ounce.

The normal silver requirement for U.S. coinage has been about 75 million ounces annually. The U.S. Treasury has on hand about 1,400 million ounces of silver. Under normal conditions, the present U.S. silver stocks would be sufficient to supply our coinage requirements indefinitely.

However, the planned production of 8 billion coins for fiscal year 1965 will consume 250 million ounces of silver. To maintain a ceiling price of $1.29 per ounce, the U.S. Treasury will sell to manufacturers about 60 million additional ounces of silver in the next year. At this rate, the U.S. silver supply will be exhausted in less than 5 years.

Today, the U.S. silver dollar has a silver content that is worth $1 at the present market price of $1.29 per ounce. The subsidiary silver coins, dimes, quarters and halves, contain silver having a market value of 92 cents per $1 face value of coins.

It is evident that the United States must very quickly take corrective action to avoid an exhaustion of its silver supply for coinage. The following possible combination of actions are under consideration by the Congress and the U.S. Treasury:

First. The elimination of silver, and the substitution of cheaper metals in our coins;

Second. The reduction of silver to 50 or 60 percent of the present silver content in our coins;

Third. The discontinuance of the sale of silver by the U.S. Treasury to manufacturers, the discontinuance of the $1.29 per ounce ceiling on silver, and freeing silver to seek its world supply and demand price.

HIGHER COFFEE PRICES—INTERNATIONAL COFFEE CARTEL

In September 1962, the United States entered into the International Coffee Agreement with 59 of the principal coffee producing and importing nations. Its purpose is to control the world coffee supply, and thus determine coffee prices.

This treaty created an international cartel with two sets of mechanics for attaining its objectives:

First. Exports of coffee and prices are regulated by annual world export quotas for each coffee year, beginning October 1.

Second. Imports of coffee and prices are to be regulated by import nations limiting coffee imports to only the quota amounts from the treaty-bound nations.

COFFEE EXPORT QUOTAS AND HIGHER PRICES

The first part of this international scheme is now in operation and does not require implementation by the subscribing nations.

The International Coffee Agreement nations immediately began fixing restricted quotas for coffee exports from the signing of the coffee treaty in 1962.

Due to a reduction in supply and a stable demand, the retail prices of coffee to the American housewife has risen from 69 cents per pound in 1962, to 91 cents per pound in August 1964.

AMERICAN HOUSEWIFE GOUGED OUT OF $600 MILLION ANNUALLY

The American housewife is the main victim of this coffee agreement. The United States imports 50 percent of the world coffee supply. It will consume 3 billion pounds of coffee this year. The retail price increase of 22 cents per pound overcharged the American consumer by $660 million in higher prices of coffee.

The wholesale prices of coffee have increased 15 cents per pound since 1962, when the quota system began its operations. This means that an additional $450 million is flowing out of the United States to increase our critical deficit of international balance of payments, and weaken the U.S. gold and dollar position.

COFFEE PRICES TO GO HIGHER

The United States and the other coffee agreement nations are evidently not satisfied with the present prices. They have agreed to create a greater scarcity of supply to reach their objective of even higher coffee prices.

For the present coffee year, 1964, the coffee export quota was 48.3 million bags. Last month, in August 1964, the International Coffee Council fixed the coffee export quota for the year 1965 at 48 million bags. This is numerically less than the 1964 supply. But, the coffee demand and increased population increase coffee consumption by 3 percent annually. Thus, there will be an artifically created shorter supply of coffee for 1965 over 1964 of about 1.7 million bags.

I anticipate that this shortage will drive coffee prices up to a range of $1 to $1.25 per pound in 1965.

The U.S. Department of State has attempted to justify this treaty on the grounds that it is a good will gesture. As a matter of fact, this scheme is a hidden "back-door" foreign subsidy program, without economic justification.

The exportable world coffee stock is 70 million bags—almost a year and one-half supply. There is neither a present nor potential shortage.

When the treaty was debated in the Senate, the State Department's justification was that its objective was to stabilize world coffee prices at the 1962 level. This has been proven to be entirely fallacious.

This cartel is contrary to our national laws prohibiting monopolies and price fixing.

COFFEE IMPORT CONTROL

Nations representing about 96 percent of the world coffee exports are parties to the International Coffee Agreement. The treaty binds the importing countries to enact laws to prohibit the import of nonquota coffee. This provision would reinforce the artificially short quota supply set by coffee export nations with laws by coffee import nations that would keep added supplies off the market from nonquota coffee-producing nations. This would perfect the scheme to extract high coffee prices by both a tight export quota and import exclusion to fix a short coffee supply in relation to demand.

Pursuant to the treaty agreement, the State Department sponsored H.R. 8864,

to authorize the United States to exclude nonquota coffee. This legislation passed both the House and the Senate in different bills. I voted against this bill on passage in the House.

The conference report, which harmonized the differences between the House and the Senate bills, was debated in the House on August 18, 1964. I took an active and leading part in opposition. The House rejected the coffee bill conference report by a vote of 183 to 194. Further conferences are expected between the House and the Senate.

On August 24, 1964, I addressed a letter to President Johnson, urging him to initiate a withdrawal from the International Coffee Agreement, upon 90 days notice, in conformity with the treaty provisions.

SOCIAL SECURITY

On July 29, 1964, the House approved a 5-percent increase in cash benefits under the old-age, disability, and survivors insurance of the Social Security Act, and higher payroll deductions to finance the additional benefits.

This increase in benefits would apply to some 20 million retired workers, widows, and disabled persons.

The House-passed amendment to the Social Security Act includes the following additional changes:

First. Provides limited benefits for about 600,000 elderly people currently ineligible;

Second. Self-employed physicians are brought under the program for the first time; and

Third. Permits widows to retire at age 60, instead of 62, and start drawing reduced benefits.

The 5-percent increase in benefits would take effect in the second month after the measure becomes law.

The House bill also provides for increases in both the social security tax and the wage base subject to deductions. The current tax on employer and employee of 3.625 percent will increase as follows: 2.8 percent on January 1, 1956; 4 percent on January 1, 1966; 4.5 percent on January 1, 1968; and 4.8 percent on January 1, 1971.

Starting in January 1965, the wage base subject to social security tax would increase from $4,800 to $5,400.

Under the House bill, a single retired worker receiving the minimum monthly payment would get an increase from $40 to $42; the average monthly payment would increase from $77 to $81; and the maximum monthly benefit from $127 to $133.40.

SENATE ACTION ON SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

On September 3, the Senate passed its version of the proposed amendment to the Social Security Act.

The Senate bill provides for a program of health benefits for the aged, to be paid out of the social security fund. This additional proposal would cost approximately $1.5 billion the first year. It would provide limited hospital, nursing home, outpatient, and home medical care for all eligible persons over age 65.

Other changes approved by the Senate include:

First. Raising social security monthly benefits by a flat $7, instead of the 5-percent increase approved by the House;

Second. Increasing the wage base on which social security tax is computed from $4,800 to $5,600; and

Third. Gradually increasing the total employer and employee tax rate from the present 7.25 percent to 10.4 percent by 1971.

The House and Senate versions of this bill have now been referred to a House-Senate conference committee. It is reported that a majority of the conferees are opposed to the addition of medicare to the social security liberalization bill.

It is expected that a House-Senate compromise bill will report an increase in and liberalization of social security benefits.

VETERANS' PENSION BILL

The House of Representatives unanimously passed H.R. 1927, to liberalize pension payments and eligibility in nonservice-connected pensions for World War I, World War II, and Korean war veterans.

The pending bill would entitle all veterans over 65 years of age to pensions, regardless of disability, if their income is within the prescribed limits. Disability eligibility is also revised for veterans under age 65. The exclusion of various incomes, such as social security, is enlarged in determining income eligibility.

The bill also provides increases for veterans and widows in the low categories of income up to an increase of $35 per month.

This bill has the support of all veterans organizations.

The Senate Finance Committee reported the House bill, but added an amendment that would reopen the national service life insurance for a period of 1 year to all veterans who served between 1940 and 1956.

Although the Senate itself has not as yet acted upon this measure, it is quite certain that a compromise bill will be agreed upon.

CIVIL RIGHTS

On July 2, 1964, the President signed into law the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The major provisions of the new civil rights law relate to the following:

First. Supplementing existing Federal laws against denial of voting rights;

Second. Barring discrimination in places of public accommodation, such as restaurants, theaters, hotels, and so forth;

Third. Desegregation of public facilities;

Fourth. Desegregation of public education;

Fifth. Broadening the duties of the Civil Rights Commission;

Sixth. Nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs;

Seventh. Establishment of an Equal Employment Opportunities Commission;

Eighth. Requiring Census Bureau to gather registration and voting statistics based on race, color, and national origin;

Ninth. Making reviewable, in higher Federal courts, the action of Federal district courts in remanding a civil rights case to State courts; and

Tenth. Creation of a Community Relations Service to aid local communities in reviewing complaints relating to alleged discriminatory practices.

The new law provides for a maximum penalty of 6 months in prison and a $1,000 fine, for any criminal contempt case arising out of the act.

While the question of civil rights has created a great national upheaval, the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 will, in fact, have very little effect upon New York State. Actually, the existing civil rights laws in New York are more comprehensive than those recently enacted by Congress.

I have always maintained that the basic problem in the relations between the colored and white people is not strictly legalistic. The problem is more extensive, more complex, and deeper than one of legalism.

I do not believe that compulsory integration will provide a workable solution to moral, economic, and sociological problems. Neither do I believe that physical force, threats, violence, or riots by either side serve to solve the fundamental issues involved.

Full equality between the races will require a maximum of understanding, patience and good will by all of our citizenry.

With every civil right, there is a corresponding responsibility. The voluntary assumption of responsibility is a requisite to all our rights. We sometimes overemphasize rights without giving enough thought to the corollary responsibilities and duties of citizenship.

I condemn those leaders, both white and colored, who are misleading our Negro population into believing that their status as citizens can be improved through civil disobedience, riots, and violence. I equally condemn those white race leaders who encourage threats and violence against our Negro population.

The vast majority of our Negro citizens are respectable, law-abiding, loyal Americans. Our Negro people rightfully take pride in themselves, and in their race. I deplore the efforts of the Negro minority who are attempting to exploit the Negro movement.

I sincerely hope that citizens of both the black and white races will give proper balance and emphasis not only to the civil responsibilities that go hand-in-hand with civil rights, but also to the economic, sociological and moral problems that confront this Nation in harmonizing our relations and attaining a maximum of our human aspirations.

APPROPRIATIONS—SPENDING—TAXES—INFLATION

"Democracy in the United States will last until those in power learn that they can perpetuate themselves through taxation."

Higher taxation is the inevitable result of greater spending.

Reduced spending leads inevitably to reduced taxes.

DEBT AND SPENDING

In June 1964, Congress again increased the debt limit by passing a so-called temporary debt limit of $324 billion in place of the permanent debt limit of $285 billion. This is the eleventh time in 9 years that Congress has had to increase the debt limit. I have consistently voted against increasing our debt

limit because there continues to be vast unnecessary expenditures in our Federal budgets. This debt represents a Federal first mortgage of $6,800 upon the future earnings of each family.

The interest charge on this debt is $11 billion annually, representing $232 in Federal tax payments each year per family.

The Comptroller General of the United States issues hundreds of reports each year upon the misfeasance, malfeasance, illegalities and wastages that continue to exist in the executive branch of our government.

It is quite evident that billions of dollars per year are wasted upon unnecessary programs, unsuccessful programs, inefficiencies and outright wastages. The Comptroller General's reports are, in the main, ignored by our Federal Government.

DEFICITS

Continuing annual budget deficits are deliberately planned to create, for political purposes, an artificial prosperity bubble. Higher living costs and reduced purchasing power for the consumer are inevitable under this plan. There have been deficits in the last 25 out of 30 budgets. The current 1965 budget plans a $4.9 billion deficit.

REDUCED APPROPRIATIONS

The House of Representatives has made a creditable record in attempting to reduce the huge and unnecessary spending programs of the executive department.

In February 1963 I was assigned by the Republican members of the House Appropriations Committee as one of five members of a task force to recommend reductions in the President's budget. The appropriations for each department and agency were closely studied in both fiscal 1964 and 1965 Presidential budgets. The task force set targets for reductions of more than $10 billion for each budget. For the first time, the Republican members of each appropriations subcommittee were given specific appropriation reduction targets under an overall coordinated fiscal plan.

In cooperation with the Democratic majority, the Republican members substantially contributed to produce a $6.5 billion appropriation reduction below the 1964 budget, and a $6 billion appropriation reduction below the 1965 presidential budget.

REDUCTION IN TAXES

These reductions of $10.5 billion—many of them were annual savings—in the 1964 and 1965 budgets made the 1964 tax reduction bill fiscally possible.

In February 1964 the Congress finally passed the largest tax cut in the Nation's history. The total tax reduction to 190 million citizens amounted to about $9 billion annually. The tax reductions for corporations amounted to about $2.2 billion annually. In addition, corporate taxes were reduced by another $2 billion per year by liberalized depreciation allowance credits and the investment credit law.

My criticism of these tax cuts was directed not at tax reduction, but at the failure to coordinate tax reductions with spending reductions. To reduce taxes out of borrowed money is fiscal irresponsibility.

In this period of highest prosperity, the least we can do is to operate on a balanced budget, with a stabilized cost of living. I also believe that the tax bill did not give sufficient tax relief to citizens in the middle- and low-income category. Out of a total of nearly $14 billion in tax relief, only $5.5 billion was allocated to 85 percent of the families earning $10,000 per year or less.

INCREASED PERSONAL EXEMPTION

It is my conviction that the most equitable tax relief that Congress can give our citizens is that of increasing personal exemptions for taxpayers and their dependents. There are too many tax loopholes and special interest favoritisms in our tax laws.

During the hearings on the tax bill before the House Ways and Means Committee, I urged the committee members to report at least a $200 increase in personal income tax exemptions. Under the rules of the House, no such amendment could be offered to the bill during its consideration on the floor.

Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, in his address before the House Ways and Means Committee, favored increasing the personal income tax exemption from $600 to $800 for each dependent. This very same proposal is contained in a number of bills which I introduced.

SMALL BUSINESS

Over 450,000 of the Nation's 585,000 corporations are small businesses, owned with net corporate incomes of less than $25,000 per year. These small business-owned corporations receive only a small share of the corporate tax cut. The 40,000 largest corporations with net incomes of more than $1 million per year will receive more than 65 percent of the total tax reduction.

To encourage small business, the $25,500 income level at which the Federal surtax applies should be increased.

Manufacturers' competition with retailers should be curtailed and "kickbacks" prohibited to preferred large customers.

Greater allowances should be granted where funds are invested in expansion, giving additional employment.

Special consideration should be given to protecting small businessmen from compulsory unionism and union harassment.

ERIE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I have had a close association with the initiation of appropriations for the various flood control and public works projects.

Both my Democratic and Republican colleagues have been most generous in granting my requests for these appropriations. Every project in Erie County received appropriations to the maximum capability of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

On August 14, 1964, Col. R. Wilson Neff, who recently became district engineer of the Buffalo district, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, kindly sent me, at my request, a progress report of the various projects in Erie County. Most of the following summary is extracted from this report.

SEAWAY DEPTH FOR BUFFALO HARBOR

The improvement of the Buffalo harbor has been the largest and most important public works project in Erie County. The total cost is $20,218,000, of which $18,579,000 has been appropriated—leaving only $1,639,000 to be required for completion. Completion of construction is expected in the fall of 1964, with final payment to be made from fiscal 1966 appropriations.

The completion of this project will make Buffalo harbor one of the safest harbors in the Great Lakes. Buffalo will be one of the first ports on the Great Lakes to have a 27-foot St. Lawrence Seaway depth harbor.

ALL-AMERICA CANAL SURVEY

This canal would connect Lake Erie and Lake Ontario to permit the bypassing of the Welland Canal.

The economic feasibility survey will cost $1,825,000. The President's budget eliminated funds for the continuation of this survey. At my request, $200,000 was appropriated to continue this survey without interruption.

BUFFALO RIVER—CAZENOVIA CREEK—CAYUGA CREEK FLOOD CONTROL

Appropriations to cover the full cost of this survey, $143,000, have been made. Starting out as a flood control study of Cazenovia Creek flooding, it has been expanded to include levees and a multiple purpose dam and reservoir.

This survey will be completed and the report forwarded to Washington in October 1964, for final approval. If there is an economic justification, congressional authorization must be approved before appropriations can be made for construction.

SMOKES CREEK, LACKAWANNA

This project is in the construction stage. Federal cost is estimated to be $2,200,000—local cost is $1,310,000.

Completion of construction is scheduled for November 1966.

TONAWANDA—ELLICOTT CREEKS—AMHERST, CLARENCE, TONAWANDA CREEK—BATAVIA AREA

There two flood control surveys have been combined. The full amount of $210,000 for the survey has been appropriated.

A multiple purpose dam and reservoir in the Batavia area to hold back flood waters is under study, together with local flood control remedial works in the towns of Amherst and Clarence.

The transmission of the final survey report to Washington is scheduled for July 1965.

SCAJAQUADA FLOOD CONTROL—CHEEKTOWAGA, LANCASTER

This survey was authorized and an initial $20,000 appropriated in the current 1965 budget for the survey. The total estimated survey cost is $105,000. I expect that additional appropriations will be made to the full capability of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

HAMBURG PARK SMALL CRAFT HARBOR—SMALL CRAFT HARBORS—LAKE ERIE

An overall study of small craft harbors on Lake Erie is underway. The total

cost is $520,000, of which $189,000 has been appropriated.

In Erie County, the sites to be included are, besides Cattaraugus Creek, which is a special project, Hamburg Park, Sturgeon Point, and Buffalo. Of these three, the Hamburg Park site is the only one under active study.

Field surveys for the Hamburg Park site have been completed and office studies are underway. Separate reports will be made of each survey as completed.

CATTARAUGUS CREEK—SMALL CRAFT HARBOR, FLOOD CONTROL

This survey combines flood control remedial works with the construction of a small craft harbor. The survey cost of $40,400 has been fully appropriated.

The Buffalo district of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, plans to submit its final report to the Chicago division headquarters in October 1964.

After that submission, local interests will be contacted for their views before final transmittal to the Washington Office of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

After approval of the survey, congressional authorization will be required before construction appropriations can be made.

CATTARAUGUS CREEK FLOOD CONTROL—GOWANDA AREA

The flood control survey is estimated to cost $55,000. The 1965 appropriations contained an initiating $15,000. Appropriations to the full capability of the U.S. Army Engineers are expected to be continued until completion.

CONSERVATION—WATER RESOURCES—WATER POLLUTION

On July 23, 1964, I voted in favor of H.R. 3846, a bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to permit the States to plan, acquire, and develop outdoor recreational facilities.

On July 30, 1964, I voted for H.R. 9070, the wilderness bill. This legislation, enacted into law on September 3, sets aside 54 wilderness areas throughout the country that will be preserved in their primitive state. A total of 9 million acres of federally owned land is permanently placed in the wilderness system by the act.

WATER RESOURCES

On July 2, 1964, I voted for S. 2, the Water Resources Research Act of 1964. This measure establishes local water resource research centers, and provides facilities for a national program of water research. The water research centers will be concerned with municipal, regional and national water problems.

WATER POLLUTION

I have been greatly concerned with the problem of water pollution in the Great Lakes. I have been especially interested in the now critical pollution problems in our own Lake Erie. At present, the Great Lakes are in international waters.

In 1909, Canada and the United States formed an International Joint Commission for the purpose of studying the water pollution problems in the Great Lakes.

In an effort to provide a practical solution to the problem of water pollution, I have introduced the following legislation:

First. A bill to amend the definition of "interstate waters," in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, to include the Great Lakes. This would bring Lake Erie within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, in addition to the jurisdiction of the State of New York.

Second. A bill to abate the pollution of the waters of Lake Erie, the Niagara River and their tributaries. This measure establishes regulations, enforcement procedures and penalties for the industrial pollution of these waters.

Third. A bill to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes.

I have urged the U.S. Public Health Service, the House Subcommittee on Pollution and Water Resources, the International Joint Commission, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to expedite their present studies of the critical water pollution problems in Lake Erie.

Further legislative action must await the completion of the intensive studies now underway by the U.S. Public Health Service and other Federal and international agencies concerning the causes, the extent and the necessity for remedial measures relating to pollution in Lake Erie.

SCHOOL PRAYER

In two separate cases, one in 1962, and one in 1963, the Supreme Court ruled that prayer and Bible reading in public schools is unconstitutional.

The Court held that the recitation of prayers in the public schools violated the first amendment to the Constitution, which states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." These decisions gave rise to a wave of controversy, both in Congress and throughout the Nation. Members of Congress have received tens of thousands of letters, telegrams and petitions expressing great concern over the action taken by the Supreme Court.

Representative FRANK J. BECKER, Republican, of New York, on January 9, 1963, introduced the first of many bills proposing a constitutional amendment which would permit voluntary prayer in the public schools.

After refusal by the House Judiciary Committee to hold hearings, Representative BECKER filed a discharge petition which, if signed by 218 Members, would bring the proposed constitutional amendment directly to the House floor. I was privileged to be among the first to sign the discharge petition. To date, 179 Republican and Democratic Members of the House have signed Representative BECKER'S petition.

Representative BECKER contends that the recital of a nondenominational prayer in a public school is in no way an "establishment of religion." It has also been pointed out that the minimal recognition of God, on a voluntary basis, in our public schools, could not be considered inconsistent with the "freedom of religion" concept of our Founding Fathers.

In a dissenting opinion in the first "school prayer" case, Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart said:

I cannot see how an official religion is established by letting those who want to say a prayer say it.

As a result of steadily increasing pressure from both the American public and individual Members of Congress, hearings on the "school prayer" bills were held by the House Judiciary Committee from April 22 to June 3, 1964. As of this date, no further action has been scheduled by the committee.

It should be noted that, to amend the Constitution, a bill must pass both the House and the Senate by a two-thirds vote, and then be approved by three-fourths—38—of the States.

THE WHEAT-COTTON PROGRAM

The wheat-cotton bill is one of the most iniquitous programs to be enacted into law.

The 2-year program for wheat and cotton was passed in April 1964. It had the effect of lowering the price of wheat in 1964 from $2 to $1.72, when diversion payment is included. A further reduction to $1.67 per bushel is a certainty under the regulations promulgated by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman.

Farmers, this year, will receive $2.25 billion, or 17 percent of their net income from the Federal Government. This is an unhealthy and alarming trend. It is converting our farm population into a "captive class" in our society, dependent upon governmental subsidy and benevolence for their existence. The Federal Government's programs for increasing farm surplus through irrigation and reclamation have depressed farm prices on one hand, while on the other hand, it subsidizes farmers who cannot receive a fair market price for their labor and products.

This wheat-cotton bill has the effect of creating a "bread tax" for the consumer. Bread prices are already up 1 or 2 cents a loaf in some areas. Further increases are expected in the price of bread.

ANOTHER LAYER OF COTTON SUBSIDIES

Cotton farmers receive various forms of Federal subsidies. On top of these, the Federal Government subsidizes our export of cotton by 8½ cents per pound.

This cotton bill imposes another layer of cotton subsidy on top of all the others. It was enacted under political pressures from the administration and special interest groups.

This bill not only continues present cotton subsidy programs, but provides $360 million in cash credits to the cotton textile manufacturers. This huge sum is $100 million more than the industry's total profits of $260 million for the year 1962.

This legislation gives an economic competitive advantage over American synthetic fiber manufacturers. It retards technological progress and punishes both the taxpayer and the American consumer.

Life at Guantanamo Bay as Seen by Kansan Jessie Stearns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the first woman newspaper correspondent permitted to visit the Guantanamo Naval Base since Castro took over the island was Miss Jessie Stearns formerly of Fort Scott, Kans., and still a Kansan.

Miss Stearns has had many years of experience in the journalistic field and the articles she wrote regarding our situation in Cuba are not only informative, but also very helpful as we deal with Castro and our problems in Cuba.

I ask unanimous consent to have these two articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GARRISON OADER ONLY CONCERN—KANSANS LIKE LIFE AT GUANTANAMO

(By Jessie Stearns)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Jessie Stearns, the Capital-Journal's Washington correspondent, last week visited the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in a group of newspaper writers invited by the Department of Defense to make the trip. Some of her observations are included in this column.)

WASHINGTON.—The dependents at U.S. naval base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, took the "missile crisis," "the water crisis," and the dismissal of Cuban maids in their stride.

Their No. 1 concern is the Presidential order changing the base into a garrison force. All women and children will be "phased out" by December 1965.

Many of the families living on the base now are enjoying their second tour of duty, because they have requested it.

Typical is Chief Photographer Bob Allen, of Sedgwick, Kans., and his family. They say, "We love Gitmo." Their oldest daughter, Lai Loni, 5, was born during the chief's 1958–59 tour of duty.

Mrs. Allen's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Perry Richard, live at Valley Center. His parents are Mr. and Mrs. Roy Allen of Sedgwick.

Without a maid, Mrs. Allen does her own household work even though their youngest daughter, Bobbie, is only 3 months old. They go to the movies with the children, take them swimming to one of the 10 swimming pools on the base. When attending dances, some neighbor cares for the children.

Mrs. Allen, commenting on the water crisis caused by Cuban Communist Premier Fidel Castro cutting off the base water on February 6, said, "We conserved on water, the same as the others or the base. Adm. John Bulkeley, base commander, told us the facts and what was necessary to cooperate."

The water supply came in on water tankers until the salt water plant making fresh water was completed on July 30. Of the salt-fresh water she said, "I don't notice any difference in the taste of the water."

The Valley Center wife is looking forward to another tour of duty when the gates to Communist Cuba will be open and they can travel to the island, as in the past.

Comdr. and Mrs. J. H. Casseday, formerly of Paola and Olathe, are happy to be back at the base, following the evacuation of the dependents during the Cuban missile crisis. They hate to think of leaving the base late next year when only men will be serving a 1-year tour of duty.

Guantanamo is located at the eastern end of Cuba. In 1903 the United States signed an agreement leasing the 45 square miles—48,000 acres of land—from Cuba for 100 years.

Today, 17.4 miles of 8-foot steel fence with barbed wire at the top separate the U.S. Naval Base from Cuba. This area is guarded at 22 sentry posts by U.S. Marines, all located 50 to 150 yards from the fence, known as the "Cactus Curtain," because on the Cuban side there is 10 feet of cactus bordering the fence.

Not one of the 9,000 Navy and Marines and their dependents mentioned fear of being at the area where a mild cold war is being fought.

They enjoy living at the tropical base, including work-play-fun.

Recreation facilities include 3 baseball fields with 1 lighted for night games; 8 softball fields, 10 swimming pools, 8 basketball courts, 8 tennis courts, 20 bowling alleys, 8 volleyball courts, 1 27-hole golf course, 5 movie theaters, riding stables, boat and sailboat facilities, bicycles for rent, a roller skating rink and boxing ring, plus 2 beaches on the Caribbean Sea.

Rear Admiral Bulkeley, whose esprit de corps is high, stated, "Recreation at Guantanamo is big business and we are inclined to regard it as an important adjunct to providing a working base for the fleet."

U.S. GOLD FLOW TO CUBA CUT AS GUANTANAMO ECONOMIZES

(By Jessie Stearns)

GUANTANAMO NAVAL BASE, CUBA, September 4.—(NANA)—Ever since Fidel Castro took over in 1959, Democratic and Republican Members of both the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate have talked about Cuba's strangulation through economic measures.

One person who is actually doing something about reduction of the flow of U.S. dollars to the Cuban Prime Minister is Rear Adm. John D. Bulkeley, commander, U.S. Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Last February 12 Bulkeley discharged 700 Cuban employees at the base, pursuant to a Presidential order that Guantanamo be more self-sufficient and lessen the monetary assistance to the Cuban economy. This was 6 days after Castro announced that the water from his Cuba into the U.S. naval base would be cut off unless the 36 Cuban fishermen held by the United States were released immediately. The men had been seized while fishing in Florida waters. The water was cut off by Castro on February 6.

Today "Gitmo" provides the fresh water it needs by desalinization of salt water.

On February 18 to prove to the world that the naval base was not stealing water as the Cuban Government claimed, Bulkeley cut the pipe and removed one section so that no water could possibly flow into the base. Base water consumption was 1.2 million gallons per day.

Then 700 Cubans doing domestic work, the less desirable and subversives, were dismissed and escorted off the base through the one remaining gate connecting Communist Cuba with the naval base. This reduction left 759 Cuban workers who come through the gate daily plus the 800 exiles living at the base, and it cut the flow of American dollars to Castro by $1.5 million annually.

Another reduction in outflow of gold was the $13,000 paid monthly for water, or $156,000 annually.

Bulkeley says the daily Cuban workers that come and go still take $1.4 million from the base. He reports 80 percent of this amount is taken by the Cuban dictator as they return to their native land on payday.

In addition to the $1.4 million the only other U.S. payment to Castro is $4,000 annually for rental of the base, the cheapest naval area in operation, and $800 per year for a telephone line into Cuba for use by Cubans on the base to communicate with their families in Cuba in case of illness or death. Of course, the line is monitored.

Bulkeley proudly admits his part in the economic strangulation of more than half of the $3.1 million that flowed from the base into Cuba and helped Castro to operate his Communist land.

Raymond L. Suell, Judge of the Juvenile Court of Jefferson County, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article about the Honorable Raymond L. Suell, judge of the juvenile court of Jefferson County, Ky. The article was written by Connie Courteau, and was published on September 19, 1964, in the Louisville Times.

The article, which is a tribute to Judge Suell's understanding of a critical problem, deserves study by officials and citizens interested in the young people of our country.

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

JUVENILE COURT JUDGE SUELL IS A MAN IN LOVE WITH HIS JOB

(By Connie Corteau)

Jefferson County's juvenile court judge is a self-driving young man with a background punctuated with diversity. He:

Worked at two jobs while going to law school and graduated at the top of his class.

Is an ex-bartender, union shop steward, paperhanger, and bedspring maker.

Is an active Catholic layman, a water skier, and a man who thinks the worst thing that can happen to a judge is to let his ego boost him into an ivory tower.

This is 33-year-old Raymond L. Suell, native of Louisville's Portland neighborhood, who went to work to support himself during his later years in high school (du Pont Manual), and went through a 6-year course of law and prelaw at the University of Louisville in 4 years.

That course included summer school, accompanied by a year-round full-time night job at the Southern Bell Telephone Co. where he was a dial-equipment maintenance man. He worked for the company 11 years, even after he started practicing as a struggling young lawyer.

While he was in law school and working for the telephone company, he was a union shop steward and "walked the bricks for 71 days" in the 1955 telephone strike. "There was not any animosity; we all went back to work."

While in school and working full time at Bell he also held some part-time jobs—"for an electrical contractor, and I tended bar at 41st and Bank. That is not a bad job. You learn a lot about people."

In his senior year, while still studying and still working for Bell full time, he was law

clerk for attorneys John McCrea and Richard Nash, with whom he still shares offices and practices law.

HE IS KEPT CUT DOWN

His office cohorts, including Nash, a former domestic relations court judge, "keep me cut down" to size, as do Suell's four sons.

Suell thinks this is good.

He also has a 9-month-old daughter, presented him by his wife, the former Mary Angela Senn whom he married "when she was 18 and I was 19."

The baby daughter does swell his head. "She's a queen," he grins.

How did a young lawyer only out of school since 1957 become a judge by 1961?

"Bill Colson (police court judge) stuck his neck out and appointed me judge of night court," said Suell. "I was the youngest judge they'd had * * * I was a young Republican lawyer and I was in the right place at the right time." It was November, 1961, when the Republicans, including Colson, swept Jefferson County on election day.

Suell was night police court judge for less than a year when another judge—this time former Juvenile Court Judge Daniel P. Marshall—stuck his neck out too.

"I wanted Ray for the (new) adult division of juvenile court, Marshall once recalled.

"He had the background for it; he grew up in an area with problems, he understood what he was dealing with," said Marshall, now a circuit court judge.

In the adult d'vision of juvenile court Suell had charge of cases involving adults accused of nonsupport of children and contributing to the delinquency of minors.

When he first became adult division judge in September of 1962 "I'd see fellows I'd gone to grade school with, and I'd think I better not handle that case. So I'd transfer it to Judge Marshall. It got so Judge Marshall was handling practically all the adults.

"So I started handling them whether they were old Portland acquaintances or not. When I'd sentence them for nonsupport and the bailiff was dragging them out they'd turn around and say:

" 'Ray, how can you do this to me?' "

HE'S HAPPY IN HIS JOB

Of the three judgeships, actually commissionerships, he has held, Suell likes his present job best.

Suell disagrees with some of his colleagues that the most crying need in Kentucky's work with delinquents is more institutions where they can get emotional help. Suell thinks the need instead is for more professional help for youngsters to be given in most cases in the situations from which the youngsters come.

"If you institutionalize them, and then put them back, they're right in the same situation they came out of They need to get strength at home. We need to work with whole families," he said. "We need more staff to do it."

He said he found parents from "better economic areas" more stable and cooperative in working with their troubled children. In poorer areas "parents are less able to help because they're barely hanging on themselves."

A HUMAN LIE DETECTOR

He praised his staff of 36 probation and other juvenile court officers, and one of them commented in return:

"The judge has a unique way of telling when somebody's lying in court. It's uncanny."

Suell laughed at that. "It's all those jobs I held. For instance, if a fellow who's a paperhanger comes in and says he can't find work because it's the slack season I know if he's lying because I was a paperhanger and I know when the slack season is."

Suell, who lives at 315 Birchwood, has no slack season.

In addition to being juvenile court judge he practices law.

He is an active Catholic layman and a member of the Serra Club which tries to interest young people in religious vocations; he tries to make a 3-day retreat once a year "to get away from the hustle and bustle * * * and reevaluate your life."

HAS TIME FOR SPORTS, TOO

He is a member of the Turners, but "I'm no gymnast, although my sons take gym lessons."

He is coach of the sixth-grade basketball team one of his sons was on last year. "This year I've got one son on the seventh-and-eighth-grade team and another on the sixth, and I don't know what I'm going to do about that."

He is a water skier: "I only look good to people who don't water ski."

What would he do if he had his choice, and the opportunity? "Be a juvenile court judge the rest of my life. People don't realize what this court and the staff does. * * * It's so rewarding when you manage to work out one problem."

"I think the trouble today is that people don't have anything to hang onto. They flounder.

"When I was in night court you'd see the same drunks coming back time after time. Nobody could do anything for them because they had nothing to hang onto."

HE KNOWS THEM ALL

Then there was the time recently when Judge Suell was in St. Louis, riding in a taxi.

"I've got a friend in Louisville," the driver told him.

"Who?" said Suell, who seems to know everybody who's ever been in trouble in Louisville.

The driver told him, and added: "We went to reform school together."

"Sure enough," Suell said, "I knew the guy."

Foreign Food Laws Can Restrict Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, a major problem in gaining better access to foreign markets for our agricultural products is the failure of the food laws of some nations to keep pace with scientific progress.

In this connection, I include an interesting article by Mr. Raymond A. Ioanes, Administrator of the Foreign Agricultural Service, as follows:

FOREIGN FOOD LAWS CAN RESTRICT TRADE

(By Raymond A. Ioanes)

"Trade barrier" is a term we usually associate with import levies, seasonal quotas, gate prices, and the like. We often overlook food health laws and regulations or don't know that they also restrict agricultural trade. The current trend abroad is toward even more stringent food health controls.

Let me tell you about diphenyl. Foreign regulations issued in connection with its use on lemons have unquestionably hurt our exports of this fruit.

Diphenyl is a chemical which inhibits the growth of certain fungi on citrus fruit. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has set the U.S. tolerance level of this fungistat at 110 parts per million. The United Kingdom has established the safe mark at 100 parts per million. West Germany and France feel that 70 parts per million is the proper tolerance. So far, so good.

West Germany, however, passed a food law in 1958 which prescribes that when citrus fruit is treated with diphenyl a sign must be displayed, which reads, "With diphenyl, peel unsuitable for consumption." I say, respectfully, that this wording is inaccurate and misleading. Citrus peel treated with diphenyl is perfectly safe for human ingestion when treated at the levels authorized by either West Germany or the United States. West German food chemists concur in this judgment. But the mandatory label with the damning word "unsuitable" remains. It has scared off consumers, of course. It has been a major factor in the decline of West Germany's imports of U.S. lemons from 1.7 million cartons in 1958 to less than 100,000 cartons in recent years.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

Other U.S. farm products are affected by foreign health laws. Prominent on the list are fresh deciduous fruit, dried fruit, wheat flour, and poultry. Still more U.S. commodities will be affected if some foreign countries follow through on current proposals and set tolerances for pesticide residues drastically lower than those permitted by the United States.

All this brings me to the question: What can be done to ease the trade-hampering effects of foreign food laws?

The first thing the United States must do is arrive at a common meeting of the minds with "customer" countries as to which laws and regulations serve a proper function—and which are being misused.

Nobody can argue about general principles. All countries must safeguard their people with effective food health laws and regulations. But, in seeking what is "effective," governments differ widely in their judgments of what is "safe," or "necessary," or "desirable." These differences in viewpoint are what we need to understand—and, if we can, to reconcile.

Let's recognize at the outset that there are some fundamental philosophic differences between the United States and Europe with respect to the use of chemicals in food production or processing.

The United States holds to the doctrine that a chemical need not be classified as poisonous or deleterious per se. Sodium chloride—common table salt and one of the oldest food additives known to man—is a good example of what I mean. Salt is a chemical and taken in excess can be unsafe. But the mere fact that salt is a chemical should not prevent its use in safe amounts if such use can be shown to be beneficial in food processing.

We don't take the safety of agricultural chemicals for granted. Far from it. No new food additive may be used in or on food until the petitioner submits to the Food and Drug Administration evidence of its safety when tested on animals. If the material proves to be a safe component of food under proposed conditions of use, and will not promote consumer deception, the FDA issues regulations specifying how it may be used. These regulations are backed up by labeling of chemical agents and formulations containing them, by instructions in their proper use, by regular inspections, by sampling and analytical control. Violators are subject to legal action, which may include criminal prosecution.

EUROPE LIMITS APPROVAL

Most European countries feel that the list of approved chemicals should be kept small—that additions to restricted lists should be granted only when they are necessary as well as safe. Necessity is given as much weight in some countries as safety.

Some countries have been reluctant to expand their list of permitted food additives even in the face of a showing of necessity and safety. They want their foods to be "naturrein"—naturally pure, that is—a product of bright sun, sparkling rain, and organically fertilized soil. This may be a desirable objective. It might even be attained if each family produced and processed its own food. But in this modern world, where division of labor is essential, where food must pass through many hands and travel long distances on its way from producers to consumers, compromises with "naturrein" have been necessary. Most countries have accepted the inevitability of compromises. The United States feels that safe food additives are justified when they maintain the nutritional quality of a food, enhance its keeping quality, make it more acceptable, aid in its processing, or improve its nutritional value.

U.S. preoccupation with foreign food laws is nothing new. For many years our agricultural exporters encountered problems in this area. These were handled largely on a case-by-case basis by U.S. agricultural attachés. Our attachés still function in this field with respect to specific cases, and will continue to do so. But the overall scope of the food health problem, and its intensification in recent years, have called for additional measures.

Establishment of the European Economic Community in 1958 probably was the principal event bringing food health matters to a focus. The Treaty of Rome, which established the EEC, provides for a common agricultural policy—a merging of the farm economies of the six member countries. Part of this merging process is the harmonization of existing national food health regulations. Harmonization almost certainly will mean, in turn, continued tightening of the regulations, at least in the case of some of the countries of the European Economic Community.

Let's face it—Rachel Carson's book, "Silent Spring," also has been a factor. The book had a great impact in the United States, as you know, especially on nonfarm people. And this work, translated into foreign languages, has had a high popularity abroad. It undoubtedly has helped to create a climate favorable to rigid foreign food health laws and regulations.

Department of Agriculture specialists have kept abreast of the shift toward more stringent controls and their effects on agricultural trade. They have followed foreign trends in food health legislation, monitoring and enforcement activities, and the thinking of food scientists. Their reports have laid the foundation for programs aimed in large part at assuring greater understanding among scientists and regulatory bodies in this country and abroad.

SPECIALIST TEAM STUDY PROBLEMS

The exchange of technical information between teams of U.S. and foreign specialists is contributing greatly to this understanding. Work of the teams is financed in large part under authority of Public Law 480, with foreign currencies derived from oversea sales of U.S. farm products.

An American food science mission visited a number of Western European countries late in 1963. The group studied general provisions of food laws and regulations related to public health, the rational and scientific bases for them as viewed by foreign scientists and officials, and the nature and effectiveness of enforcement. Findings of these experts will be invaluable as we try to find solutions to the food health-trade barrier problems.

Typical of teams coming to the United States was the group of West German scientists who last spring surveyed the U.S. food health control system. In addition to talks with Washington officials, the group visited Florida, California, and Kansas, where they saw chemicals being applied to crops before and after harvest, and food regulation enforcement. They appreciate, I am sure, that the setting of tolerances or any other food health standards must be backed up by satisfactory programs for testing and control.

As part of the drive for improved understanding, the Department of Agriculture has stationed a food scientist in Western Europe on a full-time basis to represent the United States in the food law field. With headquarters at Brussels, he is analyzing European food laws and regulatory programs, maintaining contact with the officials and scientists developing them, and relaying information back to the United States. He is providing technical assistance to U.S. agricultural attachés and cooperating trade groups abroad. He is keeping in touch with international food and health organizations.

OTHER USDA EFFORTS

The Department also has assigned a Washington staff member to the job of liaison on foreign food laws. His responsibility is to coordinate food law matters among U.S. agencies, groups, and individuals. He assists foreign teams visiting this country. And he helps to maintain a two-way flow of information between U.S. agencies and American representatives in foreign countries.

Private industry is augmenting the Department's efforts. The California-Arizona Citrus League, the National Canners Association, and the Northwest Horticultural Council have stationed technicians in Europe to analyze food laws which restrict trade in agricultural products. Other trade groups which have been active in the food law area include the Institute of American Poultry Industries and the Millers' National Federation.

The United States is taking part in work of the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health Organization to simplify and harmonize international food standards in a consolidated food code, or, more technically, a Codex Alimentarius.

Preparatory work on draft standards already is underway. Among the projects being carried forward is the development of draft lists of acceptable food additives, and the survey and designation wherever possible of proposed maximum levels of use for these additives in individual foods. A worldwide Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues has the responsibility of surveying and proposing, where possible, tolerances for pesticides in individual foods.

The second major objective of the United States in the food health-trade barrier must be continued vigilance—backed up with research.

We have struck a reasonable balance in this country.

We know that chemicals are essential to food production and processing. We know that with proper controls and safeguards they are not dangerous.

But we know that these matters must never be considered as closed—that we must be alert and resolve any doubts on the side of safety.

WORK STILL TO BE DONE

Research is essential, of course. We can all be pleased that legislation recently carried an increase of almost $26 million in the Department of Agriculture's 1965 appropriation, the new funds to be used in carrying on a stepped-up program of pest control research and education.

Some work will be aimed at improved insect control through sterility methods. Illustrative of what can be done in this area is the eradication in the Southeast of the screw-worm, a fly pest of livestock. This was accomplished by raising millions of male screw-worms, sterilizing them with radioactive cobalt, and releasing them to mate with native female flies.

New biological studies will involve the use of parasites and predators against insects and weeds; diseases against insects and nematodes; and vaccines against animal parasites. Efforts will be made to breed plants with built-in resistance to diseases and insects. Also to be investigated are such fields of insect control as light, sound, and electromagnetic energy. Basic research will delve deep into the biology, physiology, pathology, and nutrition of insects, plants, and animals. Increased attention will be directed at more specific, less persistent conventional pesticides, improved methods of application and of detecting and determining pesticide residues, and effects of trace levels.

Our foreign friends can see from this program that the United States is sparing no expense or effort to keep our foods—what we consume here and what we export—wholesome and safe.

The United States is taking many steps to expand agricultural exports. We are working, through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to lower economic trade barriers. We carry on, with cooperating agricultural and trade groups, extensive market development activities. We operate a food-for-peace program, which is helping us—as we help less developed countries—to build permanent commercial markets for our farm products.

All this effort is reflected in increasingly large agricultural exports. In the fiscal year 1963–64, we set an all-time high record when we shipped overseas $6.1 billion worth of U.S. farm products.

The food health area definitely needs work and attention for the benefit of ourselves and other countries. Greater understanding among nations with respect to food laws can do in this area what trade negotiations can do in the economic field. We know what our problems are. We have made a start toward solving them. With good will, energy, and persistence, we will solve them.

National Civil Service League's Help in Connection With Recent Government Employees' Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the National Civil Service League, a nonpartisan, nonprofit citizen's organization serving the public interest by working to improve the Federal service, has made an outstanding contribution to the studies made in connection with the Government Employees Pay Reform Act of 1964.

The league, recognizing the need for adequate pay levels in the Federal service, particularly in the upper echelons of Government, conducted an extensive survey intended to provide a sampling of significant opinion on the need for attracting men of high quality to positions of responsibility in Government. The findings of the survey were used extensively by the President's Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems. The league has also undertaken an extensive public information campaign to make known the results of its survey, and cooperated fully with the Congress in its deliberations on Federal pay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This editorial, entitled "The Top Management of Government—Good Pay for Good Man," was published in the September issue of Good Government, the official bulletin of the National Civil Service League.

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

THE TOP MANAGEMENT OF GOVERNMENT—GOOD PAY FOR GOOD MEN

(By Jean J. Couturier, executive director, National Civil Service League)

"Inadequate salaries for legislators, executives, and judges represent the most critical deficiency in our entire Federal personnel policy. The National Civil Service League considers the matter of increased salary incentives at these policy and leadership levels of transcendent importance to the retention and attraction of the best capacities in our society.

"BERNARD L. GLADIEUX,
"Chairman of the Board, National Civil Service League."

This statement defined the nonpartisan, nonprofit National Civil Service League's position on the urgent need to reform Federal pay structures for the top management of Government. If further served as a philosophical underpinning for a massive research and public information-education-counseling program that culminated in the President's signing a comprehensive salary adjustment bill on August 14, 1964. This new "Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964" provides the largest single pay raise ever granted Federal executives—$10,000 for Cabinet members, $7,500 for legislators, $4,500 for Supreme Court Justices, and comparable raises for second and third echelon managers of Government. The league's work on this crucial improvement, which it considers only a first-step success, elicited the following statement of thanks from President Lyndon B. Johnson to League Board Chairman Gladieux on June 12, 1964:

"I want to express appreciation to you and the board of directors of the league for the many distinguished contributions you have made to the cause of salary reform * * * in the past 3 years. These contributions have been an affirmative extension of the long-time policy of the league to seek * * * to improve the quality of the public service."

In its 83-year fight for efficiency and economy in the public service, the National Civil Service League has worked consistently to attract and retain top quality government personnel. It has done this by championing an able, nonpartisan civil service—a struggle that has been largely won, except for pockets of patronage and spoils that persist in some States and localities; by promoting public recognition of outstanding career civil service to raise its prestige—a continuing program that has spawned many others and continues to be lauded for its effectivenss; and by diligently working for appropriate pay structures—an old and particularly tough problem articulated by President George Washington on December 7, 1796, when he told Congress:

"The compensation of the various officers of the United States in various instances, and in none more than in respect to the most important stations, appears to call for legislative revision."

This issue has become even more acute with the increasing responsibility and complexity of our Government today.

The loss of key talent because of inadequate pay has become a problem that threatens the stature and capacity of government. Congress faced this problem in 1962 when it sought and followed the advice of the National Civil Service League—by stating as national policy that Federal salaries should be comparable with those outside Government and by requesting President Kennedy to propose adequate salary levels for top Federal officials. He acted by appointing a special Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems made up of 12 distinguished citizens under the chairmanship of Clarence B. Randall.

The league recognized the need for an objective analysis of informed public opinion. It conducted and published a public service survey among leaders of business, education, and the professions to learn the views of these "influentials" on proper pay levels for members of the Cabinet and Congress. The survey, carefully and objectively structured to include a valid sampling of the Nation's "decisionmakers" whose respected opinions provide a barometer of public thinking, showed an overwhelming interest in substantially raising salary levels for Cabinet officers, Senators, and Representatives and also a deep concern with the urgency of attracting the ablest men to Government leadership. Over 50 percent of the 400 leaders who responded opted for $50,000 Cabinet salaries. Eighty-two percent spoke out for $40,000 or more, and the average recommended salary for those officials was $36,000, or $1,000 more than Congress finally provided. Nearly half of the respondents favored congressional salaries of $35,000 or more, and 86 percent said our legislators should be paid at least $30,000 annually.

The Randall panel took the league study seriously, used the survey materials extensively, and cited the league in its report to the President. In reporting on the Randall panel's work, the New York Times of August 14, 1963, said, "In a report to President Kennedy, the 12-man panel followed many recommendations made by the National Civil Service League last April."

The league, in responding to the Government's request for advice, was performing but part of its historic research-counseling-information-education role. A citizen's action organization also must inform and educate the citizens, whose interest is crucial to effective democratic government.

The league, then, embarked on a major program of further factfinding, counseling, and disseminating information. It distributed over 50,000 copies of 11 separate special studies, reports, articles, and statements of views to key people in American leadership. League board members (all private citizens) wrote over 2,000 personal letters to other Americans asking their views and informing them of our stand. Clarence B. Randall, in the league's behalf, asked for and received formal statements of views from leaders in American industry that could be published by the league. The league was asked to testify before Congress and it did so. In addition, its board members and staff made over a dozen trips to Washington to meet with Government officials and congressional leaders to advise, at their request, on the issue. And, finally, the league made its research, statistics, studies, and opinions available to the public through the press, radio, and television. These were widely reported on the airwaves and in literally thousands of newspapers and magazines, thus informing and alerting the public to the urgency of the need for Federal salary reform.

The results of the league's efforts in this crucial issue are now history. We offer our profound thanks to the thousands of individuals, the leaders in our society who responded, to Mr. Clarence Randall and his panel for their excellent work, to the leaders of Government who had the courage to act, and to our members and supporters, without whom the league could never have made such a public service contribution. The league believes the battle is only partly won. The need remains for truly competitive salaries to be paid to the top executive managers of government. With the help of those who stand with us, we will continue to work.

The salary issue, however, is only part of the crisis facing government today. The league in appropriate sequence, has fought for and won a merit system of civil service. It continues to advance the merit principle and it further helps raise the prestige of public service through its career service awards program. Salary reform followed naturally in the league's program as part of its quest for excellence in the public service. The time has now come for a critical reexamination of the organization of government as it applies to personnel and for citizens' action aimed at improvement and modernization.

The attraction and retention of quality people to staff government, which today employs nearly 15 percent of the national work force, urges on the league the next step in the job to help government answer its manpower input problem—how to get and keep able people. The need remains to look more intensely and critically at recruitment, promotion, tenure, discipline, mobility, management flexibility, and employee motivation. The league has worked long, hard, and well as a citizens' action organization to promote an efficient and economical public service; these issues constitute a challenge that remains before it.

The National Civil Service League needs all public-spirited citizens to join its effort.

The People Have a Right To Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, concern over the series of Supreme Court decisions on reapportionment, the last of which was handed down on June 15, 1964, and one of which, by a divided court, declared a part of Ohio's Constitution unconstitutional, althought ratified in a popular election by a vote of 575,505 to 26,497 is more and more widespread and the concern deepens.

A well written editorial from the Moscow, Idaho, Idahoian, issue of September 10, 1964, deserves the reading of every thoughtful American, regardless of his conclusion on one of the most important issues of our time.

The editorial follows:

THE PEOPLE HAVE A RIGHT TO SAY

Congress is heading for a showdown vote on whether the States have the right to say that they shall be governed by two legislative branches, one representing the people and the other representing geographical areas and, perhaps, minorities.

This is the system of legislative government upon which the Federal Government itself is based. The issue is fundamental and crucial.

Those who would defeat a proposal being backed by Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, first to postpone effectiveness of the Supreme Court's decree that both State legislative branches must be on a "one man, one vote" basis have injected strident politics into the issue.

The Illinois Republican Senator would postpone effectiveness of the ruling for 2 years. This would allow time for the Con-

gress, then the States, to act on a constitutional amendment specifically leaving to the States determination of how one house of a two-house legislature should be selected.

Opponents to this two-step program are attempting to tie this in with the 30-year-old effort of Franklin D. Roosevelt to pack the Supreme Court because its members did not follow his philosophy of broad socialistic programs and knocked down one by one several of his reform measures.

This is far fetched. This issue is not whether the Supreme Court should be hamstrung or its powers limited. It is an attempt to correct what the Court has found, rightly or wrongly, to be a defect in constitutional law. Or it might be said that the Court has taken a radical view of what is constitutional and what is not that does not have historic precedent and does not reflect a constant political philosophy in our Government.

There have been innumerable other situations in which the Congress has passed remedial legislation to constitutionalize what the Court has said was unconstitutional. But never, perhaps, one of such importance.

When the Federal Constitution was written there were 13 States which ratified it. Each of those States, in turn, set up their own forms of government and deliberately patterned them after the Federal structure.

Each set up two-house legislatures, one house representing the people, the other geographical areas. Each established its own supreme court to be the final arbiter of State legislation. Each set up a single executive (the Governor) whose duties closely followed those of the Federal President.

That was the will of the people and that has been the will of the people (except in Nebraska where a single-house legislature has been operating in recent years) since.

The Supreme Court has been wrong before. It has reversed itself many times as its members have changed over the years. The most notable instance was the Court's reversal, in 1954, of longstanding opinions which held that "separate but equal" accommodations were valid as the States continued racial separation in schools and other public and private facilities.

There are many who now believe the Court erred in its summer decisions saying that all State legislatures, for both houses, must be elected on a voter-proportional basis. It is entirely possible that a future Court made up of other judges might reverse this decision. And it wouldn't have to be "packed" as President Roosevelt sought to pack it in 1934.

The Supreme Court is the final arbiter of what is and what is not constitutional—until the people, within their right, decide otherwise. The fact that we have more than two score amendments tacked onto our original Constitution attests to the right of the people to change or modify or up-date our basic charter of liberty. The people still have that right; when they abrogate it they will have turned Government over to a dictatorial body of nine men.

If the Congress, representing the people, and then the States, again representing the people, adopt an amendment to legalize a two-house legislature patterned after the Federal Legislature in the makeup of its members, this would be a legal exercise of our liberty. At least the people should have the right to make this determination. It is not a question of taking away the powers of the Court; it is a question of correcting what the Court has found to be, in its judgment, wrong.

President Johnson's Pledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert at this point an editorial which appeared in the New York Post of August 13, dealing with President Lyndon B. Johnson's address before the American Bar Association recently.

I call this article to the attention of my colleagues:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S PLEDGE

The address of President Johnson before the American Bar Association was the measured speech of a man who carries the responsibility and the burden, whose every word must be just.

"Sir, it is a solemn thing to be President of the United States," declared Grover Cleveland. That was in a much simpler time. How much more solemn is the responsibility today when, as Harry Truman observed, "there is no end to the chain of responsibility that binds" the President, and the heaviest link is that which ties him to command of our nuclear arsenal.

Speaking in the context of the Vietnamese episode, the President said: "And there is another consideration wherever the forces of freedom are engaged. No one who commands the power of nuclear weapons can escape his responsibility for the life of our people and their children. It has never been the policy of any American President to systematically place in hazard the life of his Nation by threatening nuclear war. No American President has ever pursued so irresponsible a course. Our firmness at moments of crisis has always been matched by restraint—our determination by care. It was so under President Truman at Berlin, under President Eisenhower in the Formosa Strait, under President Kennedy in the Cuba missile crisis.

"And I pledge you it will be so as long as I am President."

When the push of a button can mean the obliteration of the human race, the indispensable prerequisite in a President is a sober, prayerful—yes, humble—awareness of the dread power at his command.

Mr. Johnson spoke sternly on the subject of preserving civil peace.

"Grievances do not justify turning the streets into jungles," he said, or abusing the right of other Americans to security and safety." Violence must be stopped whether it occurs "in Mississippi or New York" and lawbreakers must be punished "whether they be murderers in the countryside, or hooded nightriders on the highways, or hoodlums in the city."

However, the President did not stop there. "Those who promise racial peace but are silent about the redress of grievances delude themselves," he commented. "Fulfillment of rights and prevention of disorder goes hand in hand."

The President did not say, but the country knows, that behind these words are deeds. He was instrumental in securing passage of civil rights and antipoverty legislation. He has asserted a restraining Federal presence in Mississippi.

He has established his moral right to be heard in the northern ghetto as well as in the southern countryside.

Interest on Church Bonds Should Be Tax Exempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE R. POOL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which is long overdue. It proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 to exclude from gross income the interest on church bonds.

Nations which love and hold God in reverent awe always have denied their secular officials the right to control or to impose taxes on the churches of the people. Recognizing that "the power to tax is the power to destroy," our Nation wisely has sought to eliminate any tax on our churches. Church property is exempt in our Nation's cities, counties and States. The Securities Act of 1933 and all following amendments have exempted church bonds from registration, and this is true also in the various securities acts of the States. My proposal, then, follows the wish of our Founding Fathers; emphasizes the spirit of our Constitution; and clarifies the intent of the Congress and the legislative bodies of the States that church property shall not be burdened directly or indirectly by taxation.

Reduction in Federal revenue, as a result of this legislation, would be infinitesimal. Religious bonds are a tiny business. At present, I am informed about $300 to $400 million in church bonds is outstanding. Compared with corporate bonds, of which some $100 billion is outstanding; or with municipals, of which about $47 billion is outstanding, the bonds affected by my proposal would amount to a minuscule part of the securities business. The greater part of these church bonds have been sold to members of the congregation. The maturing bonds and the accrued interest on these bonds are paid by the church from the tithes, contributions and offerings of members and friends of the church.

These church bonds mature serially as municipal bonds do. Unlike municipals, however, these church bonds are not tax exempt. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we provide tax exempt status for bonds to build an athletic stadium or a sewer system, but we impose Caeser's tax on the building of churches and sanctuaries. My bill would relieve this inequity, for the interest on these church bonds should not be taxable. Under the provisions of this measure, church bonds would be on a par with tax-exempt municipal and State bonds.

Our Nation's churches generally have had a difficult time with construction programs. The day is long past when the congregation could work together to cut the trees and plane into lumber the material to build their church. Over the years, conventional lending agencies—banks, insurance companies, and such—have found more attractive uses for their investment capital. They also have become somewhat reluctant to make church loans because they feel such loans could adversely affect their operations, as when a need might arise to press for payment. Therefore, within the past several years, more and more churches have been turning to bond issues to provide the capital needed for their programs.

Too, the cost of church construction now is greater than in the past. Today, the needs of the church call for more than a sanctuary. The church today is more than a place for Sunday services, for Tuesday choir practice and prayer meetings on Wednesday. Where the membership is concerned and alert to the requirements of modern society, the church has become a focal point in community leadership and development. There is a need for additional religious education space, for day nurseries, youth programs and community affairs. Robert South, the great English clergyman, once said:

If there were not a minister in every parish, you would quickly find cause to increase the number of constables; and if churches were not employed as places to hear God's laws, there would be a need for them to be prisons for lawbreakers.

The encouragement of church building the establishment of youth centers and day nurseries under the leadership of the church brings moral determination to the fight against poverty, delinquency, and despair.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard much about juvenile delinquency. We have recently passed legislation to attack pockets of poverty in this country. But I say to the Members of this House, a well-organized church program, including youth centers, day nurseries, educational training, will have a greater impact for good than all of our bureaucratic activities. It will permit local groups to solve many of their local problems. It will encourage local initiative and permit local citizens to operate.

The great growth of the suburbs of our Nation's cities has caused a tremendous growth in small-to-medium churches. In town, urban renewal programs provide funds and assistance for improvement of every part of the community except the churches—the motivating moral force in any community. Making church bonds more appealing to buyers is a sound way to help urban renewal area churches keep pace with the renewal program.

Many of the Negro churches of our Nation's cities are in the center of redeveloped, or to be redeveloped areas. The income of the people in these areas often does not permit them to be investors in any kind of securities. However, they are now contributing, and will continue to contribute, to their various churches through tithes and offerings. Making bonds more attractive to investors outside of the churches will let the Negro church acquire the money to build churches, adequate day nurseries, and properly equipped youth centers.

The bill I have introduced will aid in the encouragement of church building. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, while these institutional bonds generally carry an interest rate higher than medium corporate bonds or municipals, no default on any institutional issue has been recorded in the past 25 years and the market for such bonds—while not as active as in other securities—is steady, for the greater part of these maturing serial bonds are purchased in the local communities and by the members of the church itself. But, because the church is building to meet the more complex problems of our modern day, the amount of capital for building has increased. These church bond programs are essential if the churches are to meet the challenge of our society.

The field of institutional bonds must be expanded if our churches are to meet their obligations. I propose, through this bill, to aid this great work by making such church bonds exempt from taxation by the Federal Government.

The bill follows:

H.R. 12637

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the interest on church bonds

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income) is amended by inserting after section 103 (relating to interest on certain governmental obligations) the following new section:

"SEC. 103A. INTEREST ON CHURCH BONDS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Gross income does not include interest on a church bond.

"(b) CHURCH BOND DEFINED.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'church bond' means a bond, debenture, note, or certificate, or other evidence of indebtedness, which is issued with interest coupons or in registered form, which is issued by a church or a convention or association of churches, and the issuance of which is exempted from the application of the Securities Act of 1933 by section 3(a)(4) of such Act."

(b) The table of sections for such part III is amended by inserting immediately below "Sec. 103. Interest on certain governmental obligations." the following:

"SEC. 103A. Interest on church bonds."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to church bonds (within the meaning of section 103A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

National 4–H Club Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the week of September 26 to October 3 has been set aside as National 4–H Club Week. In previous years we have honored the National 4–H Club in the early spring. It is of small concern in what season this celebration occurs for it is always a pleasure for me to pay tribute to this fine organization and to all those who are responsible for the growth and success that it has enjoyed since it was founded around the turn of the century.

There are many who have played a strong and important part in this continuing growth and success. All of them deserve mention and a heartfelt well done from the entire Nation for the contribution they are making toward a stronger America. The Federal Extension Services of the Department of Agriculture conduct a dynamic program of education functioning through our State land-grant colleges and universities. In addition to this leadership at the national level the State extension services provide excellent direction as do the more than 307,500 local leaders, who as volunteers are unpaid for their unselfish efforts to reach and serve any and all of those who wish their advice and help. There are also about 114,960 older club members—boys and girls—who, as junior leaders give freely of their time and assistance. Working together with these groups for the betterment of the 4–H Club movement are two nongovernmental organizations, the National 4–H Club Foundation and the National 4–H Club Services Committee. Since 1914 when legislation was first passed for the purpose of assisting 4–H Club work nearly 23,830,400 different young people have participated in this "learn by doing program." This is more than ample proof of the effectiveness and wisdom of such Federal action.

The number of projects available to 4–H Club members ranges from approximately 25 in some States to 100 in others and comprise a well-diversified group of programs which are now and which will be for many years to come of immeasurable benefit.

Our 4–H Club members and their leaders have not hesitated to meet new challenges and to set forth workable programs to meet new needs and problems. There has been a widespread change in agricultural technology and this change is being faced squarely and realistically by these dedicated workers.

4–H Club members recognize the need for better understanding between the peoples of all nations and it is for this reason that the National 4–H Club Foundation was an early leader in an international people-to-people program through its farm youth exchange and its Peace Corps projects. Approximately 115 delegates from their ranks are sent abroad to contribute to the social and economic growth and expansion of some 65 countries. In return the same number of young people are brought to our country under this program which was designed to promote an exchange of ideas, aims, and purposes.

It has long been the dream of the United States to lead the free world to a lasting peace. To accomplish this, our youth must be fully prepared to meet the challenges that tomorrow holds. Youth organizations, such as the 4–H Clubs of America are vital to our Nation in this respect for they help to provide

the background for these young Americans of whom we are all so justly proud.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say again that it is a pleasure and a privilege for me to salute this outstanding organization which has earned respect and commendation from every corner of the globe for its achievements. I am sure that the 4–H Clubs of America have the gratitude of all of us for their past accomplishments and our sincere best wishes for success in the future.

Are One-third of American Young Men Unqualified for Military Service?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE M. KILGORE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, a task force composed of the Secretaries of Labor, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Director of the Selective Service System early this year issued a report declaring that one-third of the 1,400,000 young men who reach the age of 18 in this year would be found unqualified for military service.

A rebuttal was prepared by the staff of the American Medical Association's Division of Environmental Medicine and Medical Services and published in the June 29, 1964, issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association.

Because the subject is of such general interest, I feel that the Members of the Congress will be interested in reading it.

The article follows:

ONE-THIRD OF A NATION?

On January 4, President Johnson directed the Department of Defense and Selective Service System to conduct physical and mental examinations of most youths as soon as possible after they reach 18 and register for the draft. The President also ordered the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare to set up "rehabilitation programs to correct the physical and mental defects found in the examinations." Both orders become effective July 1.

The President issued these directives with the release of a "manpower conservation" report, whose findings, he said, "are dramatic evidence that poverty is still exacting its price in spoiled lives and failed examinations * * * In a nation as rich and productive as ours this is an intolerable situation." Mr. Johnson promised to present a program "to attack the roots of poverty"—later presented to Congress as "The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964."

The youth-screening program was ordered into effect the day the task force report on which it is based was released to the public, without public discussion by Congress or by experts outside the Government.

THE REPORT

The Task Force [1] document, "One-Third of a Nation, a Report on Young Men Found Unqualified for Military Service," is 86 pages and begins with 12 findings and a recommendation for a six-part "Manpower Conservation Program." Briefly, the task force's findings are:

1. One-third of the young men in the Nation would be found unqualified for military service if examined at 18—about half for medical reasons, half failing the mental tests.

2. Half the registrants called for preinduction examinations are now found unqualified.

3. The failure rate varies widely between States, areas.

4. Most failures appear to be "victims of inadequate education and insufficient health services."

5. A survey of recent mental test failures shows most to be identified with a continuous cycle of poverty.

6. Of the mental rejectees, 40 percent did not go beyond grammar school, 80 percent did not finish high school.

7. The unemployment rate of the mental rejectees (31 percent jobless) was four times that for their age group; of those working, most had the lowest paying jobs requiring minimum skill.

8. Unless their skills are upgraded, these young men "face a lifetime of recurrent unemployment." Interviewers believed 80 percent needed job counseling, or literacy or job training; most interviewees were willing to take such training.

9. The findings underscore the need for the Youth Employment Act and the National Service Corps (now before Congress).

10. Many failing the medical examination need medical attention but are not so advised; few are now receiving treatment.

11. If all the young men turning 18 in 1964 were examined, about 500,000 would be found unqualified; rejections would rise to 600,000 or more per year for the rest of the decade.

12. Further, some 1,750,000 in the 18 to 26 age group would be found disqualified if examined.[2]

Six of those twelve findings are restatements of President Kennedy's charge to the task force and two are projections from the percentages of youths rejected quoted in that charge, whereas the ninth finding is more properly a recommendation for legislation (which task force members were supporting before the task force was formed). Only the fifth, sixth, and seventh findings—on the family income, education of mental rejectees interviewed, and the proportion of rejectees who were jobless—are new data. But these findings (5, 6, 7) apply only to the 2,500 mental rejectees interviewed, not representing a valid sample of the 160,000 mental rejectees from whom they were selected. Furthermore, findings 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 are not based on well-documented evidence.

THE PROGRAM

The task force proposes a six-part program—five parts Federal action, one part local.

First (already ordered for July 1, 1964): Examination of Selective Service registrants as soon as possible after age 18. Selective Service would be responsible for classification, using facilities of Federal agencies, States, and communities.[3] Both the rejectee and the community are to be informed of rejection; Selective Service is to refer rejectees to agencies "for remedial action."

Second: Establishment of a Public Health Service referral program for medical rejectees (voluntary) to local public or private facilities for comprehensive health services.

Third: Establishment of manpower conservation units in all 1,900 U.S. Employment Service offices, for referral of mental rejectees.

Fourth (the only non-Federal action): Expansion of local manpower development and training advisory committees to include members of selective service boards and educational and welfare groups, "to assume leadership in organizing community action to work with young men rejected for military service."

Fifth: A program of experimental and demonstration projects by the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare in new techniques of testing, education, counseling, and motivation of rejectees.

Sixth: Regular publication of rejection rates "to provide * * * an index of performance in manpower conservation."

Three recommendations (1, 3, 5) are restatements of President Kennedy's program, and the proposed Public Health Service referral program (step 2) is implied in the task force appointment of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The only new recommendations are the expansion of the local advisory committees and the establishment of military rejection rates as a criterion of State and community performance.[4] The task force report, presented as a study of the problem and the solution proposed by the four members of the task force, is only a justification and slight amplification of a program already decided in September 1963.

EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM

The finding that one-third of the 1,400,000 young men who reach age 18 in 1964 would be found unqualified for military service is based, according to the task force, on a Defense Department study of all categories of examinations for military service between August 1958, and June 1960, including enlistment applications, examinations of draftees and reserve and National Guard enlistees, and local board preliminary screenings. This was computed as an overall rejection rate of 31.7 percent, distributed as 3.9 percent administrative rejection, 14.8 percent medical rejection, 11.5 percent mental rejection, and 1.5 percent who failed both medical and mental examinations. It is estimated that the rate for 1963 was "about 35 or 36 percent."

This rate is based on all ages eligible for induction into military service—not just 18-year-olds, but those 18 to 26. Applying it to 18-year-olds is a misstatement of the statistical implications. (The report states most registrants are not referred for examination until age 22.)

The medical rejectee

The report provides only two items concerning draftees rejected for medical reasons: their number in 1962 (69,638 out of 306,073 examined), and the task force's opinion that "75 percent of all persons rejected for failure to meet the medical and physical standards would probably benefit from treatment." No explanation is given of how this conclusion was reached. (Interestingly, the 75 percent applies also to local selective service board rejectees—presumably including more seriously handicapped men whose restoration possibilities would be more restricted.)

A report graph, "Reasons for Medical Disqualifications: Medical Diagnosis and Frequency of Defect per 10,000 Medically Disqualified Youths," is based on "examinations made from August of 1953 through July of 1958," [5] with no indication of whether these involved draftees only. Nor does the presentation of the chart make it immediately apparent that this deals with a sample 4 to 9 years prior to the examinations being reported on.

The report claims that 10 percent of medical rejectees have conditions entirely correctable by proper treatment and gives as examples tuberculosis and syphilis.[6]

Of these, tuberculosis is required to be reported to local health officials, whereas syphilis is not a cause for military rejection. One of five (20 percent) is reported as having a condition that "requires or would benefit" from treatment. One of four (25 percent) needs medical and other health services. This leaves, according to the Task Force, one

Footnotes at end of speech.

out of four (25 percent) "for whom regular medical services are not the answer." It also leaves 20 percent unaccounted for.

Aside from the 1953–58 chart, nowhere does the report categorize which diseases (except tuberculosis and syphilis are considered wholly correctable. It gives examples for the three other groupings, also, but not complete listings—nor does it state who has decided which conditions are correctable, which would benefit from medical services, which need medical and other services, and which would not benefit.

The task force admits this analysis of national rejection rates rests on the validity of the diagnoses made at Armed Forces examining stations and that "independent diagnoses by local public health officials resulted in a diagnostic agreement of 95 percent—confirming the high degree of quality of the medical examination given for military screening." Information is not given supporting this "confirmation" as to number of cases, the diagnoses, how much the local health officials knew of the previous AFES examination before giving their own. The only other information given about the demonstration projects in New York and Philadelphia is that New York City has a higher percentage of psychiatric disqualifications and a lower percentage of diseases of bones and organs of locomotion than the rest of the country.

Physicians associated with the New York project indicate they have made no attempt to confirm or to validate the AFES diagnoses. It is clear that all males reaching the PHS project would be known to have failed the AFES medical standards, which in itself reduces the value of any confirming diagnosis. Armed Forces officials have expressed dissatisfaction with the quality of AFES examinations, with suboptimal quality attributed to lack of adequate facilities, difficulty in staffing and maintaining medical interest in a program consisting entirely of routine physical examinations.

The task force "finds" that "insufficient health services" are a cause of rejection and that many rejectees do not know they need medical services, that few are presently told they do, and that very few now receive medical treatment.[7] No evidence is presented for these statements; none is given that any study was made of the medical histories of the 1962 rejectees—aside from the reprinting of the 1953–58 survey.

It is significant that the task force fails to consider that some conditions are disqualifying on the word of the registrant (e.g., somnambulism), since they cannot be discovered in the physical examination (average physician's time: 16 to 17 minutes); and that many males medically disqualified for military service are not examples of "insufficient health services" but of excellent health services, individuals who, with poorer health services, would not even be alive to be examined.

The mental rejectee

The task force gives the appearance of having studied the mental rejectee; much of the new information presented, and 21 of the 23 appendix tables, deal with his work status, socioeconomic background, and desire for training. One-third of the findings are presumably based on a "nationwide survey * * * of persons who have recently failed the mental test." In fact, however, the survey is not nationwide; it is based on interviewees called in by some 200 local selective service boards in only 37 States. Thirteen States were excluded "because of low rates [of rejection] and small numbers of rejectees" (although some of the States included have lower rates or smaller numbers).

Aside from the 13 States excluded, there was little attempt to make sampling proportionate to the number of rejectees by State or area, or to urban and rural background, or to different classes of rejectees such as 4F's and 1Y's, etc. In fact, no information is given of the number of interviews in each State.

Further, the only men interviewed were those who volunteered to go to the selective service office. The 200 offices presumably involved were instructed to take the most recent rejectees who would consent to the interview, held in November 1963; to get the sample some offices communicated with men rejected almost 2 years before, indicating that very few of those who were reached volunteered to cooperate. The interviewees were told their responses would be used to develop a program to reduce unemployment and increase opportunities for young men.

Interviews were held during office hours, with no apparent attempt to have workers excused from employment. This situation would act to select those not working on the day of the interview and able to reach selective service office easily. There is no evidence of any effort to validate the information supplied. Although a supplementary report was supposed to have been made out for every interviewee who reported having used the U.S. Employment Service, no data whatsoever are given on the results. Interviewers were free to motivate interviewees to cooperate, were led to expect upgrading of their own jobs if the task force recommendations were implemented, and were given no special training and apparently no supervision. (No information is given of how many of the various types of U.S. Employment Service employees were involved.)

The percentage tabulations imply that all 2,500 interviewees answered all questions—yet there are obviously some questions to which some interviewees would have to answer "Don't know." For example, 24 percent of the rejectees report they are not living with their parents and another 23 percent report that their fathers are not present in the household; it seems unlikely that all 2,500 interviewees could state accurately their fathers' education, their family income, and whether they had received public assistance any time since 1958 (when some interviewees—12 percent—were under 15 years of age).

No analysis is made of the mental rejections to indicate the areas in which failure occurred. The Armed Forces qualification test has 100 questions, in cycles of increasing difficulty, covering four areas: vocabulary, arithmetic, spatial relations, and mechanical ability. The task force, charging "inadequate education" as a cause of rejection, assumes that failure applies to the first two areas. Spatial relations and mechanical ability are rather independent of schooling, yet the task force did not resort to a study of these to validate its assertion that poverty and lack of opportunity were responsible for the failure to qualify. The information on the 2,500 interviewees would seem to apply only to those 2,500, and there is evidence to doubt its accuracy or completeness even for them.

THE PROPOSALS

This program is presented as needing no new legislation, no new agencies, no significant delay; yet it proposes the establishment of 73 Public Health Service referral centers and 1,900 manpower conservation units, with much larger appropriations, but with no evidence that these would accomplish anything. (The report states that the Public Health Service projects in New York City and Philadelphia, cited as evidence for the value of that portion of the program, "have not yet progressed far enough for thorough statistical analysis.")

The report proposes tripling the workload of the Armed Forces examining stations—draftees failing the mental examination are not now given a physical examination, and, since most young men will still be called for induction at 22, all those found qualified at 18 will be reexamined later—yet it does not consider the necessary expansion of medical and paramedical staff and facilities.

It claims that the selective service examinations present an adequate gauge of ability to succeed in civilian life, yet presents no comparison of those who passed and those who failed with regard to civilian success. Further, no one outside the agencies involved was consulted as to their effectiveness in measuring civilian potentialities. No cost estimates has been made, as regards either funds or professional and other personnel, although these are the areas where major expansion is contemplated. No question is raised as to the wisdom of a program to improve individual capabilities for employment which makes no provision for women, who comprise half the population and one-third the work force.

Finally, although the task force claims that this new program will make use of a large number of already established programs,[8] it does not explain why these programs have failed to meet the need or how the establishment of a new "sorting machine" will make them succeed.

Apparently the Selective Service System is chosen as a mechanism because it is handy. That it is as obvious distortion of the whole purpose of the Selective Service System has been completely ignored.

A program of this size, with its many implications, deserves the serious consideration of our lawmakers, of nongovernmental experts in medicine, education, vocational guidance, rehabilitation. It should not be allowed to come into being on the basis of a hasty, poorly substantiated political belief.

---

[1] This task force comprised the Secretaries of Labor, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Director of the Selective Service System, with the Secretary of Labor as Chairman; it was set up by President Kennedy on Sept. 30, 1963, and ordered to report by Jan. 1, 1964.

[2] Elsewhere in the report it is stated that 3.5 million have already been rejected (p. 29).

[3] Preinduction examinations are now given at Armed Forces examining stations—the proposed use of other Federal agencies and State and community facilities is not explained.

[4] The task force failed to give inclusive military rejection rates, one which would take account of rejection by local selective service boards, enlistees, various catgories of exemptees, ROTC, and other groups.

Rejection rates given in table 2 of the report are full of internal contradictions. It is difficult to explain in terms of poverty and low level of expenditure for education and health a mental test rejection rate of 31.6 for New York State and 6.4 for Vermont; or to account for the large negative correlation between mental rejection rates with medical rejection rates for the different States; or the fact that for the country at large, if the medical rejection rate for the mentally qualified is considered one, the corresponding rate for mentally disqualified would be 0.35. But this national average of 1:0.35 varies tremendously from a high of 1:2.60 in Alaska to 1:0 in Vermont and Guam and 1:177 in Maine.

[5] In all probability it excludes medical defects among those rejected by local boards.

[6] In the New York pilot study the preliminary findings show that, as a result of the public program, at best only 6 percent of the medically disqualified could be rehabilitated. This is exclusive of the 25 percent who were already being cared for by their doctor.

[7] In the preliminary findings of the New York study, 25 percent of the rejectees were being cared for by their own physicians for the condition that was the cause of their rejection and for 15.6 percent no care was recommended.

* Manpower Development and Training Act, Vocational Education Acts, National Defense Education Act, and programs of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Welfare Administration, the Office of Education.

Soil Conservation Pays Dividends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, today I received the August report of the Sully County, S. Dak., Soil and Water Conservation District. The report outlines in detail the advantages of good conservation farming, and points up the increased yields resulting from such practices. I know the report will be of interest to many of my colleagues and their farm constituents; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

BURNING MEANS WASTE

Stubble, straw, and roots are the only sources of organic matter in grain farming. While roots supply a limited amount of organic matter, the stubble and straw are most important. When stubble is burned, there is a loss of approximately $2 per acre in nitrogen alone—but the organic matter and surface cover lost is worth a great deal more.

If we lose 1 inch of topsoil from 1 acre, we lose plant food worth $200, if it were bought as commercial fertilizer.

The organic matter that is destroyed by burning will hold this topsoil. Organic matter contains most of the nitrogen in the soil, gives the soil good tilth, and allows it to take and hold moisture better.

DON'T BURN YOUR STUBBLE—STUBBLE MULCH

Definition: Managing plant residues on a year-round basis, to keep protective amounts of vegetative material on the surface of the soil until after seeding the next crop.

Left on the surface, the plant residues keep the wind from getting at the soil and the rain from compacting it. With residues there is less runoff because the soil takes in water more rapidly. Soils low in organic matter puddle when wet and bake hard when dry. Rainfall quickly seals the surface of such soils and water runs off. Soil without enough organic matter is cold, hard, difficult to work and subject to erosion.

HANDLING THE RESIDUE

Preparation for handling stubble and straw begins at harvestime. Straw must be spread evenly over the field, especially if a stubble crop is to be grown the next year. Long stubble should be left to hold snow on the fields and thus increase the moisture supply. The long stubble also makes cultivation easier than it would be through a heavy layer of straw.

"The fewer the better tillage operations as long as you control the weeds," is the rule. Sweep type implements are best-suited for this work; the sweep should be as wide as possible, but not less than 30 inches is a good rule for tillage equipment.

Cultivation should be no deeper than 3 or 4 inches most of the time. However, cultivation to 5 or 6 inches is necessary at least once a year to prevent a hard pan formation. Research indicates that the first tillage operations should be the deepest.

Rotary hoeing, just prior to seeding will tend to break down the residue.

RESIDUE MEASUREMENTS IN STUBBLE-MULCH FARMING

For every bushel of winter wheat produced, there is about 135 pounds of residue (20 bushel wheat—2,700 pounds of residue). For spring wheat, the ratio is 120 pounds of residue for each bushel of wheat.

Wide sweeps are most effective in stubble-mulch operations. Only about 10 percent of the stubble is lost with each tillage as compared with 50-percent loss with each tillage using a disk type implement.

If the stubble is left standing over winter, it will hold snow and help to increase the moisture supply. The greater the height of the stubble, the more snow will be held.

Control of runoff means control of erosion, one necessarily involves the other.

Wheat Dumping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, at the very time when thousands of American farmers are individually withholding this year's wheat crop hoping to boost the sagging price, it must be a bitter pill for them to swallow knowing the Government has been dumping 90 million bushels on the market since the 1st of July, thereby depressing prices even further.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the commodity letter appearing in the September 15 issue of the Wall Street Journal reporting this double dealing. The Journal notes that during the last week of August alone, the Commodity Credit Corporation—Orville Freeman's shop—dumped nearly 40 million bushels on the market. The Journal further notes that the 90 million bushels is up by some 52 million bushels over CCC sales last year, an increase of 136 percent.

I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the present price of wheat is $1.33 per bushel as compared to $1.77 per bushel last year at this time.

And while the Secretary of Agriculture allows this dumping to continue, insult is added to injury when it is reported that America has now replaced Great Britain as the world's leading importer of beef and veal.

Mr. Speaker, surely no one needs reminding importing these two meats, along with dumping policies resulting in domestic overproduction, are largely responsible for the catastrophic price slump livestock producers all over the country have had to face for the last 2 years.

The Journal report indicates the United States imported nearly 1.7 billion pounds of beef and veal last year as compared to Great Britain's 1.1 billion, making America the No. 1 importer. The British have led in past years.

No wonder, Mr. Speaker, the farmers in Minnesota expressed so much gloom about their financial future in a recent statewide poll. They realize their supposed friends in the Department of Agriculture are undercutting their markets.

No wonder, Mr. Speaker, more than 2 million farmers have had to give up their farms in the last 4 short years.

Civil Disobedience—A Threat to Our Law Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest recently the text of an address by Mr. Morris I. Leibman, of Chicago, a distinguished attorney who is chairman of the Standing Committee on Education Against Communism of the American Bar Association.

Because it is timely and thought provoking, I should like to share these remarks of Mr. Leibman with the House, as follows:

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE A THREAT TO OUR LAW SOCIETY

On a number of occasions in other forums I have suggested that there is a standard against which we should regularly test basic issues of foreign policy. That standard is the historical and continuous struggle of human beings for freedom and dignity. This must be our basis in confronting Khrushchev. We are right because the history of man proves it. Only the law society—not communism—can discipline the cult of the personality. The law society—not brute force—is man's only hope.

Domestic issues, it seems to me, must also be measured against man's historic struggle for liberty. Here, too, the record establishes that the Communists will pervert with tactics of confusion, disruption, and violence the rights of our law system.

The history of the advance of world communism overwhelmingly provides the evidence that they will seize upon any situation approximating dissent for propaganda purposes, just as they will seize upon organized outbreaks to hasten their revolutionary objectives.

Woodrow Wilson once said: "A nation which does not remember what it was yesterday, does not know what it is today, nor what it is trying to do. We are trying to do a futile thing if we do not know where we came from or what we have been about."

In seeking to improve tomorrow, it is our duty to remember where we have been and reflect on where we are.

We live in that instant of time when it can be said that never before have 190 million people enjoyed so many material goods however imperfect their distribution. Never before have 190 million people had as much mechanical, electronic, and scientific equipment with which to subdue the natural obstacles of the universe. But the multiplication of consumer wealth is subordinate to our greatest accomplishment—the fashioning of the law society.

Never in the history of mankind have so many lived so freely, so rightfully, so humanely. This open democratic republic is man's highest achievement—not only for what it has already accomplished, but more importantly because it affords the greatest opportunity for orderly change and the reali-

zation of man's self-renewing aspirations. Our goals, as set forth in the declaration, have been buttressed by a constitution, a system of checks and balances, a mechanism judicial, legislative, and executive which permits the continuation of Western civilization's spirited dialog. This unhampered dialog makes possible the opportunity to continuously approximate, through our legislative and judicial system, our moral and spiritual goals.

The long history of man is one of pain and suffering, blood and tears to create these parameters for progress. This noble and unique experiment of ours, a hundred years ago, lived through the cruelty of a massive Civil War to test whether such a unique system could endure. It did. It has. It will. Let us always remember that the law society is the pinnacle of man's struggle to date—the foundation for his future hope.

There is an obligation to that law society. It was stated more than 100 years ago by Abraham Lincoln in these passionate words:

"Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well-wisher to his prosperity, swear by the blood of the Revolution, never to violate in the least particular, the laws of the country. * * * Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the character of his own and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother, to the lisping babe, that prattles on her lap—let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political religion of the Nation; and let the old and young, rich and poor, the grave and gay, of all sexes, tongues, and colors, and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars."

No society whether free or tyrannical can give its citizens the right to break the law. There can be no law to which obedience is optional, no command to which the States attaches an "if you please."

What has happened to us? Why is it necessary, at this moment, in this forum to repeat what should be axiomatic and accepted? Many, many words more eloquent than mine have examined from every angle the genesis, the roots, the grievances, the despair, the bitterness, the emotion, the frustration that have resulted in the tragedies of these days.

Now what is the responsibility of a citizen—the majestic title bestowed on those of us who create and share in the values of the law society? Let there be no question of where we stand on human rights and our rejection of discrimination. Surely the continuing social task for the morally sensitive citizen is to impart reality to the yet unachieved ideal of full and equal participation by all and in all our values and opportunities.

Yet we must remember that there have been no easy solutions for man's inhumanity to man. Justice Frankfurter once said:

"Only those lacking responsible humility will have a confident solution to problems as intractable as the frictions attributable to differences of color, race, or religion."

Let's not forget there is nothing new in violence. Violence has throughout mankind's history been too often a way of life. Whole continents have been involved in riot, rebellion, and revolution. Human rights problems exist in India, in Asia, in the Middle East, and in Africa. A large part of the world lives behind the ugly Iron and Bamboo Curtains of communism.

We cannot sanction terror in New York or in Mississippi. Retaliation is not justified by bitterness or past disillusionment. No individual or group at any time, for any reason, has a right to exact self-determined retribution. All too often, retaliation injures the innocent at random and provokes counter-retaliation against those equally innocent. Our imperfections do not justify tearing down the structures which have given us our progress. The only solution is the free and open law society. In times when man's progress seems painfully slow on any one issue, we might also consider how well we are doing on all issues compared to most areas of the world over most of the world's history.

In this frame of reference let us identify certain current forces whose aim is to destroy the law society.

The inexorable requirement of communism to exploit every difference between men should now be clearly understood. Communism constantly exploits mankind's troubles ideologically, philosophically, and psychologically. Yet we seem to be surprised, confused, even bitter about Communist intervention in our civil rights problems. What could be a more natural target for Communist usage? The Communist Party USA has a long history of attempting to infiltrate every segment of our society. The Negroes of America have a long history of resisting this subversion, but it would be foolish—yes—dangerous to believe that Communists would not seek to insert themselves where there is unreasoning and extreme militancy in any troubled area. This is no reflection on any segment of our society—it is a recognition of the constant threat of trained troublemakers and rabble rousers aimed at all times against our entire society. The Communists know they can profit by stimulating agitation and disrespect for law and order. They would be neglectful of their own sinister doctrines if they did not use these instruments of subversion and violence.

Ethnological warfare, the inciting of dissension and conflict between nationalities and races, is a widely exploited revolutionary tactic. Communists have long been instructed to change passive attitudes to activist attitudes, to intensify the struggle at all levels at all times. To the Communist, all means are justified by the end, the basic concept that we of the law society reject. These Communists have their imitators, who mimic under many theories and many labels, doctrines which reject law and order. The Nazis, the Malcolm Xes, the Ku Klux Klanners have repeatedly and directly challenged our principles and insisted on taking law in their own hands. Those who reject our legal methods and choose terror, force, violence, hate and bigotry only play into the hands of the international Communist conspiracy.

The jungle lawlessness of the frontier demonstrated to the pioneers that law was essential to the establishment of civilization. It was not the destruction of the buffalo, or the rise of fences, or fast-draw gunmen that tamed the wilderness. It was the installation of American juridical proceedings that enabled our people to weld together the disparate territories destined to become an organic nation.

I am also deeply troubled by certain concepts which have sought acceptability: the idea of "freedom now" and the idea of "righteous civil disobedience." In my opinion both terms are semantic traps and only add heat to the problems of freedom and justice for all. It is a further semantic trap to divide the discourse on civil disobedience into a stereotype of liberalism versus conservatism.

"Freedom now" is an illusion. The desire for self-expression can be satisfied only in an atmosphere of freedom, and freedom is not absolute. It exists only within the confines of the necessary restraining measures of society.

I wish it were possible to have heaven on earth. I wish it were possible to have the ideals of justice and freedom in all their perfect form at this moment. The cry for immediacy is the cry for impossibility. It is a cry without memory or perspective. Immediacy is impossible in a society of human beings. What is possible is to continue to patiently build the structures that permit the development of better justice.

Let us also beware of pat phrases such as "justice delayed is justice denied." Justice delayed is no excuse for antijustice or the destruction of the law system. The fact that particular reforms have not been completely achieved does not justify rejecting legal means—the only hope for lasting achievement.

The demand for equality cannot be converted into a fight for superiority. We must be for equality under the rule of law. We are for freedom under law, not freedom against the law.

Let us also avoid unreal questions such as whether justice is more important than order or vice versa. Order is the sine qua non of the constitutional system if there is to be any possibility for long-term justice based on public consensus.

What about the concept of righteous civil disobedience? I take it that all men now accept the fact that there can be no justification for violent disobedience under our constitutional system. Is the concept validated when the disobedience is nonviolent? In my opinion this idea has no place in our law society.

Parenthetically, I would suggest that you experts in criminal law consider whether there can be civil disobedience where there is a specific intent to disobey the law. Such a specific state of mind is ordinarily treated as the essence of criminality, hence not civil. Therefore, it seems to me that there is an inherent contradiction in the concept of premeditated, righteous, civil disobedience.

Yet I prefer to base the case on broader grounds. The concept of righteous civil disobedience, I think, is incompatible with the concept of the American legal system. This is particularly axiomatic where this society provides more than any other for orderly change, where every minority—including the minority of one—has been protected by a system of law which provides for orderly process for development and change. I cannot accept the right to disobey where as here the law is not static and where if it is claimed to be oppressive or coercive, many effective channels for change are constantly available. Our courts do not have to apologize for their continued dedication to the liberty of all men. Our legislatures have regularly met the changing times and changing needs of the society with consideration for the unalienable rights of all. Even the Federal and State constitutions have been amended. Our law has not only been a guardian of freedom, but the affirmative agent for freedom.

While the idea of civil disobedience may evoke sympathy where the claim is made that the cause is just, once we accept such a doubtful doctrine we legitimatize it for other causes which we might reject. We must be even more careful in the sympathetic case because, in effect, that sets the standard of conduct which then becomes acceptable for cases not as appealing or for groups not as responsible. Thus we substitute pressure for persuasion and squander the carefully nurtured value of self-restraint and jeopardize the system of law.

Let us not restrict our thinking to the area of civil rights. Think of the persons who feel they have the right to interfere with the launching of a Polaris submarine; think of the people who demand the right to sail into an area restricted for military testing; think of the people who feel, as some have in England, that they have the right to publicize their government's military secrets to the detriment of national security and survival.

The plain fact of human nature is that the organized disobedience of masses stirs

up the primitive. This has been true of a soccer crowd and a lynch mob. Psychologically and psychiatrically it is very clear that no man—no matter how well intentioned—can keep group passions in control.

Civil disobedience is an ad hoc device at best, and ad hoc measures in a law society are dangerous. Civil disobedience under these circumstances is at best deplorable and at worst destructive.

Specific disobedience breeds disrespect and promotes general disobedience. Our grievances must be settled in the courts and not in the streets. Muscle is no substitute for morality. Civil disobedience is negative where we require affirmative processes. We must insist that men use their minds and not their biceps. But while the emphasis must be on the three R's of reason, responsibility, and respect, we cannot accept self-righteousness, complacency, and noninvolvement. We reject hypocritical tokenism. We have an affirmative and daily duty to eliminate discrimination and provide opportunity—full opportunity and meaningful equal justice for all our people.

Obedience and not disobedience is the requirement of law and the law must be obeyed by laborers and Governors and especially lawyers.

I often think of J. Edgar Hoover as a symbol of the lawyers' obligation. His has been the difficult task to protect the law society, in accordance with its strict rules, against enemies within and without—the spy and the gangster—the saboteur and the kidnaper; the violators in New York and in Mississippi. Let his conduct remind us that the lawyer must serve in the tough, hard areas where our society rubs against complexity and controversy, and where prejudice, bigotry, and the emotions are the sharpest; where criticism and personal attack are certain from both sides. That is where we of the law have our primary obligation.

It is most appropriate here and now to reemphasize our professional calling as lawyers. We must insist on the integrity of the means. We must support and protect the laws whether we agree with the particular statute or we don't. Freedom is not some easy gift of nature. The plant of liberty has not grown in profusion in the wilderness of human history. Liberty under law is a fragile flower. It must be nurtured anew by each generation of responsible citizenry. Let but a year of neglect be sanctioned, even celebrated, and the jungle of force threatens to recapture the untended garden. The lawyer must be in the forefront of this citizenry. We cannot settle for lipservice to legality. We cannot be sometime lawyers.

In an era of social, political, and scientific revolutions—and at a time of accelerating and complex change—we of the law must particularly renew our understanding and improve our articulation of the basic issue of freedom under law and the continuing need to strive for equality and meaningful liberty and justice for all. Our will and determination are being tested as never before.

We must not tire of the challenge to extend freedom abroad or the challenge to make freedom a still greater reality at home.

Manna From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, while the Democratic Party continues to insist that "nobody can do nothing" without massive Federal aid, the mayor of Buffalo, Mo., takes a different attitude. Buffalo resisted the lure and its citizens bowed their own backs to improve their sewerage system. I commend the following article from the September 14, 1964, issue of the Springfield Daily News to the attention of every American citizen who wonders how the Nation ever progressed without "Manna From Washington":

MANNA FROM WASHINGTON

Multiply one home handyman who figures that a mashed thumb is less painful than a flattened pocketbook by 1,477 (its 1960 census total) and you have Buffalo.

As in the case of many a reluctant do-it-himselfer, Buffalo has been caught in a bind between a need for growing services and rising labor or other costs.

In the past 2 years, Buffalo has extended about 100 sewer lines with its own men and equipment.

"It's all been done without any tax increase," reported Herbert Leach, Buffalo mayor and editor of the Dallas County Republican-Reflex, proudly.

"We've spent about $22,000 and the sewer fund is only about $1,000 lower than it was.

"Oh, the Federal Government offered us matching funds, but we would have had to pay St. Louis union scale," Leach said. "It was cheaper for us to do it ourselves, than with the Government paying 50 percent of the more expensive project."

"A lot of towns don't realize this," the mayor said, "but it's true."

Acting Attorney General Sets the Record Straight on Race, Crime, and the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, it is being freely charged, from selected campaign platforms, that recent gains in civil rights and civil liberties have fostered an increase in serious crime.

It is difficult to know whether this notion is enjoying wide currency. I for one hope not, because it can thrive only as a parasite on the fears of those perplexed by the rush of events. It is not a case founded on modern crime statistics or the facts of modern life.

Acting Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach has rendered a great service to public understanding of crime problems by rebutting this charge in his speech last Friday to the Federal Bar Association. It should be informative to those who have heard enough doomsday oratory on this subject, and sobering to still others who may feel they can continue these allegations without risking contradiction.

The text of Katzenbach's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY ACTING ATTORNEY GENERAL NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH TO THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION, SHOREHAM HOTEL, SEPTEMBER 18, 1964

I am pleased to be with you today and to be a part of a program aimed at understanding one of the great laws of this century—the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The act was—and is—a controversial law. No act was more thoroughly debated. No act was introduced with deeper conviction or opposed with deeper passion. That the Congress could have so reasonably and dispassionately debated such a highly emotional issue is surely one of the great triumphs of our legislative process.

As a nation, we are in the process of working a profound social change in human relations—a change so deeply felt that I am hard put to find in history a comparable situation which any nation has faced and resolved more peaceably, more justly, and with greater dignity.

And so this act symbolizes something even larger than the realization of ideals of equality and that is the strength of our entire political system. Last summer in the South, we had a spirit of bitterness and hundreds of demonstrations. This year, through almost all parts of the South—and despite tragic exceptions—we have a spirit of good faith and respect for the law.

This is a result for which we must give credit to the responsible men and women of the South. Its representatives, reflecting the deep feelings of their area, fought the Civil Rights Act strenuously. But now that it is law, they have spoken out for obedience, even though it has, often, taken courage to do so. This is a dramatic testimonial to our oneness as a Nation and to our fundamental respect for law and the orderly process of self-government.

It is, too, a noble—and vital—tradition in America. It was given expression by Andrew Jackson when he was fined for contempt after the War of 1812. "Obedience to the laws," he said, "* * * is the first duty of a citizen and I do not hesitate to comply with the sentence you have heard pronounced."

It is in that tradition that the leaders and responsible citizens of the South are acting now. It is on that tradition that our rights as citizens and our very existence as a society depend.

But now another view is being heard. National attention has now shifted from political posturings in a schoolhouse door to the recent riots in northern cities and to the problem of "crime in the streets." And there are those who say or imply that these problems are related to racial problems in the South.

They do not speak of the Civil Rights Act as the product of our national concern for equal rights for all our citizens. That act, they say, results from capitulation to "agitators" and "demonstrators." They do not speak of the Civil Rights Act as a remedy to deeply felt grievances of Negroes in the South. The act, they say, has encouraged disrespect for the law in other parts of the country.

Thus, a link is drawn between demonstrations for civil rights and crime in the streets. Riots in Harlem, or Rochester, or Philadelphia, are tied to rising crime rates. And profound concern is expressed over lawlessness which has made our cities unsafe and our homes insecure. Because Negroes have been importantly involved in these riots—and despite the fact that they have been deplored by the overwhelming majority of Negroes and by all Negro leaders—they have been called racial.

I do not mean to suggest that these concerns with lawlessness are not real. Of course they are. The question is not whether disorders or increases in crime are serious. The question, really, is What do we do about it?

I wish I could tell you that these are simple problems that have simple solutions. But only the ignorant or the uninformed so regard them. To call them racial problems is not a solution but a slogan. What is worse, it is wrong.

To tie the difficult problems of racial adjustment to the equally serious problems of

crime and delinquency, can only obscure, obstruct, and politicize. "Prejudice, which sees what it pleases, cannot see what is plain." But that is no excuse for not looking at the facts.

The increases in the crime rate, for example, have been great, but they have overwhelmingly been increases in crime against property. Such crimes—robbery, burglarly, larceny, and auto theft—account for 90 percent of serious crime. In 1963, crimes in this category increased by 11 percent.

Crimes against the person increase far less. Aggravated assault went up 6 percent, murder 1 percent, and rape 1 percent. These increases are only slightly greater than the population increase.

As a second point, there appears to be no significant connection between a city's crime rate and its Negro population. During a debate on the Civil Rights Act in Congress, there was frequent reference to the crime rate of Washington, D C., whose population is 54 percent Negro. I do not recall a single reference to Phoenix, Ariz.—a city I pick at random—the population of which is 95 percent white and whose crime rate is a third higher than that of Washington.

The point is further demonstrated by suburban crime figures. In the first 6 months of this year, crime in the suburbs—where there are few Negroes—increased approximately 28 percent. But crime in the city—where Negroes are concentrated—increased at less than half that rate.

As a third point, the increase in crime generally is directly related to the increase in the teenage and young adult population. Young people commit a very large proportion of the crimes against property—those crimes which have increased most. In New York City for example, more than three-fourths of all auto thefts are committed by those under 21. In Washington, D C., young people under the age of 17 comprise half of those arrested for robberies, half those arrested for car thefts and 40 percent of those arrested for housebreakings.

The number of persons aged 15 to 24 is growing far faster than the rest of our population. And unhappily, people in this age group account for 70 percent of all arrests for serious crimes. This does not mean that our young people are crime-prone. Less than 3 percent of young people are ever arrested. But it does mean that our efforts to solve crime problems should in large measure be devoted to the problems of our youth. Juvenile delinquents may cease to be juveniles at 21, but they do not automatically cease to be delinquents.

This point applies demonstrably to the recent riots in Harlem, Rochester, Philadelphia, Jersey City and elsewhere Plainly, these riots involved Negroes. But what is significant is not their race, but that some of our worst slum areas are occupied by Negroes; that the unemployment rate among Negroes in these cities is two and three times that of whites; that the school dropout rate among Negroes it twice that of whites. It is clear from the facts of the riots how these circumstances apply:

1. Most of those involved in the riots were between 15 and 25, unemployed, without education, jobs—or hope.

2. Juvenile gang members played a role in the riots in each city, and a large percentage of those arrested or known to have participated had criminal or juvenile records.

3. The participants came from poor, overcrowded slum areas.

4. To the extent that these riots could be said to have had a focus, they were aimed against police officials and merchants in Negro areas. And they were motivated, in part, by the possibility of an opportunity to loot—to make financial gain—under the cover of the disorder.

5. Only one of the riots occurred in areas of likely racial conflict, where Negro and white neighborhoods adjoin. The remainder have occurred in the heart of Negro neighborhoods.

I do not mean to imply that Negroes do not commit crimes. Of course they do. What I do mean to show is that to draw a causal connection between membership in the Negro race and crime is wrong. The relevant link is not between riots and race, but between riots and delinquency, between lawlessness and lawless environments.

It is to this complicated link, not to an emotional cliche, that we should devote our attention and our energies. FBI Director J Edgar Hoover has for years expressed the deepest concern over youth crime. And, what has become obvious to others in 1964 was obvious to Attorney General Kennedy 4 years ago. He realized that our most serious crime problem was and would continue to be crimes committed by young people.

Accordingly, under the leadership of President Kennedy and President Johnson, the Federal Government embarked for the first time on a comprehensive juvenile delinquency program. This program involved comprehensive studies of young people, their problems, and methods to deal with them at the local level. Pilot projects have been established in 10 major cities to determine, through actual work with youngsters, how to help them adjust to our complex urban society—whether it be jobs, education, organized sports activities, or increased counseling.

In this effort, the Federal Government has not sought to assume responsibilities that belong to local communities. It has, rather, sought to offer assistance and experience to those communities which seek their own answers to their own problems.

Second, beginning also in 1961, Attorney General Kennedy mounted an unprecedented drive on organized crime and racketeering. Convictions against racketeers increased 23-fold in the past 4 years, from 14 to 325. The importance of these convictions—and there are many more to come—is best understood when one realizes that it is organized crime which supports and profits from the narcotics traffic, illegal gambling, and prostitution. It is organized crime—and occasionally organized prejudice—which corrupts law enforcement agencies and public officials. Where such corruption exists, or even where it is thought to exist, we cannot have respect for law. Lawlessness feeds on lawlessness. Lawlessness of one kind breeds lawlessness of other kinds.

In many cities, a high percentage of crime can be directly related to addicts' need to pay for narcotics. In this administration, we have sought not only to prosecute and punish those who run the narcotics business, but also to mount a drive against narcotic addiction. President Kennedy called the first national conference on this subject in history and the recommendations of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotics and Drug Abuse have been and are being implemented by President Johnson.

Third, recognizing that slum conditions breed crime and disrespect for law, this administration has embarked upon the most extensive program of slum clearance and housing assistance in history.

Finally, under the leadership of President Johnson, the Federal Government, again in cooperation with local communities, has embarked on a major war against poverty. Its significance cannot be overstated. Surely it is clear to any thinking person that poverty—the lack of food, shelter, education, work, self-respect, and hope—goes hand in hand with crime.

All of these programs are concrete, practical, realistic, and nonpolitical approaches to the crime problem. All of them are based on hard facts. None of them offer simple or simple-minded explanations or solutions.

I have talked thus far about how we have sought to respond positively to the causes of crime and how we should continue to do so. But this long-range concern would not obscure and has not obscured the equally important needs of day-to-day law enforcement. Lawbreakers must be apprehended and punished with appropriate severity. Law enforcement authorities must have the widest public support and assistance. It should go without saying.

But there is no conflict between this need and the parallel need to attack the causes of crime. Rather, the two needs are complementary. Obsessive emphasis on either—whatever its inspiration—can only handicap effective law enforcement.

While the principal responsibility in this area rests on local law enforcement authorities, the Federal Government has sought to provide maximum assistance to them. The anticrime legislation enacted in 1961—the most extensive addition to the criminal laws in 30 years—has permitted us to expand considerably the kinds of investigative and other assistance we can provide. The FBI has built a proud body of alumni of its National Academy in police departments all over the country. And our greatly accelerated crime effort has produced leads and information which we have shared, to mutual benefit, with State and local officials.

It is for this reason that I welcome the support of all Members of Congress who believe, as I do, in the importance of these programs. Anticrime legislation has never been a partisan issue. It should not become one.

Yet I have read the opinion recently that the problems of crime and of local law enforcement stem from an "obsessive concern" on the part of judges "for the rights of the criminal defendant." I have read that the courts have taken away from the States powers which are "absolutely necessary for fair and efficient administration of criminal law." And, I have read, this is why crime is increasing.

These assertions are uninformed. More damaging, they are irresponsible. It is a historic function of the Supreme Court to insure that State convictions comport with due process of law. Undeniably, some decisions have created problems for State law enforcement officials. But then so has the Bill of Rights. In neither case have any fundamental State powers been destroyed.

I think it is helpful to review some of the fruits of powers which are supposedly "absolutely necessary" to the States and which the Supreme Court has declared unconstitutional:

The conviction of a man without evidence.

The conviction of a man upon the prosecutor's knowing use of perjured testimony.

The trial of a man for a serious crime without the assistance of a lawyer.

The conviction of a man upon a confession coerced by the police, or upon a subsequent confession induced by the knowledge that the police already had the extorted confession.

The trial of a man before a jury biased against him.

Which of such vital powers, I wonder, should a State have?

The individuals rights the Court has defended in these cases are part of the fundamental guarantees our country makes to every citizen. I cannot understand how anyone committed to individual liberty could consider violations of these rights as mere "technical" violations, or consider protection against such violations as "obsessive concern" by our judges.

Approximately half the Federal judiciary—and two-thirds of the Supreme Court of the United States—have been appointed since 1952. During the whole of the administrations of Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, the American Bar Association has been consulted on each and every judicial appointment. In all these administra-

tions, the views of the organized bar have been sought, appraised, and honored. The record is public and open to examination.

I hope—under these circumstances—that I may be excused for wondering how the growing crime rate can be blamed on judges so selected. If the ABA is too liberal to be entrusted with this responsibility—or if the ABA is incompetent—then to whom do we turn for advice?

I believe that both candidates for the Presidency will continue to adhere to a system which seeks and respects the advice of the organized bar on judicial appointments. And I think both will feel, as I do, that professional, not ideological, criteria are appropriate.

To attribute the growing crime rate to the attitudes or decisions of the Federal judiciary is an insult not merely to the courts but also to the bar. As a lawyer, I cannot but resent those who seek to make political capital by attacking the decisions of an independent judiciary which cannot, in propriety, defend itself. Indeed, I have an obligation to defend the courts against such an attack.

I had thought—perhaps I had only hoped—that the judiciary was beyond the realm of partisan politics. I had thought—perhaps I had only hoped—that all would realize that the constitutional independence of our judiciary, the separation of powers, was basic tc the whole cause of law and order, and that to bring the courts into politics could only undermine that respect for law which is the cornerstone of our Republic.

Clearly I am not saying that our courts are immune from criticism. Indeed, responsible and informed criticism is one of the factors which shapes the law. Every lawyer knows this. And every lawyer—I hope—has respect for a court's decisions even when he disagrees vehemently with the result of the reasoning. And every lawyer has confidence in the independence of our judges.

We need to protect the rights of the individual from hasty infringement just as much as we need to protect society from lawlessness. Each is essential to ordered society and responsible freedom. There is need for everyone, whether from the South or the North, the East or West, to join in strengthening respect for law and order. Your presence at this conference demonstrates your participation in this process.

Law-government is a process which begins with respect for the Constitution, the decisions of our courts, the laws of our land, and the rights of each individual. It is a process which requires all of us, at all levels of government and in each walk of private life to seek to identify our common problems and to work together toward their resolution.

New Honor for Editor Jack Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is soon to be engrossed with the many events which take place as a part of the 1965 Olympics in Tokyo. The fine representation which our country will have at this international athletic meet will be possible only because of the time and energy of people like Jack Clark, sports editor of the Alameda (Calif.) Times-Star newspaper.

Jack Clark and the many other Jack Clarks throughout our Nation who stimulate interest in sports activity, provide an inspiration for our young people to take an active interest in sports and thereby to contribute so much to the healthy competition among nations which we will soon witness at the Tokyo Olympics.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an article describing a recent honor given to Jack Clark, the sports editor of the Times-Star:

NEW HONOR FOR EDITOR JACK CLARK

Another honor has been accorded Jack Clark, sports editor of the Alameda Times-Star.

At the annual dinner climaxing the summer boys' baseball program conducted by the Alameda Recreation Department and the Alameda Elks, Clark was presented with a plaque from the National Recreation Association.

The award commends the veteran Times-Star writer for his "outstanding contribution to the recreation movement in America."

The award was presented to Clark by Al F. Blanchard, chairman of the Recreation Commission.

Blanchard pointed out that Clark has "contributed 100-percent support to the boys' baseball program in Alameda and to all other local recreational activities."

The honor followed the recent Alameda Boosters campaign which will send Clark to the Olympic games in Tokyo next month.

Medal for an Old Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on September 14, Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, CSC, president of the University of Notre Dame, was one of 30 outstanding Americans to be awarded the Nation's highest civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Freedom. The awards were presented by President Johnson in a special White House ceremony.

Father Hesburgh, whose award cited him as "a most influential figure in the reshaping of Catholic higher education," is not only the president of a great university but has shown outstanding leadership in academic development in areas far beyond his own university.

I have known Father Hesburgh in many roles, among them that of educator, community leader, and, I am proud to say, constituent. He is a man whose achievements and character make him a fitting recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD an editorial tribute to Father Hesburgh published in the South Bend Tribune along with a list of the distinguished Americans whose achievements, in the words of President Johnson, "have made freedom stronger for all of us."

MEDAL FOR AN OLD FRIEND

The United States, unlike some countries, has never bestowed medals lightly or promiscuously. By the same token, when a U.S. medal is bestowed, it is a thing of meaning, a signal that the recipient is truly deserving of the honor and respect of his fellow Americans.

Thirty men and women today accepted Presidential Medals of Freedom, the highest civilian honor bestowed in peacetime, from the President of the United States in a White House ceremony. One of them was an old and familiar friend of South Bend area people, Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, CSC, president of the University of Notre Dame.

It was not surprising that Father Hesburgh arrived in Washington for the ceremony from Geneva, where he has been attending the Conference on Peaceful Use of Atomic Energy and the annual meeting of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Notre Dame president is very much on the go in his ceaseless service to his country and his church.

Father Hesburgh deserves the medal he received today for many reasons, but for two above all: His role in making Notre Dame a great American institution, and his membership on the national Civil Rights Commission, a group that has become the country's conscience in the field of human relations.

We are delighted to see Father Hesburgh recognized by his President and we know the South Bend area echoes the honor paid him today.

LIST OF RECIPIENTS

Those awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, as listed in the New York Times, were:

Dean Acheson, 71 years old, Secretary of State from 1949 to 1953, of Washington, D.C.

Detlev W. Bronk, 66, neurophysiologist and for 12 years head of the National Academy of Science, of New York City.

Aaron Copland, 63, composer and lecturer, of New York City.

Willem de Kooning, 60, abstract and impressionist painter, of New York City.

Walt Disney, 62, pioneer in the animated movie cartoon field, of Los Angeles.

J. Frank Dobie, 75, writer, professor and authority on the folklore and history of Texas and the Southwest, of Austin, Tex.

Lena F. Edwards, 63, physician and humanitarian who at the age of 60 gave up private practice in Jersey City to devote herself to care of migrant workers, of Hereford, Tex.

Thomas Stearns Eliot, 76, Nobel Prize-winning author of poetry, plays and criticism, who was born in St. Louis, of London.

John W. Gardner, 51, president of the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, of Scarsdale, N.Y.

The Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, 47, president of the University of Notre Dame since 1952, of South Bend, Ind.

Clarence L. Johnson, 54, aircraft engineer who designed the U–2 reconnaissance plane and the A–11, 2,000-mile-an-hour interceptor, of Encino, Calif.

Frederick R. Kappel, 62, chairman of the board of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., of Bronxville, N.Y.

Helen A. Keller, 84, a leader in assisting the blind although she was left blind, deaf, and speechless by an illness when 19 months old, of Westport, Conn.

John L. Lewis, 84, retired president of the United Mine Workers, of Alexandria, Va.

Walter Lippmann, 74, journalist and columnist of Washington, D.C.

Alfred Lunt, 71, honored jointly with Lynn Fontanne, husband and wife team of the American theater, of Genesee Depot, Wis.

Ralph Emerson McGill, 66, publisher and former editor of the Atlanta Constitution, of Atlanta.

Samuel Eliot Morison, 76, sailor and historian noted for his histories of naval affairs, of Boston.

Lewis Mumford, 68, author, social philosopher, and authority on architecture and city planning, of Amenia, N.Y.

Edward R. Murrow, 56, radio and television reporter and commentator and former

head of the U.S. Information Agency, of Pawling, N.Y.

Reinhold Niebuhr, 72, theologian and American Protestant leader, of New York City.

Leontyne Price, 37, American concert and opera star and the first Negro woman to sing some famous opera roles, of New York City.

A. Philip Randolph, 75, president of the Brotherhood of Sleepingcar Porters and a longtime leader in the Negro civil rights drive, of New York City.

Carl Sandburg, 86, Pulitzer Prize-winning poet and biographer, of Flat Rock, N.C.

John Steinbeck, 62, Nobel Prize-winning author and playwright, of New York City.

Helen B. Taussig, 66, professor of pediatrics at the Johns Hopkins University and the discoverer of surgical means to save blue babies, of Baltimore.

Carl Vinson, 81, retiring chaiman of the House Armed Services Committee, of Milledgeville, Ga.

Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president of the International Business Machines Corp., of Greenwich, Conn.

Paul Dudley White, 78, physician and an authority on heart disease, of Belmont, Mass.

Proposal To Name TVA Structures in Honor of Senators Kefauver and McKellar Endorsed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, Tenn., recently adopted a resolution urging enactment of legislation before the Congress renaming a dam and a steamplant of the Tennessee Valley Authority in honor of two of TVA's great champions—the late Senators Estes Kefauver and Kenneth McKellar of Tennessee.

As the resolution states, each of these distinguished Senators from the great State of Tennessee contributed importantly to the establishment and development of the Tennessee Valley Authority "which has been of such great value to our State and Nation."

I ask unanimous consent to include this resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD. It follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE ELECTRIC POWER BOARD OF CHATTANOOGA, TENN., URGING THE ENACTMENT OF LEGISLATION BY THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES DESIGNATING THE PRESENT NICKAJACK DAM AND RESERVOIR OF TVA AS THE "ESTES KEFAUVER DAM AND RESERVOIR" AND THE JOHNSONVILLE STEAM-ELECTRIC PLANT OF TVA AS THE "KENNETH MCKELLAR POWERPLANT"

Whereas the late Honorable Estes Kefauver, a Member of the Congress of the United States, and the late Honorable Kenneth McKellar, a Member of the Congress of the United States, during their service to the State and Nation contributed greatly by their efforts to the establishment and development of the Tennessee Valley Authority which has been of such great value to our State and Nation; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States a bill to designate the Nickajack Dam and Reservoir as the "Estes Kefauver Dam and Reservoir" and the Johnsonville Steam-Electric Plant as the "Kenneth McKellar Powerplant," both of these installations being a part of the Tennessee Valley Authority project; and

Whereas the enactment into law of this bill will bring about justly deserved recognition of the efforts of the late Honorable Estes Kefauver and the late Honorable Kenneth McKellar in bringing the Tennessee Valley Authority project to its present state: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

(1) The Electric Power Board of Chattanooga urges the enactment into law of this proposed legislation;

(2) That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, a Member of Congress from the State of Tennessee, who has introduced said bill so recognizing and honoring the late Honorable Estes Kefauver and the late Honorable Kenneth McKellar.

S. R. FINLEY,
Chairman.
R. H. DULANEY,
Secretary.

Passed and adopted:
September 4, 1964.

Resolutions Adopted by the Polish Legion of American Veterans in Its 17th Biannual Convention, at the Hotel Schroeder, Milwaukee, Wis., September 6, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD resolutions adopted by the Polish Legion of American Veterans at its 17th biannual convention at the Hotel Schroeder, Milwaukee, Wis., on September 6, 1964.

These resolutions of a distinguished body of American veterans of Polish descent merit the attention of our people and the careful consideration of all Americans.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS IN ITS 17TH BIANNUAL CONVENTION, AT THE HOTEL SCHROEDER, MILWAUKEE, WIS., SEPTEMBER 6, 1964

1. The city of Milwaukee, its public officials and its citizens have spared no efforts to make our convention a tremendous success, and to provide for our physical comfort and spiritual well being: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the PLAV hereby expresses its sincere gratitude to the citizens and public officials of Milwaukee for their generous hospitality.

POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

2. We enjoin both candidates for the office of President of the United States to avoid any political promise of a war to liberate Poland from Communist domination, unless the candidate is prepared to commit the United States to full, all-out armed conflict with Soviet imperialism and to accept the consequences of a nuclear war, which would wipe out Poland and which would probably destroy most of the United States and kill or maim most American citizens.

We urge that the campaign be kept free of false promises, the inspiration of false hopes, and that no group be made a political pawn for the gain of public office.

Poland's future and freedom will be gained at a conference table attended by all major powers.

NUCLEAR WAR

3. The PLAV counts in its ranks veterans of both World Wars and the Korean conflict. Our memory is only too full of the horrors of armed conflict with its great toll in human lives and wanton destruction of property. Our Blue and Gold Star Mothers know equally well the consequences of armed aggression. We are not anxious that our sons wear the Purple Heart or that they receive the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously.

All of the foregoing considerations lead us to an expression of high praise for those leaders of the United States who succeeded in securing enactment of the nuclear test ban treaty and for their continued efforts to bring about true disarmament.

In the same context our disarmament must not reduce our military posture to a point where we will lay prostrate before the Chinese Communists, or where Soviet Imperialists will beat us to death with axe-handles. America must always remain strong enough to keep the peace everywhere.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

4. We urge the Veterans Administration, our Representatives in Congress, and the President of the United States to use their offices in order that the PLAV becomes a nationally recognized veterans organization. Denial of this privilege means a denial of adequate representation to the thousands of our members, who because of a language barrier, cannot communicate with VA officers except through a bi-lingual PLAV Service Officer.

We also urge that full medical and hospital benefits be extended to veterans of allied forces who are now U.S. citizens.

Whenever available, "counter-part funds" should be used to care for the graves of Polish soldiers in Italy and other foreign countries. The Communist regime in Warsaw has neglected the cemeteries of these brave men until they have become shambles.

We do not seek to have veterans set apart as a specially favored group of citizens; but we do insist that the sacrifice we made for the defense of this country be not forgotten. Those captains of industry and finance who oppose any extension of veterans' benefits should be reminded that we kept their empire intact.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY ASSASSINATION

5. The assassination of John F. Kennedy evoked a tremendous emotional demonstration throughout the entire world. It brought tears to eyes of strong men and withered their spines. Therefore, let us pledge ourselves to make his martyrdom an inspiration for us to rededicate ourselves to those principles and ideals for which he lived and died.

These include such ideals as dignity for all men, regardless of race, religion, or national origin, the abolition of poverty and want everywhere; the building of a great America for future generations; and true peace for mankind. These goals can be implemented by our support of the Alliance for Progress, the mutual security program, the food for peace program, the Peace Corps, and other similar undertakings.

FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM

6. We urge the continuation of strong steps to halt the spread of communism and pledge ourselves to the support of our Government in this field. Diplomacy, rather than armed intervention, removed Red missiles from Cuba. But we must not hesitate to use armed force, as in southeast Asia, to prevent the spread of communism.

We urge continued use of surplus foods as a tool for the spread of democracy. The sale and gift of wheat and other foodstuffs to Poland and other Eastern European countries must be continued, the alternative is to force the citizens of those countries to continuously rely on Communist Russia for their survival. It is because America is the only bright light remaining for these people that we must not let them down in their hour of need. We must continue the foreign aid program.

DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

7. We have expressed ourselves on international matters and foreign policy in the foregoing resolutions. But we must not forget the problems of domestic housekeeping. Therefore, the PLAV resolves to cooperate and implement programs designed to make America a better place to live. We pledge our support for:

1. Job-retraining programs for veterans and nonveterans alike;

2. A reduction in Government spending, with further tax cuts resulting;

3. The use of all of our facilities to curb juvenile delinquency and reduce its incidence.

The PLAV has already instituted a plan of youth activities for this purpose on a State level; this program will be continued with greater emphasis and with more funds.

4. Conservation of natural resources and support of the wilderness preservation program.

5. The enactment of a comprehensive medical care for the aged program, using the best features of both the Social Security Administration and private insurance organizations.

6. The prevention of erosion of our cities by supporting urban renewal and urban conservation programs.

7. The upgrading of all our citizens to end the vast waste of human resources in our country, whether by aids to education, greater social security benefits, or any other means consistent with human decency.

As veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States, we pledge ourselves to the principles set forth herein, and as good citizens, we resolve to abide by both the letter and spirit of these resolutions.

UNITED NATIONS

8. We pledge our continued support of the United Nations and urge that its offices be used to pursue the peace everywhere; that it be used as a vehicle to move the Iron Curtain out of Europe; that our Government and the other powers act through the U.N. to foster democracy in the entire world.

IMMIGRATION

9. We urge that Congress enact a humane immigration policy based on the economic and social needs of our country, and that the archaic quota system be done away with.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

10. We solicit Congress to reopen the national veterans life insurance program for those veterans who failed to avail themselves of it upon separation from military service; we urge an expanded program of medical and domiciliary care for World War I veterans which will not reduce them to paupers, but rather will give them the decent care which their military service demands. The system of pensions for World War I veterans should be revised in line with the increased cost of living.

POLONIA AFFAIRS

11. All organizations of Americans of Polish descent must cooperate together for the accomplishment of our common objectives. These include the perpetuation of our Polish culture and its dissemination among Americans.

All Americans of Polish descent must work together to restore democracy and freedom to Poland and move out the Communist intruders.

We must combine our efforts to remind the world that this is Poland's millenium; that Poland was a Christian nation 1,000 years ago, and she introduced culture to Eastern Europe.

It is recommended that the Secretary of this convention distribute copies of these resolutions to:

A. Local press, radio and television.

B. All Polish newspapers and Polish radio programs in the United States.

C. To the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe.

D. To the Members of Congress from States having PLAV posts.

E. To the President of the United States and the Republican and Democratic National Committees.

F. To the Library of Congress.

G. Such other persons as the national commander directs.

Respectfully submitted.

Committee on resolutions: Judge Benjamin C. Stanczyk, Chairman, Edward L. Bielaga, Henry Gromak, Matthew Zamorski, Leonard J. Wolodzo, and Joseph C. Zalud.

The Poor Pay—The Rich Receive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Aurora Advertiser, a daily newspaper in southwest Missouri, recently carried a front page editorial describing in very clear terms the political motive behind the effort to attach "medicare" to the House-passed social security bill.

I commend the article to the attention of all who are interested in this critical issue:

THE POOR PAY—THE RICH RECEIVE

When, in order to provide a governmental service for a specific segment of our population, it is proposed to tax the wage-earners of this country and their employers, leaving out all others; to tax those who earn the least money proportionately much more than those who earn a lot and to tax employers whose employees earn less heavier than those with highly paid workers; and then to spend those taxes to provide that service to that part of the population with the largest income, on the average, and deny it entirely to the very part least able to provide it for themselves, it can be called nothing but "unfair," and the politicians who dreamed up such a scheme should be given a much deserved rebuke.

That is exactly what the clearly politically inspired rider to the social security bill called "medicare" provides, and regardless of what one thinks about the necessity of the Federal Government paying for the hospital care of the aged one can be opposed to this version tooth and toenail.

Here is the way medicare as provided in this bill works out for the Nation's workers, the Nation's employers and the Nation's aged.

Low-paid workers will be soaked extra social security taxes amounting to double the amount they saved through the tax cut the politicians hail is such an economic boon to the country's economy.

Employers of the low-paid workers, many of them barely able to stay in business, will be soaked an amount equal to the total all their workers have deducted from their already slim take-home pay.

Workers who earn the big money will pay only on a part of their salaries, and their employers will match the part, not the whole. In most cases these will be left with a part of the savings through income tax reductions.

Only those aged who have qualified for social security benefits will receive free hospital care.

Old age pensioners will receive nothing. Neither will retired farmers.

The people who pay the tax will receive nothing at all from their taxes directly. If they live to qualify for social security, then those who are employed during the remainder of the time they live will pay for them during that period.

Scrubwomen will pay taxes to provide free hospital care for retired millionaires, though not eligible for free hospital care themselves should they break down before they are old enough to draw minimum social security benefits.

Medicare, as now passed by the Senate, is based upon the rotten foundation of taxing the part of our people with least money to provide a service to the part of the aged who have the most money.

And that is unfair any way you look at it, and the very politicians who voted for it thinking to score a political advantage know that it is.

If we are to have governmental paid medical care for the aged, then let all of us pay for it equally according to our abilities to pay, and let that care go to all our aged, not just the best heeled part of the aged.

What has happened is that the jubilant and victorious liberals of the Democratic Party, flushed with the false enthusiasm of the "wheeler dealer" convention at which a bitter fight over who got to vote was solved by letting no one vote at all, came back to the Senate, and tacked onto a bill to provide a justified small increase in social security retirement benefits this rider, for just one reason, to embarrass the conservatives of the country—to make them go to the country seemingly opposed to social security. For, with medicare onto the bill to increase payments, conservatives cannot vote against the one without also voting against the other.

The idea is to reelect President Johnson and beat BARRY GOLDWATER, and to heck with being fair to the American people.

The liberal Democratic Senators, even though they had a big party majority to work with, could not have achieved their political aim without the help of five Republican Senators It is significant to note that not one of the five is going to support the Goldwater-Miller ticket in November. Beaten in their attempt to rule the Republican convention, they are now determined to ruin their party's chances to win the Presidency.

The medicare rider stinks so loudly that neither Senator from Arkansas could stomach it. Senator MCCLELLAN voted "No." Senator FULBRIGHT, a liberal himself, ducked the vote.

But, sadly we must relate, both Missouri Senators voted "Yes."

There is still hope that this reverse "Robin Hood" bill will not become a law. The House turned it down once, and may block passage again. But politics being politics, the odds that it will are not good.

What can the people do about this injustice? Probably nothing, now, but in November they can single out those Senators and Congressmen who would soak the poor to help the rich and spank them with a ballot, the very punishment most likely to be felt by a candidate.

Outstanding Reserve Airman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure recently to meet the outstanding Reserve airman in the Continental Air Command, M. Sgt. Elmer F. Schilling.

Sergeant Schilling is a resident of San Antonio, and his honor of being selected the outstanding Reserve airman for the Continental Air Command is a personal achievement of the first magnitude. There are about 250,000 Reserve airmen in this command, and this man stands out above all of them. He is one of the less than two dozen outstanding airmen in the U.S. Air Force. There are, of course, thousands—hundreds of thousands of fine, dedicated men like Sergeant Schilling in active service and in the Reserves. But no matter how fine all these men are, there are always a few who are truly outstanding, and Sergeant Schilling is one of these.

Sergeant Schilling is the outstanding airman in the 433d Troop Carrier Wing—a unit which is distinguished in its own right. He has been in the Air Force now for a tctal of 19 years. Until the Cuban crisis he was a civilian, or weekend airman, but when this great crisis struck, Sergeant Shilling volunteered for active duty and has been there ever since.

As a member of the cadre of the 433d Troop Carrier Wing, Sergeant Schilling has made strenuous and dedicated efforts to attract high quality men and to retain them. His efforts have resulted in a 100-percent effective manning for his unit.

This is also a man of courage, for on two occasions in 1963—both within mere weeks of each other—he risked his life to jettison heavy equipment from his stricken C–119 aircraft. These acts are credited with saving possible serious injury to the crew of his craft.

Elmer Schilling is an outstanding airman, an outstanding family man—a credit to himself and his community. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to count him among the residents of my district and proud to salute him before my colleagues.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Loyalty Day—Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, Quincy, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 3, 1964, in the city of Quincy, Mass., the George F. Bryan Post No. 613, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, conducted its annual observance of Loyalty Day which was established by Presidential and congressional order.

Under the general chairmanship of Post Commander John P. Dineen and the chairmanship of Post Americanism Officer Arthur G. McLean, a most successful and impressive Loyalty Day observance was carried out by the George F. Bryan Post.

In keeping with the theme of the national VFW poster of the 1964 Loyalty Day which depicted the first Commander in Chief of our country's Armed Forces and the first President of our great Nation kneeling in the snow of Valley Forge praying for divine assistance to the loyalty and allegiance of our American people, Americanism Officer Arthur G. McLean drafted the following letter which was sent to all veteran, civic and paternal organizations in the city of Quincy and Norfolk County.

The letter is as follows:

THESE ARE TIMES THAT TRY MEN'S SOULS

A great American patriot, Thomas Paine, penned these words in a pamphlet in the winter of 1776–78 when the very life and future of our infant Nation was at its lowest point.

Our Continental Army, although lacking proper clothing, food and fuel, and ravaged by exposure and disease, encouraged by the inspiring words of that great American, produced for us today an America which is the greatest Nation in the world.

During the almost 200 years since those patriots left their bloodstained footprints in the snows of Valley Forge, our Nation has had other years in which the words of Thomas Paine again became true.

Today all true Americans must be again advised that in this year of our Lord 1964 "these are times that try men's souls."

Today prayer is banned in our public schools.

Today attacks are being made on the Pledge of Allegiance and the salute to the flag of our country.

Today many of our allies are doing business with any Communist nation and are giving aid and comfort to their demands for world recognition and support. These very Communist nations who have publicly avowed their determination to "bury" the democratic form of government of our United States.

The Communist bloc countries universally hold their greatest holiday, May Day, on the first of May each year. Unfortunately this infamous day is being celebrated in more countries each year.

Truly "these are times that try men's souls."

To counteract the cancerous spread of this communistic, athiestic ideology, the Veterans of Foreign Wars have been sponsoring an American Loyalty Day on the first Sunday in May.

This year the George F. Bryan Post No. 613, VFW, will again conduct its Loyalty Day in Quincy on Sunday May 3, 1964.

We earnestly solicit your joining with us in our observance to publicly show to all that the spirit of Americanism is just as alive today as when we first won our independence.

We will dedicate this year's observance in memory of the late Rev. Thomas J. Tierney, a man who truly lived as a dedicated and loyal American, who served his God and country equally well.

A most enthusiastic response to this letter was received from most of those contacted with the following dignitaries and organizations participating in the ceremonies and parade:

Hon. James A. Burke, Member of Congress; Hon. Amelia Della Chiesa, city of Quincy mayor; Hon. James A. McIntyre, State representative; Hon. Joseph E. Brett, State representative; Hon. Charles L. Shea, State representative; Hon John J. Quinn, Quincy City Council; Hon. William Edwards, Quincy City historian; Chief William Ferrazi, Quincy City Police Department; Chief Thomas Gorman, Quincy City Fire Department.

U.S. Navy, Boston Naval Shipyard Band.

215th MANG Band.

Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts.

Lexington Minute Men.

Quincy Police Department Drill Team.

Quincy Fire Department Drill Team.

Quincy City Hospital Nurse Corps.

Quincy Veterans Council (includes eight veterans organizations).

Quincy Post No. 95, American Legion.

Cyril P. Morrisette Post No. 294, American Legion.

Wollaston Post No. 295, American Legion.

Houghs Neck Post No. 380, American Legion.

Stoughton Post No. 89, American Legion.

Milton Post No. 114, American Legion.

Norfolk County Council, American Legion.

Quincy Post No. 195, Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

Amvets Memorial Post, Quincy.

Riding in Cars, surviving members of the John A. Boyd Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, Quincy.

Boston Post Office Department Band.

Quincy High School Band.

Braintree Warriors Band.

Braintree Braves Bugle and Drum Corps.

St. Ann's Neponset Band.

Sir Thomas More Bugle and Drum Corps.

Golden Rays, Stoughton Drum Corps.

The Brigadiers, St. Christophers Drum Corps.

Blessed Sacrament Walpole Drum Corps.

Joanettes, Weymouth, marching unit.

Norfolk County Council VFW colors—fifth district VFW colors.

Wellesley Post VFW and auxiliary and junior units.

Waverly Post VFW and auxiliary and junior units.

Natick Post VFW and auxiliary and junior units.

Medford Post VFW and auxiliary and junior units.

Walpole Post VFW and auxiliary and junior units.

St. Marks Post VFW and auxiliary and junior units, Dorchester.

George F. Bryan Post VFW.

Quincy Council, Boy Scouts of America, comprised of 25 Cub packs, Scout troops, and explorer units.

The 1964 VFW Loyalty Day in Quincy was dedicated in memory of a truly loyal American, the late Reverend Thomas J. Tierney, a priest who for many years served as the Catholic chaplain of the Quincy fire and police departments and also was the official parade director of the city of Quincy. His recent death has been considered a great loss to the city of Quincy by all its citizens. The only float in the parade was in memory of this beloved clergyman, and depicted his major duties. First was the Biretta of a Catholic priest carried by an altar boy—second his white fire helmet as fire department chaplain, and third his official uniform hat as Quincy parade director carried by a member of the George F. Bryan Post No. 613 VFW.

The formal observances were opened with the tolling of the bell of the First Parish Church in Quincy Square. It is in the crypt of this church that the remains of Presidents John Adams and John Quincy Adams now rest. The Loyalty Day observances are held on the steps of this church.

Next followed the raising of our national flag and the singing of the National Anthem by all assembled.

The invocation was given by Rabbi Jacob Mann of Congregation Beth Israel, Quincy.

The greetings of the city of Quincy were given by Mayor Amelio Della Chiesa.

Greetings from the Department of Massachusetts, the American Legion, were given by Department Vice Commander Paul A. M. Hunt, of Quincy, and a member of the George F. Bryan Post No. 613 VFW.

Henry L. Cyr, senior vice commander, Department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, spoke on the necessity of all citizens reaffirming their loyalty and pride of our American heritage, and of the need of a more watchful concern about the encroachment of communistic and extremist ideologies.

I had the honor of being the keynote speaker and following my address, wreaths were placed on the tombs of President John Adams and President John Quincy Adams in the crypt of the First Parish Church. The Reverend Bradford Gale offered prayers at the tombs.

A hymn in memory of all our war dead was played by the Navy yard band. Volleys were fired by the St. Marks Post VFW firing squad and taps was sounded by the Braintree Warriors Buglers.

The benediction was given by the Reverend Francis X. Dufresne, St. Joseph's Church, Roxbury, of which Father Tierney had been pastor.

The parade then formed and when it reached School Street and Hancock Court it was halted to carry out the dedication of this square as "Rev. Thomas J. Tierney Square."

The dedication prayers were given by the Reverend Chester A. Porteus, Chirst Church Episcopal of Quincy. Reverend Porteus a fellow chaplain with Father Tierney for the Quincy Fire Department also recalled some of the incidents of their many years of friendship and close association.

Dedication speakers were Lawrence A. Butler, commander Quincy Veterans Council, Mayor Amelio Della Chiesa and Timothy J. Murphy past commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

After the dedication services the parade reformed and continued on to the George F. Bryan Post where refreshments were served to all who participated in the ceremonies and parade.

The Loyalty Day committee of the George F. Bryan Post was comprised of the following:

General chairman, John P. Dineen, commander; chairman, Arthur G. McLean, Americanism officer; honorary chief marshall (posthumous) Rev. Thomas J. Tierney; chief marshall, Timothy J. Murphy, past commander in chief, VFW; chief of staff, James Johnston, sgt. first class U.S. Army; officer of the day, Maj. William Dillon, USMCR; Lawrence A. Butler; Paul A. M. Hunt; David Alexander, past commander; John J. Brior, senior vice commander; A. Warren Steward, junior vice commander; Thomas McDonald, past commander.

South Dakota Young GOP Convention on August 27–29

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 21, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it was my privilege to attend and address the convention of the Young Republicans of the State of South Dakota. The convention was held on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, in the city of Aberdeen. It was the largest and most enthusiastic young GOP convention in the history of our State.

Under the able leadership of President Stan Adelstein, of Rapid City, S. Dak., the Young Republican League of our State has been steadily growing, both in size and in significance. Two of our present State candidates for the offices of secretary of state and attorney general are young Republicans, as is the executive secretary of the regular South Dakota State Central Committee of the Republican Party.

Instead of adopting a formal Republican Party platform for the Young Republican League, the convention endorsed and embraced the State and national platforms of the party, and then unanimously adopted a set of resolutions dealing with some of the subjects in which these Republicans, who are below age 36, are vitally interested.

SOUTH DAKOTA YOUNG REPUBLICAN CONVENTION RESOLUTIONS

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolutions adopted at least week's State convention of the Young Republican League of South Dakota.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE CONVENTION RESOLUTIONS, SOUTH DAKOTA YOUNG REPUBLICAN LEAGUE, 1964, ABERDEEN, S. DAK., AUGUST 27, 28, 29

South Dakota Young Republicans proudly endorse the State and national Republican platforms. We wholeheartedly support the national ticket of BARRY GOLDWATER and WILLIAM MILLER, and the South Dakota congressional delegation of Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Representative BEN REIFEL and Representative E. Y. BERRY. We also enthusiastically support Nils Boe and Lem Overpeck for the offices of Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the State of South Dakota, and the outstanding slate of constitutional officers selected at the State convention.

We commend the Archie Gubbrud administration for its progressive administration over the past 4 years and commend it for its sound fiscal policy. We also commend it for its aid to State education, an increase from $5.2 million to $10 million per biennium, and for the establishment of a teacher's retirement program on the college level. We urge the further supplementation of South Dakota education opportunity.

AGRICULTURE

We deplore the lack of concern of the Democratic Party for the continual decline of farm prices to 74 percent of parity, the lowest level since 1938. We particularly resent the displacement of millions of acres of our productive lands through importation of cheap foreign beef and other red meats, and for surrendering to the State Department philosophies in forcing through Congress an ineffective beef import quota law as a substitute for the effective type of legislation which is so badly needed.

ASK REPLACEMENT FOR SECRETARY FREEMAN

We suggest that this administration replace Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman with Billie Sol Estes, who is apparently the only man who fully understands the farm program of this administration well enough to make it pay.

OPPOSE CARPETBAG CANDIDATES

We condemn the drive toward excessive power by the executive branch of our Federal Government and the manifestation of this attitude by the administration sending carpetbag candidates into strategic States to run for the office of U.S. Senator.

GOLDWATER BEST BET FOR PEACE

As young Americans we place our faith and confidence in the Republican Party with its policy of firmness supported by strength, which has always kept us out of war, rather than in a party whose policies of vacillation and indecision have repeatedly blundered America into foreign wars. We place our faith in the Republican Party and its leadership, which will regain the support and confidence of our friends and allies and restore the respect our enemies had for the determination and military might during the Republican years of Eisenhower and Dulles.

RECREATION

As young South Dakotans, interested in our unequaled recreational, fish and wildlife opportunities, we deplore and condemn the recent statements by the Democratic candidate for Governor, John Frank Lindley, revealing a desire to put the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks back into partisan politics.

MORALITY IN GOVERNMENT

The YGOP feels that the people of the United States deserve the guarantee of morality, honesty, and integrity in government which the people of South Dakota have enjoyed with the Gubbrud administration and which will be continued by the Boe-Overpeck administration. All Americans can achieve this type of government only by election of the Goldwater-Miller ticket, "a team you can trust," which is in sharp and refreshing contrast to the scandalous, unethical, and immoral "fast deal" of the national Democrat ticket.

The South Dakota Young Republican League expresses its appreciation and thanks to the citizens of South Dakota and to the senior Republicans for their acceptance, support, and encouragement of the many young people who have entered into political activities of South Dakota.

The convention further thanks the host city of Aberdeen and the Brown County Young Republican Club, Steve Smith, convention chairman, and also those persons and businesses who have helped to make this convention a success.

Part I—Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I sent one of the most comprehensive questionnaires of any I have seen to every resident of my district, concerning the issues facing the United States. I have had nearly 12,000 returned and tabulated electronically, and I believe that the results are extremely revealing.

My district is partly urban and partly suburban, in Los Angeles County, and I am sure that all of our colleagues will find the following news story—based on the first question asked—of great interest:

CONGRESSMAN BROWN SAYS UNEMPLOYMENT, DELINQUENCY OF MOST CONCERN IN DISTRICT

First tabulations from the questionnaire which Congressman GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., sent to every resident of the 29th Congressional District earlier this year were released this week, showing unemployment to be considered the major domestic problem in the United States, with juvenile delinquency, narcotics and crime running a strong second.

The first question in a questionnaire that was one of the most comprehensive ever sent to constituents by a U.S. Congressman, listed 10 items generally considered to be major domestic problems, asking that the person answering check 3 which he felt would be the greatest source of trouble during the next few years. The 10 items, in the order of importance that 12,000 of BROWN'S constituents gave to them, with the percentage of all persons responding who checked each item, are as follows:

	Percent
Unemployment	50.0
Juvenile delinquency, narcotics and crime	46.9
Negro demonstrations	35.2
Racial discrimination	35.1
Communist subversion	28.2
Educational needs	24.6
The rapid population increase	21.9
The poverty of a large proportion of our citizens	21.5
The cost of medical care for the aged	20.6
Automation	16.2

Congressman BROWN pointed out that it was most interesting that the problem of automation received the least attention while unemployment ran the highest. Coauthor of the bill that was recently signed into law establishing a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, BROWN noted that these two items were tied together very closely, but were not, apparently, as closely related in the public mind.

Some of the most interesting figures are in the breakdown that BROWN has made by political party, age, and religion. However, 57.3 percent of the Democrats included unemployment in their list of concerns, making it the highest priority item in BROWN'S party, while Republicans ranked unemployment fourth in importance, with 37.9 percent checking it off.

Republicans in the 29th District placed juvenile delinquency first, with 57.9 percent, Negro demonstrations second, and Communist subversion third. Democrats gave juvenile delinquency second priority and racial discrimination was ranked third.

"Presumably, those checking racial discrimination as a major problem would be inclined to look favorably on the civil rights issue and the Negro's efforts to increase his opportunities, while those marking Negro demonstrations as a problem, are probably not too sympathetic to these efforts," Congressman BROWN stated.

Religious breakdowns were also significant, with Protestants placing delinquency ahead of unemployment and Jewish constituents ranking racial discrimination second, just behind unemployment. Catholics placed importance on the issues closely paralleling the overall ranking, although they placed discrimination slightly ahead of demonstrations. The numbers in the following chart indicate the rank in importance which each group gave to each of the major problems listed:

	Total	Democrat (60 percent)	Republican (40 percent)	Protestant (54 percent)	Catholic (24 percent)	Jewish (5 percent)
Unemployment	1	1	4	2	1	1
Delinquency, etc.	2	2	1	1	2	3
Negro demonstrations	3	4	2	3	4	8
Racial discrimination	4	3	5	5	3	2
Communist subversion	5	10	3	4	5	10
Educational needs	6	6	7	7	6	4
Population increase	7	9	6	6	10	9
Poverty	8	5	9	9	7	5
Medical costs for aged	9	7	8	8	8	6
Automation	10	8	10	10	9	7

Other facts BROWN discovered in the questionnaire include those showing that persons answering who were under 25 years of age are most sympathetic to the Negro problems, placing racial discrimination at the top of their list. All other age groups gave unemployment and juvenile delinquency either first or second place, with the delinquency problem receiving only fourth ranking among the youngest age group.

As expected, the cost of medical care for the aged received continually increasing attention with increase in age. It remains in the bottom position for all age groupings through age 40 and then picks up to where it is ranked fourth as a major problem by those aged 56 and over. The table below shows ranking by age:

	Under 25	26 to 30	31 to 35	36 to 40	41 to 45	46 to 50	51 to 55	56 to 60	61 and up
Unemployment	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
Delinquency	4	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
Negro demonstrations	7	5	4	4	3	3	3	3	3
Racial discrimination	1	3	3	3	4	4	4	5	6
Communist subversion	5	6	6	6	5	5	5	6	5
Educational needs	3	4	5	5	6	10	10	10	10
Population increase	8	7	7	7	9	8	6	7	8
Poverty	6	8	8	8	7	7	9	8	7
Medical costs	10	10	10	10	8	6	7	4	4
Automation	9	9	9	9	10	9	8	9	9

Several high school and college classes were given BROWN'S questionnaire to answer, bringing the percentage of those in the youngest age grouping to a larger figure. BROWN noted that the large percentage of those answering in the 61 and over category is due partly to the fact that other groupings are in 5-year steps and partly to the fact that elderly persons take a greater interest in political issues as well as probably having more time to spend answering a questionnaire.

The tabulations were placed on IBM cards and compilations were done by the California Research Foundation, an independent research group.

Legislative Salary Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Hoosier Farmer is the publication of the strong and highly respected Indiana Farm Bureau, whose membership comprises a very significant proportion of the farmers of the State.

An editorial signed by the editor, C. W. Stall, and appearing in the August issue of that publication, commented on the action taken by Congress in the recent pay-raise bill, centering on the provision for pay increases for Members. Although some criticism has resulted from that action, and I am sure every Senator has received letters on the matter, Mr. Stall has made a reasonable analysis which should help the understanding of not only his regular readers, but also others to whose attention it might come.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "A Good Investment," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

A GOOD INVESTMENT

(By C. W. Stall)

Congress passed a bill not long ago increasing the salaries of certain Federal Government workers. Included was provision for a $7,500 increase in the salaries of U.S. House Members. This would bring their annual salary, beginning with those elected to Congress this fall, to $30,000.

In discussing salary, expense allowance, living costs, etc., with several Hoosier Representatives now serving, the cost of public service and campaigning comes out.

Experience shows that money can stand in the way of some well-qualified people seeking public office.

One House Member explained that his last campaign for reelection cost about $20,000. About half of that amount, he confided, came from the party and from individual small contributions, and the other $10,000 came out of his own pocket.

Flying back and forth between the Capital and the home district for business and political purposes is expensive. One round trip per congressional session is paid for at the rate of 20 cents a mile. The rest must be financed by the man himself. One Hoosier made the round trip 40 times last year, at a total cost of around $3,000. Only five of these were paid for by the party or by groups asking the Congressman to address them.

In addition to his salary, a Member of the U.S. House receives about $20,000 each year to pay nine assistants and clerical workers. He can use up to $1,200 per year for stationery, and send business mail postage free.

While all of this would seem to add up to a lot of money, it is easy to see how it can melt away rapidly for newsletters to constituents, necessary travel, correspondence, living expenses, social expenses, political contributions, administrative, and clerical help.

NONE HAVE COMPLAINED

No Indiana Congressman that we talked to has complained. Indeed, they seem dedicated to serving their districts as long as the voters continue to elect them.

This is just one example which shows that the financial consideration is real. It is felt just as much by people seeking office

at the local and State levels as by those aspiring to national offices.

Most candidates refuse unreasonably large campaign contributions because they do not want to feel subject to undue influence on their vote. Yet, they welcome small campaign contributions from well-wishers. Maybe it would be a good investment in good government to send a dollar or two to the candiate, candidates, or the political party (at any level) that you want to support. This kind of help, in addition to active work and a vote on election day, truly represents citizenship at its best.

Congress Should Keep At It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer today, September 22, 1964, entitled "Congress Should Keep at It."

We of the Philadelphia congressional delegation wholeheartedly concur with the sentiments expressed in the article.

We firmly believe the Congress should remain in continuous session until all major legislation of importance to the American people is enacted into law.

To this end, we pledge ourselves to work around the clock to accomplish this task.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD KEEP AT IT

As summer yields to autumn, and election day stands only 6 weeks away, Members of Congress understandably are anxious to adjourn without further delay.

However, much work remains to be done. Bills are pending that demand attention now, not next year. It is the duty of Congress to stick to their desks until their task is finished.

Senate Democratic Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD has listed a half dozen must bills that should be acted on before adjournment. He is hopeful that several other measures will be passed also.

On the priority list are: a major appropriations bill containing funds for numerous programs; the foreign aid bill; food-for-peace legislation; Federal aid to education in areas, such as Philadelphia, where military or other Government installations are located; an increase in social security benefits with a medicare rider attached; and authorization for U.S. participation in an international coffee quota agreement.

The logjam will not be broken until the Senate ends its impasse over legislative reapportionment. A rider has been attached to the foreign aid bill which seeks to delay enforcement of last June's Supreme Court decision which declared unconstitutional the apportionment of either house of a State legislature on any basis except population.

At this late date, it well might be advisable for the Senate to schedule night sessions on a regular basis until the reapportionment deadlcok is broken and the deck is clear to proceed with other urgent business.

We believe the Appalachian economic development bill ought to be elevated to a place on the priority list for enactment at this session of Congress. Much hard work of a bipartisan nature, by Governors as well as Congressmen, has gone into the Appalachian aid measure to eliminate flaws in the original program. Congress should not let this bill die.

Even though Congress has compiled a creditable record thus far—with passage of bills on tax reduction, civil rights, mass transit aid, war on poverty and several important conservation measures—there is much more still to do. Adjournment anytime soon ought to be out of the question now.

The Charity Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the American people have never failed to rally behind the national charity drives which have been conducted with more and more frequency during the past decade. Hundreds of millions of dollars has been collected for many worthy causes. Thousands upon thousands of unfortunate citizens have benefited from these charity drives. Lately, however, we hear more and more stories about "fast-buck operators" who feather their own nests through participation in these drives.

On August 22, Paul Harvey discussed the situation in his radio broadcast. I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from this program be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE CHARITY BUSINESS

Just when we think we're shockproof, along comes an exposé revealing that charity dollars intended for war widows and orphans have been pocketed by crooks.

Five years ago the Sister Kenny Foundation was rocked by scandal and an ugly shadow fell across all organized charities.

You'd think with such a warning that persons responsible for the administration of the other charities would immediately investigate and ventilate any symptom of hanky-panky. Yet, in the 5 years since, while Kenny Foundation officials were being prosecuted, the Disabled American Veterans allowed a professional fund-raising outfit in Chicago to steal some 2 million donated dollars.

Harold Sager, calling himself Col. Harold S. McClintock, solicited contributions for the DAV. Some contributions were sizable. When the Borden Co. donated property worth almost a million dollars, the DAV received only $250,000. The Attorney General says Sager pocketed the rest. There were some 400 comparable transactions in which he talked industries into making "tax deductible contributions" or merchandise, real property, sometimes entire factories.

Actually, the DAV, having been similarly embarrassed 1953, should have been gun-shy. A New York legislative committee showed at that time that the DAV had collected more than $21 million of which none went to individual veterans. A professional fund-raising group had kept for itself 68 percent of all contributions.

Now we discover that even if Mr. Sager had not got greedy, according to the terms of his contract with the DAV he could have kept—legally—49 percent of the total take.

Now the March of Dimes is under investigation. New York's Attorney General Lefkowitz says he is particularly interested in the "personal expenses of President Basil O'Connor."

Charity, in the original American tradition, constituted nothing more than a helping hand for a nearby neighbor.

When charity was taken out of the hands of the church and became a business—so that half the proceeds went to professional fund raisers and much of the remainder went for "administrative expense"—it became something other than charity.

I am militantly opposed to increasing Government snoopervision of our private lives, but we keep asking for it.

Have no illusions. The billion of your dollars which Congress recently voted for the President's antipoverty program will be culled by a lot of sticky and inefficient fingers before it ever finds its way into the hands of the hungry * * * Government administration of charity is no improvement. But the proponents of private charity had better examine their own degree of efficency before they invite Federal usurpation and administration of all welfare.

There are in our midst examples of how it can be done right. The Salvation Army accomplishes magnificent results with minimal overhead. Society charities on a community level often pay little or nothing for the brainpower and womanpower they are able to enlist.

But when dedication is so lacking that professional fund raisers must be employed, then charity costs more than it's worth.

Part II—Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most paradoxical situations confronting us today is the extremely strong support given to the proposed hospital insurance amendment to the social security system, and the apparent disregard shown by so many of our colleagues.

I would like to call attention to the following news story, showing how 12,000 of the residents of the 29th District of California feel about this program. The results of this questionnaire, mailed to every household in the district, have been tabulated in conjunction with a great deal of demographic information and every return has been included in the totals. I believe they are, therefore, quite significant:

GEORGE BROWN POLL SHOWS HEAVY MEDICARE SUPPORT

The medicare program, which was recently passed by the Senate and expected to be voted on in the House of Representatives this week, is favored by a 2-to-1 margin in the 29th Congressional District, according to the results of a questionnaire mailed out by Congressman GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., early this summer.

Tabulations show 67.5 percent of BROWN'S constituents either strongly or mildly supporting a hospital insurance program as part of the social security system, and 32.5 percent either strongly or mildly opposing.

These percentages are based on only those expressing an opinion without including those who were undecided.

The Senate added the hospital insurance program to amendments that had previously been passed by the House, and a vote will probably be taken by Representatives this week to determine whether or not they will accept the addition of this amendment. Congressman BROWN introduced a bill in support of the medicare program early in 1963, and has indicated his desire to see it enacted on many occasions.

BROWN'S questionnaire also gives him results according to age, sex, political party, religion, and certain other categories. Democrats indicated heavy support for the program, which President Johnson includes in his list of essential legislation, with 83 percent in favor, whereas even 38 percent of the Republicans supported the proposal as well. The 29th District is strongly Democratic, about 63 percent registering that way for voting purposes, although only about 57.5 percent of those answering the questionnaire checked Democrat as their party preference.

The following table shows Catholic and Jewish persons as being the strongest supporters of the program (although Protestants also favor it by a substantial margin) when broken down by religion, and men more in favor of medicare than women.

[In percent]

	Support	Oppose	Undecided
Total	64	31	5
Male	66	31	4
Female	62	32	6
Protestant	56	40	4
Catholic	73	23	4
Jewish	86	11	3
Democrat	83	14	3
Republican	38	57	5

The results of Brown's questionnaires, with 11,700 returns from approximately 75,000 sent out, were all put on IBM cards and the tabulations compiled by the California Research Foundation.

Age breakdowns were interesting on the medicare issue, since it would primarily benefit the elderly. The differences in percentages were not as large, however, as one might suspect.

A marked drop in support between the ages of 26 and 35 is shown, with those aged 25 and under favoring the program heavily. Most concern, of course, is shown by persons who have passed their 51st birthday. The table of percentages by age is as follows:

[In percent]

	Support	Oppose	Undecided
25 and under	67	28	5
26 to 30	55	41	4
31 to 35	58	38	4
36 to 40	63	32	5
41 to 45	64	34	3
46 to 50	66	31	3
51 to 55	68	28	4
56 to 60	70	26	4
61 and over	70	25	5

Walter Norblad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, once again this House stands bereft of one of its most distinguished Members, and once more we stand with bowed heads as a good friend and colleague is called to his eternal rest.

In Walter Norblad we had a dedicated legislator who devoted most of his congressional career to a search for methods whereby the public interest could be conserved and the wasting of public substance brought to a stop. Our departed colleague's chosen field was the military, and he kept a constant vigil to make sure that defense administrators did not become derelict in the discharge of their accepted responsibilities.

Walter Norblad was a genial man and his unfailing good nature came to the surface in a ready smile and the kindly word. Gifted in repartee, he usually had a witty comeback to anyone who seemed inclined to question his sincerity in the pursuit of better living conditions for servicemen and a more effective utilization of the defense dollar. We shall miss this good friend, and assuredly, the House will be the poorer because of his passing.

Mrs. Dague joins me in extending our heartfelt condolences to the members of his family as they contemplate this irreparable loss. May an all-compassionate Father encircle them with His arms and ease for them the heartache of this sad hour.

Praise of the National Park System and Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, a Congressman's daily mail is replete with constituents' problems—matters, the resolution of which bring pleasure and satisfaction to both constituent and representative.

I have recently received a letter from a constituent which seeks no help, sets forth no problem, and no complaint.

This letter in praise of our Rangers and park service personnel deserves wide notice:

BABYLON, N.Y.,
August 24, 1964.

Hon. JAMES R. GROVER, Jr.,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have just finished one of the most rewarding vacations of our life touring the national parks of our country and we want to thank you for your efforts in promoting the national conservation program of which the park system is but a part. We only wish there were some way of adequately letting you know how grateful we are to those many fine people who made this trip so memorable. The educational effort and almost personal care of each ranger and the never-ending patience of the personnel are all remarkable. For several years we have noted these facts and have resolved to try to let those responsible know of our praise.

I would be pleased if you felt that forwarding this letter to the Department of Interior or another Government office could in some way be helpful. I can think of no tax dollar that is of more ultimate value than one spent in preserving the heritage of our country.

Yours truly,

ARTHUR CHAMPAGNE.

Saturday Evening Post Smears and Attacks on Senator Goldwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON W. GLENN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in my memory as a subscriber and reader of the Saturday Evening Post, I note vicious smears and attacks on Senator GOLDWATER in its editorials. I recall the days when the editorials were interesting and timely, and it was a magazine which thousands of readers looked forward to every week as part of the American scene. Now, instead of editorializing for the sake of news, the Post serves the purposes of a political party by circulating throwouts attacking a candidate. This certainly is not in keeping with the great traditions of the old Post, and I have written to the Curtis Publishing Co. as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1964.

SATURDAY EVENING POST,
Curtis Publishing Co., Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: I have been a subscriber to the Saturday Evening Post almost all of my life and remember the days when the Saturday Evening Post had the largest circulation of any magazine in the country and rightfully so. The articles and stories were something which thousands of readers looked forward to every week. Even the front cover was outstanding with the pictures of Norman Rockwell becoming part of the American scene The editorials were interesting and timely.

For the first time in my memory as a subscriber and reader of the Post, I now receive news releases from its public relations manager, sending me copies of the editorials endorsing President Johnson for reelection, which is your privilege, and at the same time attacking his opponent, Senator GOLDWATER, with a vicious smear, which is not at all necessary and certainly not in keeping with the past policy of the Saturday Evening Post. In fact, the complete editorial instead of editorializing on President Johnson, mentions him only in passing and continues with an attack on Senator GOLDWATER that sounds like something written by political hacks of the Democratic Party.

I have always believed that an editorial is part of a periodical and is issued as part of the body of the magazine, but to start running a public relations news release, not apparently for the sake of news but to serve the purposes of a political party by circulating "throw outs" attacking a candidate, is certainly not in keeping with the great traditions of the old Saturday Evening Post.

Sincerely yours,

M.C.

Salute to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is in the record of the 88th Congress much of which we may justly be proud. Indeed, that record has already been made the subject of a celebration at the White House. But as is pointed out in the following editorial from the August 20 editions of the New York Times, there is much we can still accomplish—notably passage of a hospital care program for the elderly. Let us, therefore, redouble our efforts and perhaps we may even merit another celebration—this one hosted by our senior citizens.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 20, 1964]

SALUTE TO CONGRESS

Bipartisan amiability and invincible optimism have always been parts of President Johnson's operating technique, but in his praise for this Congress he is surpassing himself. "When the record of this Congress is completed, it will place the 88th Congress in the record books as the most constructive in the 20th century. Exectuive and congressional relationships could hardly have been better," he told reporters this week. In celebration, he invited members of both parties to a "salute to Congress" reception at the White House yesterday.

The record is at once less simplistic and less satisfactory than the President's rhetoric suggests. This Congress is sure of an honorable place in history if only because it adopted the Civil Rights Act. Cutting taxes to keep the economy from sagging, even though the budget was unbalanced, represented a wise departure from outmoded economic orthodoxy. This Congress has passed several other desirable pieces of legislation, notably aid to higher eduaction, the wilderness bill, and the expansion of the Hill-Burton hospital program. It has also pioneered—too timidly but still in the right direction—in the antipoverty and mass transit programs.

As against these achievements, however, there have been some serious failures. A southern filibuster stalled the Civil Rights Act for more than 4 months. The tax-writing committees stripped the tax reduction bill of all reforms, leaving the Internal Revenue Code a patchwork of inequities and special privileges. Chairman WILBUR MILLS and a bipartisan bloc in the Ways and Means Committee once again denied the House an opportunity to vote on the long-overdue medicare program. Chairman HOWARD SMITH again used the authority of the House Rules Committee to snarl the flow of legislative traffic. In recent days, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, the minority leader, has tied up the work of the Senate by seeking to attach to the foreign aid bill a rider on the wholly unrelated issue of legislative reapportionment.

This has been a better-than-average Congress, but it could have done much more to meet the needs of the Nation. In common with all recent Congresses it has provided fresh evidence of how hard it is proving for our national legislature to keep abreast of the problems of a rapidly growing and rapidly changing Nation. Even so notable a contribution as passage of the Civil Rights Act cannot obscure the necessity for a thorough reform of procedure and committee system of both Houses.

The bonhommie of a party at the White House provides an engaging curtain-raiser to what is likely to be an unpleasant campaign, but it ought not encourage too much complacency on Capitol Hill. A Congress which tolerates the present delays, obstructionism and committee irresponsibility deserves a reform even more than it does a salute.

Commencement at Willowbrook State School for Practical Nursing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 1964, I attended the commencement exercises of the Willowbrook State School, School for Practical Nursing, Staten Island, N.Y. Dr. Jack Hammond, director, presided at the graduation; Rev. Arnold Ostlund gave the invocation; Elizabeth Turner and Norman Middlebrook of the graduating class delivered a greeting and farewell message respectively; Mary Kelly, R.N., principal, presented the class; Dr. Frank Glasser awarded the diplomas; and Joseph Lombardi directed the Willowbrook State School Band. The graduates were: Betty J. Bolden, Susana Colon, Frances Fleschner, Arthur H. Hanna, John W. Harding, Jr., Peter L. Jones, Delina Diane Mahoney, Norman Clark Middlebrook, Martha E. Moore, Nancy Loretta Muldoon, Vena E. Murray, Georgette Nicholson, Stuart Paul Olsowske, Jr., Edward Robinson, Patricia Ann Russell, Geneva Sadler, Elizabeth J. Turner, Marianela Walmsley, and Yvonne J. Williams.

Marion Crotty, R.N., gave the principal address, and under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this speech:

The art of living—Florence Nightingale once said, "A better world will not be given to us, so let us begin without delay to make one." Many discerning individuals are deeply concerned over the future of our young people in the 1960's and onward. This awesome age of ours is one of "Sputniks," "Discoverers," and "Echoes"; man-into-space trips, shrinking continents; jet transportation, mass communication media and hundreds of other technological advances. In the health science fields we have had the discovery and the development of cures, treatment and methods of care that even 50 years ago would have been thought to be almost in the realm of fantasy. We should not overlook the effects of automation on society and individuals. Madison Avenue, labor unions, organized nursing and many other groups all tend to take care, or should I say charge, of many things and submerge the individual. Some of these trends are the road to riches for individuals and groups but some trends are the road to ruin.

With this marked progress, what is happening to individuals, to society, and what is being done about it? Some leaders are afraid, and there may very well be reason for their fear.

Because individuals, young and old, are being desensitized to the wholesome aspects of the "good life." The "good life" to which I refer you is the day-to-day life we live, the one which has deep meaning, the one in which we aspire to build that which will pay dividends for a whole life with deep satisfactions. These deeper satisfactions give meaning to life itself.

To illustrate my statement that individuals are being conditioned negatively, let me tell you how this is taking place.

One of the most outstanding changes that I have noted in people is their lack of concern for what is happening about them. People in general are quite casual to the murder stories that appear in print or occur in the same block or town, to the success of TV which depends on violence, to the wholesale corruptions of large groups of young men and women by the use of drugs, and their ensuing behavior. Is this not an acceptance of unwholesome living in a form that is second only to war in its destructive result? A desensitization toward violence comes about in an individual and his society in a not so unusual way. It may be outlined briefly by saying first there occurs a blunting of feelings to sudden shock. This is a defensive reaction for the individual. When it occurs frequently enough and the intensity of the shock is increased, we then note a lessening or blunting of the feeling toward actual danger to ourselves and others; or in some cases we could substitute the word "brutality" in any of its forms. What is the outcome of such a pattern? Unsafe, unbalanced, chaotic individuals, world or community. If this is true and there appears to be some evidence to substantiate it, then what is to be done? It is not sufficient to admit to the problem and then retreat. The situation should be corrected without further loss of human resources and dignity.

To correct this current dilemma, what can be done? First, we have to be seriously concerned with the role of knowledge and education in preparing individuals to meet everyday life situations. It is only when knowledge has passed into judgment and becomes assimilated into good behavior that wisdom is born. Man or men are simply the convertors of ideas into action and wholesome purposes. When wisdom is welcomed in the sanctuary of the heart and becomes wedded to emotions, it puts on the admirable cloak of charity, compassion and understanding. Education for any group, and particularly nurses, that is content with purveying information, is incapable of preparing individuals for a decent and successful life in the world of today and tomorrow. It is said by many of our leaders today that one of the greatest needs of our civilization is that more must be demanded of the individual. This has a particular application to the nursing field, of which this group is now a part.

The graduates will be given the rights and privileges of the nursing profession by their peers (other nurses), by their employers (hospital, health agency or wherever they as individuals elect to give service). The rights and privileges to which you are entitled have been enumerated, I'm certain, in your professional adjustment course, therefore, the repetition would not serve a purpose at this time. Your responsibilities will continue to increase in number and depth as you continue in the profession. You have been prepared to meet them and the road ahead will not be to riches, but should give you much satisfaction when you as an individual assume the role of responsible person who is a practical nurse.

I ask you to ask yourself some questions for the purpose of determining if you are an individual that has knowledge, some education, sensitivity for others, respect for your fellow man or if you may have a tendency

toward reacting in an insensitive way to the world about us, this last type of reaction would be disaster for a practical nurse. She would do better to enter a field of endeavor in which objects, or products, are of major importance.

Are you educated nurses? I would like to ask further questions of these new graduates. Can you entertain an idea—that is, have you the openness of mind, the objectivity of outlook, the concern for truth which would enable you to entertain every idea on merit—not accepting or rejecting a new idea because it happens to be fashionable, not welcoming an old idea because it has the backing of tradition, nor spurning it because it has ceased to be popular.

Have you determined for yourself that there is merit in doing a thing because it is right and can you accept that certain things are right for you as a person who is a nurse.

Extreme example: It is right to give medicines only on prescription of the doctor. It is not right for you to deprive any patient of spiritual counsel.

It is my opinion that we need a little more of doing a thing because it is right, as compared to the superficial thinking that has been used for an excuse to explain why patients have received quick, abrupt, or incomplete treatment from nurses in the hospitals. I am speaking of hospitals in general.

Can you entertain the other fellow? That is, have you willingness and the capacity to share joys and sorrows of others? Can you expand your ego so as to include other human beings in the sweep of your sympathy and understanding?

Can you entertain yourself? That is, do you have inner reserves to fall back upon which will enable you, as it were, to enjoy your own company, or must you be rushing from one thing to another in order to avoid yourself?

I would like to put in a plea for an important principle of life—one I shall call the gospel of work. I firmly believe that the continued interrelationship of manual and intellectual work is a vital part or element in our field. Work is the greatest useful force in life. Work is the price every decent person should be prepared to pay for the gift of life and the many gifts that life brings. It is a sound principle of life only if the doing is good. If it is haphazard or slipshod, doing it can be hopelessly bad. This brings me to a point of view of an oriental educator (Dr. Z. Husain). An adaptation of his theory for our purpose may be said to be: "All work is not purposeful. It is purposeful in the broad sense only when it is preceded by suitable motivation and intellectual effort and only that work is genuinely purposeful which serves some value, higher that our own selfish ends, and to which we are devoted." He who works only for his own selfish ends may be skilled; he does not become a valued member of service personnel in the hospital team. A valued member of the health team does not seek his own enjoyment, but strives to achieve perfection in his work. Work does not mean the passing of time by doing unimportant things; it is not amusement; it is not play; it is work; it is purposeful striving. Work sits in judgment of itself with the strictness of an enemy and when it is well done, it passes the test, which yields satisfaction to the patient and to the nurse.

This brings me to another point which has a bearing on the art of living and in the nursing profession—the relationship between the material and spiritual values in life. This is a matter which has been shuttled back and forth by many philosophers, men of religion and thinkers in general throughout the ages. I do not propose to discuss this at length but would like to say a few sentences about this contemporary and controversial topic.

There has been in recent years an overwhelming impact of material progress and prosperity on our outlook and attitudes, but I wonder if there is sufficient feeling and sensitiveness for moral and spiritual values in personal and social life. There is an unlimited multiplication of human wants—not merely in the usual course but through the mass media.

TV spaghetti, toothpaste, soaps, and detergents; all are best.

A fiction is being built up which is sold to or accepted by millions—but what do these things do for happiness. Or is this a type of so-called happiness of possession. Avoid the cult of easiness and security. Should we not be moving more toward another type of happiness through which we strive for happiness.

1. Through the peaceful pursuits of science and art.
2. Through social service endeavors.
3. Through human relations.
4. Through the "pursuit of excellence" because it is right.

CONCLUSION

Against the background of what I have said, I would hope that you will conclude that:

1. Violence must not be part of your life or your thinking.
2. Sensitivity to all humans and human relationships is essential in your field of work.
3. That continuous self-improvement through informal and formal education will help you in your personal and professional life.
4. That as an intelligent individual you will entertain ideas; accept and tolerate your fellow man with his strengths and weaknesses; accept, tolerate, and entertain yourself.
5. Use good commonsense and accept that which is right for you and the patient because it is right.
6. Accept the philosophy of the "right to work" means to do a good job, and you are a nurse by choice which implies that you will give service as needed.
7. Material and spiritual values must be brought into accord first within the individuals, then in the larger group.

Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a senior citizen in my congressional district concerning the issue of medical care for the aged under social security. Because the views of this constituent seem to be representative of many communications I have received in recent weeks I ask permission to have it printed in today's RECORD:

CONNERSVILLE, IND.,
September 5, 1964.

Hon. RALPH HARVEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARVEY: As I am an older person on social security I would like to present my views on the medicare bill which is up in the House of Representatives at present. My opinion and quite a number of other older people agree. I think with me that the medicare bill should apply only to those with less than a $5,000-a-year income and that a person that does not have over $40 a month social security check should be raised to at least $50 a month and that instead of 90 days of hospital care that should be 60 days hospital and 120 days nursing home care. This is my opinion and I think that as we taxpayers are paying the raise you gave yourselves without our consent I think you owe us this much and I dare you read this letter to Congress.

Sincerely,

RUSSEL GOEHRINGER.

Retirement of William R. (Bill) Thomson, District Tax Administrator, California Board of Equalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in California on September 30, 1964, we will be honoring Mr. William R. "Bill" Thomson, who is retiring as district tax administrator of the State board of equalization. On that day a retirement luncheon is being tendered him by the Honorable Richard Nevins, fourth district member of the board of equalization.

I am bringing this event to the attention of the Members of the House because I believe Bill Thomson is a fine example of a person who through dedication has made an outstanding contribution in serving the State of California.

In good measure Bill Thomson is responsible for the excellence of the operating procedures of California's State Board of Equalization. His service should be an inspiration to all public servants as the example of the opportunity and satisfaction of accomplishment which can be obtained in civil service by dedication, hard work, and interest in these positions of responsibility.

A native of New York State, born in 1899, Bill sojourned briefly to Ontario, Ohio, and Montana, before settling in Los Angeles County in 1922. His 31 years of service with the board began in 1933 after a number of years experience in the retailing merchandising field.

During his career with the board he contributed to many improvements in tax administration, such as the establishment of the board's out-of-State offices, the decentralization of the Los Angeles County Board of Equalization offices, and the initiation of out-of-State recruiting tours.

A veteran of World War I, he is past commander of Frank J. Irwin State Post No. 547; past president of the American Legion Luncheon Club of Los Angeles; past president of Metropolitan Chapter No. 54, California State Employees Association; one of the organizers and charter members of the California Association of State Auditors; also a member, American Society for Public Admin-

istrators; and vice president, board of trustees, Westminster Presbyterian Church; and trustee of Westminster Presbyterian Church Foundation.

Through the years it has been my privilege to be in public service, first as a member of the California State Legislature where I had the opportunity to observe the operations of the California State Board of Equalization, and Bill Thomson firsthand, and now as a Member of Congress from California, it has been a source of pride and satisfaction to know that the State of California has compiled such an outstanding record in the administration of its tax laws. William R. "Bill" Thomson has helped make this record possible.

To Bill Thomson we offer our thanks for a job well done and best wishes for a continued bright and happy future.

California: No Harvest of Shame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, any liberal, self-conscious about defending some type of reasonable farm labor agriculture work program for California, whether it be Public Law 78 or Public Law 414, should acquaint himself with the contents of a newsletter issued this week by the California Council of Growers.

It appears, after all is said and done, that the State which hires 54 percent of the bracero work force and produces 35 percent of the Nation's table food does not have the impoverished "harvest of shame" after all. Council letter follows:

INSIGHT BY THE COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA GROWERS

SAN FRANCISCO.—California farmworkers are covered by more protective legislation than similar workers in any other State, according to the Council of California Growers.

Source of this information is Bulletin 264, just issued by the U.S. Department of Labor, and titled "Coverage of Agricultural Workers Under State and Federal Labor Laws."

Of 10 major labor laws listed by the Department of Labor, California farmworkers are covered by 9; Pennsylvania is second with 6.

Florida, a big competitor of California in citrus and vegetable crops, is credited with two.

Texas, another competitive State, provides limited coverage in only one category—farm labor contractor regulations.

Workmen's compensation, temporary disability insurance, farm labor camp standards, and minimum wages for women and minors, are among the major laws applying to farmworkers in California. Others fix the minimum wages for minors employed in agriculture, set up standards for buses used in transporting farmworkers, guarantee prompt payment of wages, and provide regulations to govern the practices of farm labor contractors.

The laws apply equally to foreign and domestic workers.

Besides providing benefits and protection under these laws, the council also points out that California farmers pay higher wages than their competitors in the major fruit and vegetable producing States with the exception of Washington. As reported by the Statistical Reporting Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture on July 1, 1964, the average wage paid in California was $1.35 per hour. This compared with the national average of $1.13 per hour, 88 cents in Texas, 95 cents in Florida, and $1.40 in Washington. The latter State, incidentally, has only two laws governing employment of farmworkers.

Herb Lee, president of California-Arizona Farm Labor Association, representing the major employers of farm labor in California, told the council that the combination of more benefits and higher wages puts a steady pressure on the farmer to increase his efficiency.

"The prices farmers receive are relatively unchanged from 20 years ago," Lee said, "yet wages, benefits, and competition have increased steadily. It is an indication of the progressiveness of the California farmers that they have managed to remain competitive with growers in other States despite these economic disadvantages."

Labor Day Sermon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Labor Day, September 7, 1964, I attended the 16th Annual Labor Day Mass sponsored by members of organized labor in the Calumet region of my congressional district. The Reverend Martinian Wolf, O.F.M. Cap., associate professor of economics and philosophy, Capuchin Seminary of St. Mary, Crown Point, Ind., delivered the following message in his highly instructive sermon.

LABOR DAY SERMON

On this Labor Day 1964 we find that there is a certain fear gripping the world. There is good reason for this. The nuclear weapons of our country are twice as powerful as those of the Soviet Union. The destructive capacity of American weapons is the equivalent of 50 tons of TNT for every human being on this planet. Besides the nuclear bomb, we have the fear that comes from automation: the fear of losing one's job. Many of us fear this much more than the 50 tons of TNT. Maybe we have also been tinged with the myth of history which the marxists have been preaching the past 30 years. They have told us that man has lost control of his own destiny. Man's destiny is determined by the events of history.

Pope John XXIII wanted to smash this myth of history. He did this in many ways but particularly by his two encyclicals, Mater et Magistra and Pacem in Terris. These documents sum up the teachings of his predecessors from Leo XIII to Pius XII on peace. Peace was his watchword; not fear.

As you may recall, shortly before his death the late holy father was awarded the international Balzan peace prize. In a talk to 2,000 diplomatic government and church officials gathered in St. Peter's, he said:

"The edifice of peace must be built day by day, and on solid foundations. Here, under the vaults of the Vatican basilica, we see Michelangelo's peerless dome rising in the Roman sky. Surely we do not forget that it rests on four imposing pillars driven deep into the earth.

"Peace, then, is a house, the house of all. It is the arc which joins earth to heaven. But to rise so high it must rest on four solid pillars: those we pointed out in our encyclical Pacem in Terris.

"It is an order that is founded on truth, built on justice, nurtured and animated by charity, and brought into effect under the auspices of freedom."

In the past, papal pronouncements on the political and social order had always been suspended from three great words; namely, truth, justice, and charity. Here a fourth is added: freedom. This is so characteristic of the Pope of the II Vatican Council where he wanted the debate to be held in "holy liberty." The Pope had urged them on, "We are not friars singing in a choir."

In Mater et Magistra the Pope had said:

"The fundamental principle in this doctrine is that individual men are of necessity the foundation, the cause, and the reason for the existence of all social institutions, insofar as men are social by nature and have been raised to the level of the supernatural realm."

In Pacem in Terris the Pope wrote:

"Any human society, if it is to be well ordered and productive, must lay down as a foundation this principle; namely, that every human being is a person; that is, his nature is endowed with intelligence and free will."

God has made man responsible for his acts. This is why man is not a slave of history. Pope John merely repeats that which Leo XIII wrote in Libertas Praestantissimum, "Liberty * * * is the faculty of choosing means fitted for the end proposed." I admit that this is a philosophical concept and hard to grasp. However, have you ever asked some one in prison what he misses the most. He has three meals a day. He has a job. But he has been deprived of his freedom.

You may have heard of the tunnels that have been built underneath the Berlin wall. They call it, "Digging a way to freedom." The tunnels range from the 20-yard tunnel in an East Berlin graveyard to the famous tunnel 29 which was 15 feet beneath the surface and 250 tons of dirt had to be hauled away with tubs. This went on despite the fact that within the first year's existence of the Berlin wall 50 persons were shot and killed in trying to escape. Why did the people risk their lives? The answer is simple: freedom, namely, the ability to choose the means fitted for the end proposed.

Ask Hartwig Gerlach why he escaped through tunnel 29? In East Germany the Communist authorities had forbidden him to any further schooling toward becoming an electrical engineer. He is now studying engineering. He has regained his ability to choose the means fitted for the end proposed.

Yet, need we go overseas to understand the idea of freedom? The very formation of Gary ACTU was in response to a desire for freedom. There was little notice taken of a news item that appeared on page 6 of the June 28, 1944, issue of the Gary Post-Tribune. The heading of the news item stated: "Henry Yurin Reelected by Steel Local." The article pointed out that this was the largest vote in the history of CIO Local No. 1014. Yet, this election marked the end of Communist influence in the largest steel union in the United States.

The Communists had infiltrated strategic positions. They simply failed to take care of the grievances that were piling up. Hundreds of them were never brought to final settlement. As a result, the members of local No. 1014 criticized their officers and were on the verge of giving up their membership. It was then that Joe Goin, a Southern Baptist from Kentucky, challenged the Catholic members of local No. 1014. He reminded them that their complaints were use-

less but that they could change the situation by applying the principle of majority rule at the next annual election in June. The work behind the scenes was as dramatic as the escapes through the tunnels beneath the Berlin wall. It was your fight for freedom, namely, the effort to have a sense of participation in the control of your working life.

Perhaps John XXIII gave his best commentary on what he meant by freedom when he addressed the farmers in his encyclical, Mater et Magistra. He asked them to organize. Why? He says, "For today almost nobody hears, much less pays attention to, isolated voices." Unless you unite, you will not have a voice in the maintenance of your prices, you will not be on an equal footing with other economic and professional groups, you will not have a voice in the conduct of public affairs. In other words, if you do not unite, you will not be free.

However, John XXIII warns us not to lose our freedom in organizations by useless discussions, "They should take special care, moreover, not to exhaust themselves in interminable discussions and, under pretext of seeking the better or the best, fail meanwhile to do the good that is possible and is thus obligatory." Too many, he implies, want perfection immediately and so get nothing. You thereby endanger your freedom.

How well John XXIII applies his own principles. To solve the problems existing in the world today calls for a public authority having worldwide power and the means to bring about the universal common good. This public authority must be set up by common accord and not imposed by force. He sees that the United Nations is not perfect. Does he scrap it? He writes: "It is our earnest prayer that the United Nations—in its structure and in its means—may become ever more equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks." He is striving for that which is possible though it may not be the better or the best.

How did he look upon organized labor? He tells us: "In the midst of many and frequently grave difficulties, these, our sons, have been striving and continue to strive for the effective promotion of the interests of the working classes and for their material and moral improvement." He is aware of the corruption that can exist. Despite that he wants the workers' associations to operate on an international scale. He states his reason:

"But it is not the decisions made within each individual productive unit which have the greatest bearing on this complex. Instead it is those made by public authorities or by institutions that function on a worldwide or national scale in regard to some economic sector or category of production."

John XXIII is not only striving for the possible but he wants the workers to be "able freely to make their voices heard, and listened to, beyond the confines of their individual productive units and at every level of society."

So far we have considered a lot of theory. This sounds nice. The question still remains: How can you preserve your freedom in this technological age? John XXIII told us that the edifice of peace must be built "day by day." The fight for freedom must begin in your own home.

Pope John stresses the need for organization. He had been in military service and saw the need of organization. He is rather blunt when he writes:

"Nevertheless, in order to imbue civilization with sound principles and enliven it with the spirit of the gospel, it is not enough to be illumined with the gift of faith and enkindled with the desire of forwarding a good cause; it is also necessary to take an active part in the various organizations and influence them from within."

To take an active part in an organization is learned in the home. A 12-year-old boy ran away from home in Michigan, dodging police and a search party of 25 volunteers for 7 hours. When he finally turned up, the only explanation he gave for his disappearance was: "It was my turn to wash the dishes."

It is within the family that the child learns division of labor and the need for organization: Dad earns the paycheck, Mother prepares the meals. As long as the meals are not eaten from paper plates and we don't want to eat from dirty plates, someone has to wash the dishes.

Pope John had a few more words about entering organizations. He says:

"And since our present age is one of outstanding scientific and technical progress, one cannot enter these organizations and work effectively from within unless he is scientifically competent, technically capable and skilled in the practice of his own profession."

In other words, John XXIII says that today education is necessary. This, too, must be learned in the home. In a small Indiana home not too long ago, a young mother had a busy day ahead. She knew the paperboy would come to collect. She gave her 5-year-old son, Mike, some money and told him, "Now you're going to get some money back. This you can keep." I forget the exact amount but it was not more than a dime or nickel. When the newspaper boy came, Mike transacted the business and went back to play. Now one can easily imagine what must have gone through his mind: How am I going to spend that dime or nickel? Perhaps he thought of a Hershey candy bar. Here he may have been up against the problem of inflation. Maybe the money won't even be enough for that. Suddenly he stopped his play. He ran into the kitchen and gave the money to his mother. "Here," he said, "keep this and put it away for my education." In some way these parents had brought home the idea to 5-year-old Mike that he needs an education in this technological age.

Education will also be the answer to the man who fears the loss of his job because of automation. Automation will bring with it new jobs. When the auto came, the blacksmiths, harness makers, wagon producers went out of business. With the auto came the industry itself together with gas stations, motels, highways, etc. The workers displaced by automation today will need retraining before they can be reemployed. You can cushion the shock of automation by the avoidance of layoffs, early retirement, work-spreading, transfer, and relocation; but the best job insurance still remains within yourself and that is your determination to learn. A determination to train not for any single job but for a whole class of jobs. This may require extra effort in the form of tuition fees, classes after a hard day's work, and continual study. This is your fight for freedom. A fight that may be as hard as those who dug the tunnel underneath the Berlin wall and the men who voted to oust the Communist out of local No. 1014.

The days are over when we can expect to have one type of job for life. A Department of Labor spokesman said, "A worker can expect to change his job two or three times within a lifetime." The author of "Pacem in Terris," John XXIII, is a wonderful example of the desire to learn. At 44 he learned Bulgarian. At 50 he learned Turkish. At 80 he started to learn English. In Turkey he had ordered all his priests to learn Turkish too, and when they protested that it was unnecessary, "because all civilized people here speak French," he reminded them that, unfortunately, they were not in Paris but Istanbul.

The teenager, too, has to fight for his freedom. To avoid losing his freedom he may have to be careful of the pitfalls of "going steady." I am atacking it not from the moral angle—though one cannot overlook the moral dangers. I am attacking it not from the psychological angle—though the question of emotional immaturity can enter it. I am attacking it purely from an economical angle. Here I would ask you to listen to a letter which was written to a Catholic newspaper a few years ago. The young mother writes:

"If you use my letter it may save some young couple from rushing into marriage without any knowledge of, or preparation for, the duties ahead. I married at 17, today is my 27th birthday, we have four children, expect our fifth late this summer. Husband is 28, 5 feet 11 inches, weighs 130 pounds and looks wan and worn and harassed. He is a common laborer. Don't laugh, but he wanted to be a doctor. It was 'going steady' that cheated both of us out of any single happy years of young manhood or maidenhood.

"Husband and I blame all our parents for our unsupervised rearing. We were together almost every waking hour. We could take either family's car and of course we went in for parking in lonely places. Consequently marriage was our only way out. Family cars and unsupervised young folks is one sure way to early marriage. Right now we're so deeply in debt that even thinking of it makes me cold. * * * I'm not writing to whine but print my letter to alert young girls and boys to be their age."

This letter needs little commentary. A person is not free when he makes it impossible for himself to choose the vocation in life he wants. Though this letter may be aimed at the teenagers; could not also the parents learn from this letter. This couple did not blame themselves; they blamed their parents. Would any of you parents want your children to blame you for not preparing them for this technological age?

In our concern to meet the demands of technology, we must not expect our salvation from it. In fact, because we have put so much trust in it, technology has made us so fearful today in giving us the nuclear bomb. Pope John reminds us, "The moral order, however, cannot be built except on God. Cut off from God, it disintegrates." Without God man will lose his freedom.

Last April the Soviet leader devoted a large part of his speech to imploring the people to work harder to attain the luxuries of life. He explained this by referring to the Bible:

"The Bible says the Creator sent manna to the Jews. I don't know whether this is true, I did not see it happen. I don't know whether the manna was of first quality or whether the Jews got enough of it.

"To find out, we sent Soviet Astronaut Yuri Gagarin up there to take a look. But Gagarin reported he saw nothing but emptiness. So we sent Valentina Tereshkova * * * and told her if she finds manna she should cook herself a meal, but she found nothing.

"So there is no hope that we can get manna from heaven. This means that we must trust our hard-working hands."

Your presence here this morning shows that what was said is not true. You use your hands to work but you must use them also to pray. God does watch over us. This reality must also be learned in the home. A young mother in Chicago did this while she was preparing the noon meal. She happened to glance out her pantry window. She noticed the neighbor boy sneak across the yard. He looked cautiously to the left and to the right to see if he was being noticed. When he got to the corner of the yard, he checked again and then pulled out a cigarette and match. While this was going on, the young Chicago mother called to her son,

"Come on over here. You want to see something."

The little fellow came over and crawled on top of the counter. The mother asked him, "Do you see that boy over there trying to sneak a smoke?"

"Sure, I do," he replied.

"He thinks no one sees him. But I see him. You see him, don't you?"

"Sure."

"It's the same way with God. We think He doesn't see what we are doing. But He does."

To know that God watches and cares for us will in itself help replace the fear that grips the world today. The knowledge of God's care for you and me will help bring us peace that is "founded on truth, built on justice, nurtured and animated by charity, and brought into effect under the auspices of freedom."

This is the type of peace that is so real that it makes a man confident and which made John XXIII remark when he was in his last illness, "Don't worry too much about me. My bags are packed. I am ready—in fact, very ready—to go." The type of peace which means not only peace on earth but peace in heaven. Amen.

Constitutional Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, no more important issue has faced the Congress in recent years than that of considering whether the legislative branch of our Government should attempt to nullify or modify the Supreme Court decision on the reapportionment of State legislative bodies.

A recent article in the Journal of the Missouri Bar by J. Ward Driscoll has impressed me with its pertinence and clear logic.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A NEW U.S. JUDICIAL SYSTEM

(By J. Ward Driscoll)

I

Suppose a State deprives one of a right given in the U.S. Constitution.

Does one have the right to invoke the Government of the United States and to enforce the U.S. Constitution against the State?

The Judiciary Act of 1925 in effect says that the answer is no—that one does not have such a right.

This writer believes the answer is yes—that such a right is given in the Constitution.

Article III of the Constitution provides that "the judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution * * *" and that the "judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

So, it seems elementary that if a State deprives one of a right given in the Constitution, that then one would have a case arising under the Constitution, and, since article III assures one that the judicial power of the United States extends to all such cases, that one would have the right to invoke the Government of the United States and to enforce the Constitution against the State.

Why then is it that the Judiciary Act of 1925 says in effect that one does not have such a right?

This writer believes that it is a result of a misinterpretation of another paragraph of article III, to wit:

"In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations, as the Congress shall make."

This paragraph refers to which cases the Supreme Court will hear in the first instance and which cases it will hear on appeal. As is seen in the last sentence of the paragraph, Congress is given the authority to determine which cases will be heard on appeal in the Supreme Court.

Pursuant to this authority, Congress in 1789, the year the Constitution went into effect, provided that when the highest court of a State has ruled in a matter which involved the exercise of authority by the State on the ground that it was repugnant to the Constitution, the party could appeal directly to the Supreme Court.

This provision of the 1789 law remained in effect until changed by Congress in the Judiciary Acts of 1916 and 1925.

In an effort to limit the expanding number of appeals from the State courts to the Supreme Court and to effectuate the purposes of the 1916 act, the Justices of the Supreme Court, under the leadership of Chief Justice Taft, prepared a bill and presented it to Congress.[1] Known as the Judges' bill, it was passed by Congress in 1925 and is the law today.

This Judiciary Act of 1925 divided the constitutional cases involving the States into two categories—those cases where the State infringement of the Constitution is in the form of the State statute itself and those cases where the State infringement of the Constitution takes a different form.

As regards the first category, the act provides that a party still has his right of appeal from the highest State court to the Supreme Court.

As regards the second category, the act takes away one's right of appeal. In its place is substituted a proceeding by certiorari.

Certiorari means that it is completely discretionary on the part of the Supreme Court as to whether it will hear one's case or not. All one can do is to request the Supreme Court to hear the case. One no longer has the right to be heard. The Supreme Court might well agree that a State has deprived one of a right given in the Constitution, but still refuse to hear the case.

Congress has the authority to determine that a case need not be heard by the Supreme Court. But it is this writer's belief that Congress does not have the authority to determine that a case arising under the Constitution need not be heard by any court of the United States and that is exactly what Congress has done.

The judicial power extends to all cases arising under the Constitution. This judicial power is vested in the Supreme Court and in the inferior courts of the United States. Therefore, if one has a case arising under the Constitution, one is entitled to be heard by either the Supreme Court or one of the inferior courts of the United States. It is for Congress to determine which court will hear one's case.

Could Congress ordain and establish the State courts as the inferior courts of the United States?

In *Houston* v. *Moore*, 5 Wheat. 1 (1820), the Supreme Court ruled that the State courts could not be made the inferior courts of the United States and that Congress has no power to confer jurisdiction on any court not created by it.[2]

II

The following analogy might be helpful.

Suppose a baseball game is going on.

The score is 1 to 0. The team that is losing is at bat in the last of the ninth inning. The bases are loaded and there are two out. The count is three balls and two strikes.

The pitcher winds up and throws. The batter doesn't swing. All eyes are on the umpire to see if the pitch was a ball or a strike.

Then a strange thing happens. The umpire announces that he is not going to call whether it was a ball or a strike, but he is going to let the pitcher call whether it was a ball or a strike.

The pitcher says it was a strike. The game is over. The pitcher's team is the winner.

What if one's child was the batter and the pitch was over his head?

How could one ever explain to him what had happened? One would never be able to convince him that there was any fairness or sportsmanship connected with such a proceeding.

When a State takes away a right given in the Constitution and the Supreme Court refuses to hear the case and leaves the matter up to the State, it is similar to the umpire refusing to call the pitch and letting the pitcher call whether his own pitch was a ball or a strike.

III

Cases construing the constitutionality of the taking away of one's right to be heard would have to date from those two Judiciary Acts, but there seem to be none on the subject.

In reviewing cases prior to those acts it seems that there has always been at least one hearing in a court of the United States, when the case came within one of the specified classes in the Constitution.

This is true of Ex Parte McCardle, 6 Wall. 318 and 7 Wall. 506, which is referred to as "* * * the ultimate in sustaining congressional power over the (Supreme) Court's appellate jurisdiction.[3]

The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court was taken away, but there remained jurisdiction in the circuit court, where McCardle received a hearing.

Such cases as *Turner* v. *Bank of North America*, 4 Dall. 8, and *Sheldon* v. *Still*, 8 How. 441, are cited as examples of congressional power over the jurisdiction of the inferior courts.[4]

Denied trial in the inferior courts, the parties in these cases could have conceivably prosecuted their cases in the State courts and then appealed to the Supreme Court.

In *Cary* v. *Curtis*, 3 How. 245, it is stated that Congress by the act of 1839 "has made the head of the Treasury Department the tribunal for the examination of claims for duties said to have been improperly paid." In 1962 in the Glidden case, 82 S. Ct. 1459, Justice Harlan refers to this case, 1 c. 1472, note 21:

"As for Bakelite, its reliance on *Cary* v. *Curtis* for the proposition that disputes over customs duties may be adjudged summarily without recourse to judicial proceedings, appears to have overlooked the care with which that decision specifically declined to rule whether all right of action might be taken away from a protestant, even going so far as to suggest several judicial remedies that might have been available."

There is, however, a question inherent in the line of cases, represented by *Cary* v. *Curtis;* namely, Can Congress create article I courts to take the place of article III courts?[5]

Footnotes at end of speech.

It is seen that this question is basically the same as the question, Can Congress provide that no court of the United States, created pursuant to article III,[6] need hear a case arising under the Constitution?

The answer to both questions is "No."

IV

The underlying concept of the powers of Congress seems to stem from a misinterpretation of article III, section II, par. II, and in particular from the application of the word "exceptions."

The Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such "exceptions" and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

The Federalist papers, Nos. 80 and 81, refer to this subject of "exceptions."

Federalist paper No. 80 discusses the classes of cases to which the judiciary authority of the United States is to extend:

"From this review of the particular powers of the Federal judiciary, as marked out in the Constitution, it appears that they are all conformable to the principles which ought to have governed the structure of that department, and which were necessary to the perfection of the system. If some partial inconveniences should appear to be connected with the incorporation of any of them into the plan, it ought to be recollected that the National Legislature will have ample authority to make such 'exceptions' and to prescribe such regulations as will be calculated to obviate or remove those inconveniences." [7]

A reading of No. 81 is necessary to ascertain the precise meaning of the above quotation from No. 80. In that quotation the word "inconveniences" appears twice.

Federalist paper No. 81 develops what those "inconveniences" are:

"We have seen that the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court would be confined to two classes of causes, and those of a nature rarely to occur. In all the other cases of Federal cognizance, the original jurisdiction would appertain to the inferior tribunals; and the Supreme Court would have nothing more than an appellate jurisdiction, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

"The propriety of this appellate jurisdiction has been scarcely called in question in regard to matter of law; but the clamor has been loud against it as applied to matters of fact.

"The following train of ideas may well be imagined to have influenced the convention in relation to this particular provision. The appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court (it might have been argued) will extend to causes determinable in different modes, some in the course of the common law, others in the course of the civil law. In the former, the revision of the law only will be, generally speaking, the proper province of the Supreme Court; in the latter, the reexamination of the fact is agreeable to usage, and in some cases, of which prize causes are an example, might be essential to the preservation of the public peace. It is therefore necessary that the appellate jurisdiction should, in certain cases, extend in the broadest sense to matters of fact. It will not answer to make an express exception of cases which shall have been originally tried by jury, because in the courts of some of the States all causes are tried in this mode; and such an exception would preclude the revision of matters of fact, as well where it might be proper, as where it might be improper. To avoid all inconveniences, it will be safest to declare generally, that the Supreme Court shall possess appellate jurisdiction both as to law and fact, and that this jurisdiction shall be subject to exceptions and regulations as the National Legislature may prescribe." [8]

So, it is seen that these "exceptions" were intended as possible limitations on the review of facts and were not intended as a limitation on the review of law and were not intended to authorize Congress to provide that no court of the United States need hear a case arising under the Constitution.

Congress can constitutionally solve the problem of too many appeals from the State courts to the Supreme Court in cases arising under the Constitution by providing that the inferior courts, which Congress has created, shall hear the appeals from the State courts.

Federalist paper No. 82 is testimony that this solution is in accord with the Constitution: "And this being the case, I perceive at present no impediment to the establishment of an appeal from the State courts to the subordinate national tribunals; and many advantages attending the power of doing it may be imagined." [9]

An appropriate summary of the case is contained in the same Federalist paper: "The evident aim of the plan of the convention is, that all the causes of the specified classes shall, for weighty public reasons, receive their original or final determination in the courts of the Union." [10]

---

[1] Frankfurter and Landis, The Business of the Supreme Court (1928), Macmillan, pp. 259–260.

[2] William Bennett Munro, The Government of the U.S., Macmillan (1946), p. 549.

[3] The Constitution of the U.S. of America, Analysis & Interpretation, 1952, U.S. Government Printing Office. Prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Edward S. Corwin, Editor, p. 615.

[4] Ibid., p. 619.

[5] In the *Glidden* case, l. c. 1472, Justice Harlan remarks, "Nor need we now explore the extent to which Congress may commit the execution of even inherently judicial business to tribunals other than Article III courts."

[6] *Glidden*, l. c. 1469, "The Constitution nowhere makes reference to 'legislative courts.' The power given Congress in Art. I, No. 8, cl. 9, 'To constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court,' plainly relates to 'inferior Courts' provided for in Art. III, No. 1, it has never been relied on for establishment of any other tribunals."

[7] The Federalist, edited by Henry Cabot Lodge, from McLean's Edition (1788), G. P. Putnam's Sons, (1888), p. 501.

[8] Ibid., pp. 509–511.

[9] Ibid., p. 516.

[10] Ibid., p. 515.

Eulogy—Hon. John Beamer

SPEECH
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be a friend of John Beamer. In many ways his family and ours enjoyed a variety of mutual interests and they were all pleasant.

John Beamer was a remarkable man. He had a keen mind, compassionate heart, and delightful personality.

The Beamer family was a close one and their wonderful devotion to one another was always obvious.

As he evinced his talents as a community and civic leader, John was destined to be called to higher service. It was no surprise indeed that he should be called ultimately to national service. We were closely associated during the 8 years of his congressional tenure. It was my privilege to observe his activities on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I can say that he was one of its most diligent and knowledgeable members. In fact his entire career was one in which the characteristics of a truly dedicated servant of the people were outstanding.

His last hour found him in the service of his Lord and those of his friends—they are legion—know that he would not have had it otherwise.

Our deepest sympathy is extended to his lovely wife, Letha, and their family.

Letters on Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. GILL
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, the fight for medicare legislation is not new, but this year we have arrived at a new juncture in the struggle. The Senate has approved a medicare under social security plan and I feel strongly that it is the responsibility of the House to approve this or a similar measure before going home.

The people of Hawaii, like the majority of our senior citizens across the Nation, want the Congress to approve a medicare plan under social security. In Hawaii we have an organization called the Hojukai which is made up of elderly Japanese people. The Hojukai is under the able leadership of Rev. K. C. Kondo. The Reverend Kondo and his organization in 1962 collected more than 33,000 names on a petition urging the Congress to approve the social security medicare program. This year, in 1 week, they have collected 5,000 names on new petitions. In addition to this, many members of the Hojukai have written me urging the passage of this vital legislation.

Here is a sampling of these letters:

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
September 12, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS GILL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GILL: I am now approaching the age of so-called "worrying." In less than 15 years, I, too, shall be receiving social security benefits, God willing.

It will be heartwarming to know that medicare will be available soon for the retired persons and for our generation too. Please give us your kokua.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. MAY F. HYNES.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
September 12, 1964.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GILL: Please support the medicare bill.

Yours truly,

Mrs. T. HARANO.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
September 11, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS P. GILL,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am of the older citizen in your community. The cost of hospitalization is a fear that many of us face as we grow older. I cannot afford private hospitalization insurance and there are no group plan that I can join. If I must go to the hospital for a long stay, it will use up all my life savings and leave me in a very serious condition.

Please use your office to help pass a social security medical plan for the aged. This is what we need for real security.

Very truly yours,

Mr. GENTARO TANAKA.

HONOLULU, HAWAII.

DEAR MR. GILL: We requesting you and your endeavors to pass for the a poor old-man medical aid law in Congress which is we are always concerning for the present high expensive medical and hospital bill.

By the way, we depending only you strenuously effort.

Very sincerely,

T. YAMASAKI.

HONOLULU, HAWAII.

Hon. THOMAS GILL,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am one of older citizens in your community. The cost of hospitalization is a fear that many of us face as we grow older. I cannot afford private hospitalization insurance and there are no group plan that I can join. If I must go to the hospital for a long stay, it will use up all my life savings and leave me in a very serious condition.

Please use your office to help pass a social security medical plan for the aged. This is what we need for real security.

Very truly yours.

Mr. YOSHIO FUJII.
Mrs. MISANO FUJII.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
September 12, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS P. GILL,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am one of the older citizens in your community. The cost of hospitalization is a fear that many of us face as we grow older.

I cannot afford private hospitalization insurance and there are no group plans that I can join. If I must go to the hospital for a long stay, it will use up all my life savings and leave me in a very serious condition.

Please use your office to help pass a social security medical plan for the aged.

This is what we need for real security.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. JEAN YAMADA.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
September 11, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS P. GILL,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am one of the older citizens in your community. The cost of hospitalization is a fear that many of us face as we grow older. I cannot afford private hospitalization insurance and there are no group plans that I can join. If I must go to the hospital for a long stay, it will use up all my life savings and leave me in a very serious condition.

Please use your office to help pass a social security medical plan for the aged. This is what we need for real security.

Very truly yours,

Mr. GEORGE K. TANAKA.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
September 12, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I am one of the older citizens in your community. The cost of hospitalization is a fear that many of us have as we grow older. I cannot afford private hospitalization and insurance and there are no group plans that I can join. If I must go to the hospital for a long stay, it will use up all my life savings and leave me in a very serious condition. Please use your office to help pass a social security medical plan for the aged. This is what we need for real security.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. CHIYO MCKILLOP.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
September 12, 1964.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GILL: As an aged resident of Hawaii, may I respectfully request your full support of medicare bill?

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. SHIZUKO IKUMA.

HILO, HAWAII,
September 12, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS P. GILL,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am one of the older citizens in your community. The cost of hospitalization is a fear that many of us face as we grow older. I cannot afford private hospitalization and there is no group plan that I can join. If I must go to the hospital for a long stay, it will use up all my life savings and leave me in a very serious condition.

Please use your office to help pass a social security medical plan for the aged. This is what we need for real security.

Very truly yours,

HIDEKICHI SUEOKA.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
September 11, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS GILL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GILL: I am the mother of six grown children and the wife of a retired tailor. We now receive social security benefits and it is a blessing.

However, medicare will be the ultimate blessing for people like ourselves and it will make the sunset of our lives a great deal longer and brighter. I thank you for your interest and help.

Yours very truly,

SHIGE OKAMOTO.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
September 11, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS GILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GILL: I beseech you to make medicare possibe for retired persons like myself and for the multitude of workers who will be eligible for social security benefits and medicare in the very near future. Medicare will be an added security especially for people who are retired and who have worked hard to educate his children to become good citizens on meager earnings, all his life and now finds that any help from Uncle Sam will be a godsend.

Thank you.

Yours very truly,

YUICHI OKAMOTO.

KAHUKU, HAWAII,
September 12, 1964.

HOZU KAI,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

DEAR SIR: I am a widow, who is aged with no income.

I would be very happy if there will be a passage of the medicare bill.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

ASA KANEYUKI.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
September 12, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS P. GILL,
New Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am one of the older citizens in your community; the cost of hospitalization is a fear that many of us face as we grow older. I cannot afford private hospitalization insurance and there are no group plans that I can join.

If I must go to the hospital for a long stay, it will use up all my life savings and leave me in a very serious condition.

Please us your office to help pass a social security medical plan for the aged.

This is what we need for real security.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. HIDEI ODA.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
September 12, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS P. GILL,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am one of the older citizens in your community. The cost of hospitalization is a fear that many of us face as we grow older. I can't afford private hospitalization insurance and there are no group plans that I can join. If I must go to the hospital for a long stay, it will use up all my life savings and leave me in a very serious condition.

Please use your office to help pass a social security medical plan for the aged. This is what we need for real security.

Very truly yours,

JAMES T. NAMIKI.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
September 14, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS P. GILL,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am one of the older citizens in your community. The cost of hospitalization is a fear that many of us face as we grow older.

I cannot afford private hospitalization insurance and there are no group plans that I can join.

If I must go to the hospital for a long stay, it will use up all my life savings and leave me in a very serious condition.

Please use your office to help pass a social security medical plan for the aged.

This is what we need for real security.

Very truly yours,

ELIZABETH AIARESMA.

PACIFIC LABORATORIES, INC.,
Honolulu, Hawaii, September 15, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS P. GILL,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am one of the older citizens in your community. The cost of hospitalization is a fear that many of us face as we grow older. I cannot afford private hospitalization insurance and there are no group plans that I can join. If I must go to the hospital for a long stay, it will use up all of my life savings and leave me in a very serious condition.

Please use your office to help pass a social security medical plan for the aged. This is what we need for real security.

Very truly yours,

JAMES K. YONEMURA.

SEPTEMBER 11, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS P. GILL,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GILL: I am one of the older citizens in your community. The cost of hospitalization is a fear that many of us face as we grow older. I cannot afford private hospitalization insurance and there are no group plans that I can join. If I must go to the hospital for a long stay, it will use up

all my life savings and leave me in a very serious condition.

Please use your office to help pass a social security medical plan for the aged. This is what we need for real security.

Sincerely yours,

KAME KANESHIRO.

SEPTEMBER 14, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS P. GILL.

DEAR MR. GILL: As you know, I am one of the older citizens in this community. The cost of hospitalization is a fear that many of us face as we grow older. I know that a number of my friends who cannot afford private hospitalization insurance and there are no group plans that they can easily join.

If they must go to the hospital for a long stay, it will use up all their life savings and leave them in a very serious condition. I am seriously considering these matters as I see they are aging fast.

Please use your office to help pass a social security medical plan for the aged. This is what we need for real security.

Very truly yours,

SEINOSUKE TSUKIYAMA.

I have also received a number of letters written in Japanese. Here are the names of persons from whom such letters were received:

H. Aihara, 1739 Nakula Street, Wahiawa, Hawaii.

S. Baba, 603 F. Kunawai Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.

U. Fujita, Lihue, Kauai, Hawaii.

Kinu Furukawa, 410–C Ulupaina Street, Kailua, Hawaii.

Masaru Furukawa, 410–C Ulupaina Street, Kailua, Hawaii.

Mr. and Mrs. S. Hada, 713 University Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Sato Hanki, 334 Koa Street, Wahiawa, Hawaii.

Y. Henna, 1805 Akone Place, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Zenpei Higashi, Post Office Box 36, Honalunau, Hawaii.

Hiroyoshi Hirota, 718 University Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii.

I. Horii, 2074 Young Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

S. Inada, 45–689 Pua Alowalo Street, Kaneohe, Hawaii.

Kumaki Inouye, 1969 Kilauea Avenue, Hilo, Hawaii.

Mrs. K. Ishii, 1619 Ua Drive, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Hashiji T. Kakazu, Post Office Box 193, Halualoa, Kona, Hawaii.

Hirato Kajiwara, 1507 Makiki Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Isao Kato, 66 Kealakekua, Kona, Hawaii.

H. Kondo, 2820–B Kapiolani Boulevard, Honolulu, Hawaii.

C. T. Matsuda, 2506 Rooke Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii.

K. Matsuda, 2506 Rooke Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii.

T. Miyagawa, 4467 Alakoa Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Charles Miyashiro, 1583 Pahulu Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Kame Miyrashiro, 1583 Pahulu Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Mr. and Mrs. C. Miyazaki, 625–D Kunawai Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.

K. Miyazono, 2820 Kapiolani Boulevard, Honolulu, Hawaii.

M. Miyazono, 2820 Kapiolani Boulevard, Honolulu, Hawaii.

S. Murakami, Post Office Box 686, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii.

Yaroku Murashige, 1962 9th Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Mrs. J. Murobayashi, 1320–A 17th Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii.

K. Nakamoto, 460 Glen View Place, Wahiawa, Hawaii.

S. Nakamura, 1758 Young Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Shigemori Nishi, 2226 Palolo Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Shojiro Okamuro, 907 16th Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Kinpei Okuda, 33 Puainako Street, Hilo, Hawaii.

S. Okura, 456 Halapia Place, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Juichi Saito, 347 Koa Street, Wahiawa, Hawaii.

Kimiyo Saito, 347 Koa Street, Wahiawa, Hawaii.

N. Sakamoto, 1628 Democrat Street Honolulu, Hawaii.

Mrs. Matsue Sakata, Box 678, Honokaa, Hawaii.

T. Shimoda, 234 Valley Avenue, Wahiawa, Hawaii.

Aya Toki, 3684 Waialae Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii.

K. Ushijima, 3122 Hinano Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Tona Watai, 2519 Myrtle Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Juzo Watanabe, 944 18th Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Rev. K. Asaoka, Post Office Box 664, Kapaa, Kauai, Hawaii.

Mr. Eijiro R. Iwamura, 176 Muliwai Avenue, Wahiawa, Hawaii.

Eulogy—Hon. John Beamer

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of sorrow that I learned of the passing of my dear friend, the former Congressman from the Fifth District of Indiana, the Honorable John Beamer.

It was my privilege to be a close personal friend of this remarkable man. I first met John Beamer several years ago while he was a Member of the Congress and I served in other capacities. He had a brilliant mind and was most helpful in his advice to me when I became a Member of the House.

John served his community of Wabash, Ind., as a civic leader, and even after coming to Washington to serve in Congress his ties were very close to his hometown.

Although I never had the privilege of serving with him in Congress, I have had many occasions to know this great man intimately, and to be aware of his dedicated service to those in his community and to the Congress and to the Nation.

His passing occurred during the time he was demonstrating his love of God and his church. I know his many friends in Wabash will sorely miss this great leader, and I want at this time to extend my depest sympathy to his lovely wife, Letha, and to his family. There is little one can say at such a time, but perhaps the fact that we pause to remember a great man will be some measure of comfort to his wife and family.

The 15th Anniversary of the Federal Republic of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on September 22 the Federal Republic of Germany marked its 15th anniversary. On this momentous occasion, we wish to take opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Chancellor Ludwig Erhard and to His Excellency the German Ambassador to the United States, Heinrich Knappstein.

This is an appropriate time to take stock of the distance the German people have traveled in the almost 20 years since the close of World War II and in the 15 years since the establishment of the West German Government. Shame, defeat, devastation, and foreign occupation were the lot of the German people in 1945. But in 4 short years, under the guidance of the military government authorities of the Western Powers, Germans residing in the Western zones of occupation had made sufficient progress in reestablishing order in their affairs to be empowered to establish a central government with relatively large responsibilities in the domestic realm.

Unfortunately, the same 4 years marked a growing split between the Soviet Union and the Western allies. Whereas the Western Powers sought to establish central administrative agencies for the whole of Germany and to plan for the holding of eventual free elections in all four zones, the Soviet Union sought only to consolidate its hold on the Eastern Zone while casting a hungry eye toward Berlin and West Germany. Thus, while West Germans could take pride in the birth of the Bonn government on September 21, 1949, they at the same time had to accept the fait-accompli of a divided Germany and to recognize that the way to reunification would be long and difficult.

Under the able leadership of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, the West Germans in 1949 refused to let distress over a divided Germany become a national obsession. Instead, they turned their attention to the tasks of rebuilding the West German economy and of establishing a strong, democratic regime. Even more important, they set out to play a constructive role in Europe. It is a measure of the intelligence and determination of Adenauer and his successor, Chancellor Ludwig Erhard, that these efforts have been crowned with success. Today, the German economy is far stronger and more prosperous than it was in prewar years. War-torn industries have been rebuilt and hundreds of thousands of refugees from the East have been absorbed in the employment market. The West German government has proved remarkably stable and there are signs that a two-party system may soon become firmly established. In Europe, the

West Germans have led in the movement toward European unity, which is a goal that has captured the imagination of the youth of West Germany. With the settlement of the Saar dispute in 1956, the last impediment to the realization of good relations with France vanished. The Franco-German rapprochement that has occurred since that time is surely one of the greatest achievements of postwar Germany.

As it rapidly became apparent that West Germans were determined to turn their backs on the past, the Western allies relinquished the powers they had reserved in 1949, and assigned increasing importance to the positive role West Germans could play in world affairs. Thus, in 1955 West Germany became a member of NATO, and in 1956 began to rearm in order to make a contribution to the defense forces of the Atlantic Alliance. Today, with almost 12 divisions assigned to NATO command, the West German contribution to Western forces stands second only to that of the United States. West Germany has assumed other burdens. The government makes a substantial contribution to the costs of stationing American and British troops in Germany. The West German foreign aid program, which is worldwide, has steadily grown.

During the visit of our late President Kennedy to Berlin and West Germany in the summer of 1963, the strength of the ties between the United States and West Germany was made eloquently clear. These ties have been further strengthened by the recent visits of Chancellor Ludwig Erhard to this country. The distance traveled since 1945 is far indeed. Today, West Germany is a respected member of the family of free Nations, and it is a pleasure to salute the remarkable achievements of a friend and an ally.

Jim Jacobs' Contribution to International Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, there are a great many citizens of this country who are devoting their time and energy, on a volunteer basis, to one kind of humanitarian service or another. Not the least of this group are the "ham" radio operators, many of whom have worked out highly useful ways of combining their hobby with very significant public services. James M. Jacobs of Chestnut Hill, who is the president of a well-known haberdashery in Harvard Square, Cambridge, has taken the lead in this kind of effort in the Boston area and has been widely commended for his efforts. Recently, for example, the Naval Communications Bulletin, published by the Navy Department, called special attention to his contribution in creating, drilling and supervising a net of thirty amateur stations in the Boston area. This group, which has helped out in a number of emergencies, was especially effective during the Alaskan earthquake, relaying more than 500 messages to people in the devastated area and working with the Red Cross.

Over and above the establishment of this net, Mr. Jacobs has performed a number of life-saving enterprises for people in foreign lands. In May of this year, for example, he responded to a request from a hospital in Lima, Peru, for a special valve needed for a delicate heart operation. Obtaining the valve from a Boston hospital, he got it on a plane so it reached Lima within 48 hours of the first request. The same night he was asked by a fellow "ham" operator in Venezuela to get another valve for an operation on an infant in Caracas; again he made the necessary arrangements and the instrument was soon on its way. In March, he kept Boston surgeons in touch with the progress of a patient of theirs who was recovering from a hand-graft operation in Peru; 3 months ago he made it possible for an Ecuadorian girl to come to a Boston hospital for a stomach operation; and last November he made similar arrangements for the 11-month-old son of Israel's ambassador to Ecuador. Jim Jacob's name is now so well-known in Latin America that he is constantly responding to requests of this kind. In his own way, he is making a truly important contribution to international understanding in general and the Alliance for Progress in particular.

Auburn, N.Y., Mets Win the New York-Pennsylvania Class A League Pennant, and Also Win the Governor's Cup Playoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to extend my warm congratulations to the Auburn Mets, of Auburn, N.Y., in my congressional district. This great team, part of the New York Mets farm system, has just racked up a tremendous record by winning, not only the New York-Pennsylvania Class A League pennant, but also the Governor's Cup playoffs.

We are proud of this fine group of athletes and the great community of sponsors, fans, and supporters who have made this winning combination possible. In the process, they have also made Auburn "Baseball Town, U.S.A."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial from the Auburn Citizen Advertiser:

BASEBALL TOWN

Auburnians can be particularly proud of their Mets baseball team this year.

And this isn't solely because they have won their second straight New York-Pennsylvania Class A league pennant. It's much more than that.

It was explained in part when their manager, Clyde McCullough, described them as one of the best groups of young athletes he ever has been associated with. This is why Mac, a veteran of 30 years in organized baseball and a member of three pennant-winning major league teams, was compelled to say that Sunday's victory was a "bigger thrill than any of them."

The young players gave their best on the field, of course. But they also were gentlemen off the field as well as on.

And there's no doubt that they were inspired to a great degree by the intense loyalty of their fans. More than 700 of them made the trip to Geneva Sunday to cheer them to victory. And thousands of others unable to attend were able to follow them by radio, thanks to local sponsors.

This year's successful season has caused older fans to recall the days when the national pastime was at its peak in the 1920's, when "outlaw" baseball was played at old Norwood Park.

But Auburn always has been known throughout the sports world for its contribution to baseball, so it's not surprising that a national magazine currently is working up an article on "Auburn—Baseball Town, U.S.A."

Fleet Reserve Association Marks 40 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Fleet Reserve Association's 40th anniversary falls on November 11 of this year. The history and progress of any organization, in a great measure, reflects the personalities and abilities of its founders. Society has recognized the need for organizations—fraternal, charitable, protective, and social. All organizations qualify in some of these respects, but since its inception the Fleet Reserve Association has been a composite of all four. Since 1924 when a self-sacrificing group of enlisted shipmates gathered in South Philadelphia and formally organized it, the Fleet Reserve Association, established in the spirit of loyalty, protection, and service, has forged ahead until it is the acknowledged leader in affairs concerning the career serviceman of the Navy and Marine Corps, indeed, the career serviceman of all services. No greater tribute organization than its present membership total of nearly 60,000 in a highly restricted group.

Claims can be made for any organization, but an organization that can sustain its claims is the Fleet Reserve Association. It is primarily interested in the long-time enlisted man, the man who enters the Regular Navy or Marine Corps for a career. It is proud of its 40 years of adhering to its three cardinal principles: Loyalty, protection, and service.

The October 1964 issue of Naval Affairs magazine, has carefully gathered together the record of the association's long history of accomplishment. I have asked that it be placed in this RECORD, following

my remarks, believing that the material deserves both the attention of the Congress and preservation in this manner:

THE FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION, 1924–64—40 YEARS' SERVICE

("With reverence for God and country and being mindful of the glorious traditions of the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps; our duty to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; our responsibility to aid in maintaining adequate naval defense for our beloved country; our desire to assist in obtaining the best type of American manhood for our Navy and Marine Corps; our interest in the welfare of the men who served and are serving in the Navy and Marine Corps; our devotion to our shipmates in good fortune or distress; our reverence for the memory of our departed shipmates; we associate ourselves together and declare this to be the Constitution of the Fleet Reserve Association.")

PREAMBLE TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION

Setting forth on an uncharted sea with naught to guide them but the above lofty principles, less than 100 shipmates gathered at a formal organizing assembly at 2417 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa., in October 1922 to form the Fleet Reserve Association. The group chose that name because their members were largely from the Fleet Naval Reserve component or eligible to transfer to it. In other words, this was the first time in recorded naval history that career enlisted men were banding together for mutual loyalty, protection, and service.

The idea of banding together in such a fashion had its inception in the mind of a chief yeoman, George L. Carlin, on duty in Philadelphia. He is rightfully referred to as "the founder of the Fleet Reserve Association."

His idea stemmed from the earlier action of unorganized enlisted men who contributed to the expense of sending Chief Yeoman Robert W. "Bob" White and Chief Gunner's Mate Carl H. McDonald, U.S. Navy, retired, to Washington, D.C., to represent the enlisted men on legislation affecting them being considered by Congress.

In 1916 the Naval Reserve Act was enacted which permitted enlisted men of the Regular Navy and the Regular Marine Corps to transfer to the Fleet Naval Reserve, upon completion of 16 and 20 years of active service. At this time it became apparent that there was a need for an active organization to preserve the rights and benefits which Congress granted to these personnel and their dependents.

During the years of World War I, no attempt was made to secure direct representation for the enlisted man in the halls of Congress. However, in 1919, through the efforts of loyal shipmates, and with the sanction of the Navy Department, Chiefs White and McDonald, were able to present the views of the enlisted men in hearings on proposed pay legislation, then under consideration in the Congress. They made an excellent presentation of fact, and substantial pay increases were recorded in the passage of a temporary pay bill written in the act of May 18, 1920. A permanent pay plan was under consideration in the Congress in 1921–22. The successes obtained in the Temporary Pay Act of 1920 emphasized the need of an organization evident to protect these gains during the 1921–22 period. Unfortunately, no organization of enlisted men had formed to back up the beneficial work of Bob White and when he worked on the proposed permanent pay legislation he had to ask again for voluntary contributions to meet his expenses.

It was during this second fundraising campaign that Chief Carlin thought the time opportune for organizing a permanent organization and he devised the "Philadelphia plan." He wrote a letter to every fleet reservist in the 4th Naval District outlining his plan. Several informal meetings of this group followed and led to the organizing meeting in October 1922. The shipmates assembled there elected their first staff of officers; namely, president, William P. Green; vice president, Francis A. Knauss; secretary, George L. Carlin; treasurer, Walter E. Lowery; and they chose Bob White to represent them in Washington, D.C. Shipmate Carlin's letter received such a favorable response that he was encouraged to seek support from other naval districts.

This pioneering crew had to face their problems without experience in a new and exclusive type of protective unionism. Their organizing was viewed with alarm in many quarters of the Naval Establishment. They held no weapons of civil action, such as strikes, with which to force their desires. To gain disputed points they had only logic, debatable laws, honorable service, and a sense of American fairplay to support their efforts. They had no treasury with which to fight their way through the Federal courts, if necessary. To gain such a treasury would require immediate growth in membership. Despite these drawbacks, they courageously tackled the challenges of growth and ways and means of operating effectively.

It was not easy to navigate safely through the rocks and shoals of fear of naval discipline, inexperience, and financial weakness; but those who would ask proof of their success need only to compare the standard of living of the enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps lists (active, fleet reserve and retired) of today with their condition before the Fleet Reserve Association began to guard them. Such comparison must include the dependents of these men, too, for in this field truly vast success has been attained.

In 1923 came the first test of the ability of the new organization to provide protection for its members and potential members. Shipmates who had accepted temporary commissions in the Navy in World War I, were taken aback by the decision of the Comptroller General that only enlisted time could be counted as time served for transfer to the Fleet Naval Reserve. In the interim, many men, with commissioned service had transferred to the Fleet Naval Reserve. Under the sponsorship of the new organization, Bill H.R. 4820 was written in such a manner that no one could question its intent, allowing all active duty time, enlisted and commissioned, to count for transfer to the Fleet Naval Reserve. This was the first of many signal victories by the group.

The hardworking founders in Philadelphia aroused the interest of eligibles in the large cities in the East and the first organization movement outside the 4th Naval District came to life in the New York City area, under the leadership of Cornelius E. Anderson and James C. Shields. They launched a temporary setup on December 3, 1923, at the National Navy Club, New York City, and Shipmate Anderson was elected president. This was the birth of branch 2, which made Brooklyn its home. It was the first big step in expansion which eventually carried the Fleet Reserve Association to a growth of 280 branches located throughout the United States and overseas.

The charter of the Fleet Reserve Association was obtained on November 11, 1924, in the court of common pleas, Philadelphia. The constitution, as we know it now, was accepted on January 5, 1925, and, on the same date, the seventh branch charter was issued.

The association continued to win outstanding victories for the career enlisted man. They were responsible for the savings clause in the Naval Reserve Act of 1925 (which abolished future 16-year transfers to the Fleet Naval Reserve) to allow anyone on active duty on July 1, 1925, to retain all existing benefits pertaining to pay and time on transfer with either 16 or 20 years active service. Another outstanding victory was gained while fighting the Comptroller General's decision in the Willie Conway case. The Attorney General ruled that the Secretary of the Navy was competent to determine the eligibility of any person in the naval service for transfer to the Fleet Reserve, and that his decision was final and conclusive.

The distinctive triangular emblem of the Fleet Reserve Association was adopted in June 1925. To this date the cardinal principles embodied in its design—loyalty, protection, and service—have ever been true.

During the first national convention, under the charter granted by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the constitution was amended providing eligibility to membership of members of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve.

In 1927 the creation of a legislative committee was another forward step, made necessary by the ever-growing membership and the chartering of additional branches. In this year recognition was given the Fleet Reserve Association to act as agent for principals in matters before the Veterans' Administration.

The country was enjoying unprecedented prosperity in 1928 and legislation detrimental to the career man "just wasn't." In passing, it may be noted that during the prosperous years the Congress is apt to consider the man in uniform a pretty good fellow, but let the tide turn and the career man becomes an expensive luxury. At this time the membership rolls numbered 1,700 shipmates, but what they lacked in numbers, they more than made up with a clearly defined legislative program.

By 1929, the organization had proved its worth to the Navy Department. At its sixth national convention in Norfolk, no less than three rear admirals addressed the assembled delegates; one being Rear Adm. R. H. Leigh, the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, or the Chief of Naval Personnel as it is known today. Success of the new organization was assured when Rear Admiral Leigh unequivocally gave the association the endorsement of the Navy Department. Similar expressions have been forthcoming ever since.

Legislation, including free hospitalization and medical treatment for members of the Fleet Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve, passed the Congress in 1930; later, however, the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery put a stopper on this legislation as a result of a ruling by the Comptroller General. It was not until 8 years later that the career man finally received the benefits of this important legislation when the Navy Reserve Act of 1938 became law.

During the 1930 convention held in Washington, D.C., annual dues were reduced to $9. The delegates assembled recognized the ladies auxiliary. Also in this year, through the support of the association the pay of members of the Naval Academy Band was placed on par with other musicians in the naval service.

A milestone in 1931 was the copyrighting of the title "Naval Affairs" for the official magazine of the Fleet Reserve Association. This superseded the "Fleet Reserve Bulletin," which was returned to its owners. A further change was made when the convention, held in Philadelphia, voted to reduce from 25 to 15, the number of names required to be on a petition requesting a branch charter.

As is well known the great depression of the early 1930's created economic havoc. Great economy moves stemmed from Congress. One such move was to give all Fleet Reserve men 1 year's pay in cash and remove them from the rolls. The FRA mustered the strength to defeat this proposal. Thanks to a

savings provision, introduced by the FRA, which included two words "except enlisted," they thereby prevented the members of the Armed Forces from taking a pay cut of from 8 to 20 percent in 1932.

The latter only saved the day temporarily, because the so-called Economy Act of July 1933, reduced the pay of the Armed Forces 15 percent and this action was bona fide proof of the axiom "What Congress gives, Congress can take away."

The shipmates in attendance at the ninth national convention in New York adopted a program to fight the 15-percent pay cut. In addition they proposed recognition of the free hospitalization while hospitalized in naval hospitals and civil service preference for inactive duty men with more than 16 years of service.

That year, 1934, the shipmates enjoyed the restoration of 10 percent of the pay cut in two 5-percent increments. The remaining 5 percent was restored in April 1935. While it would not be true for the Fleet Reserve Association to claim full credit for this restoration of pay, it did, as an organization, use all means at its command to alleviate the hardships caused the enlisted man by this cut.

Not only was the enlisted man faced with financial difficulty in 1934, the association experienced a financial crisis, too. The association, despite its magnificent service to the career enlisted man, had a total membership of a mere 2,000, yet owed debts totaling $5,000. The national president, Jesse M. Acuff, requested the branches to loan sufficient cash to the national body to allow it to pay off its debtors. The individual branch loan to be proportionate to its membership. He appointed a prosperity committee to administer the receipt of the loans and the disbursements to creditors. The response from the branches were overwhelming and the creditors were promptly paid off.

At the 10th national convention in Boston a new fiscal policy was adopted and the position of financial secretary in the Washington, D.C., executive offices was created. Shipmate C. A. Tudge, of Washington, was the first man to fill this billet. Also, at that convention, Shipmate Charles E. Lofgren was elected national secretary although he was not able to actively fulfill his duties until January 1935. When the complete new team started to work in January 1935 the association had but 2,000 members and owed the oustanding sums of the loans to the branches. Six months later at the end of the association year, membership had climbed by 93 percent, the loans to the branches were repaid in full, and treasury contained almost $5,000. This success was largely due to the stewardship of Shipmate National Secretary Lofgren, who is now the national secretary emeritus. The association secured a top rating with Dun & Bradstreet shortly thereafter and has been on a sound financial basis ever since.

In 1935, the association's national executive offices were moved from the Earle Theater Building to the Investment Building where they remained until the latter part of 1951. The association then moved to 522 Rhode Island Avenue NW., where it stayed until it purchased its present building.

Another benefit gained for the fleet reservists and retired man in 1935 was the eligibility for care in Veterans' Administration facilities in areas where Army and Navy hospitals were not available. Also gained was a provision for obtaining medical care for their families by Navy medical officers within designated areas adjacent to navy yards and naval stations.

In January 1936 the national secretary appeared before the Naval Affairs Subcommittee of the House of Representatives on a proposed reorganization of Fleet Reserve personnel. Through the watchfulness of the Fleet Reserve Association nothing of value was lost to the enlisted man. Legislation granting commissary privileges to widows of officers and enlisted men was enacted by the Congress. Membership this year reached 6,000, due mainly to the activities of the national administrative staff.

The association underwent some internal changes this year with a further subdivision of geographic regional districts. Three new regional districts were created and definite territorial boundaries were assigned each region. A committee was appointed to prepare a plan of action during a national emergency or war. Enjoying the stabilized finances of the past 2 years the association set up a cash reserve of $25,000 over a 5-year period. The distinctive Gold Button Award was initiated this year as an incentive to membership promotion.

In 1937, San Diego, Calif., was the site of the first FRA national convention to be held on the west coast. The office of regional vice president, Philippines, was created at this time. A past presidents pen for branch presidents was approved plus an automobile decalcomania for members. The convention body authorized the investing of surplus funds in Government bonds and provided a term of 2 years for the editor of Naval Affairs.

Shipmate National Secretary Lofgren proved as adept in his dealings with the Members of Congress as he was in boosting membership and squaring away the financial deficit. He and Shipmate Philip G. Cronan, vice chairman of the national service committee, assisted in drawing up the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 at the specific invitation of the Navy Department. The experience, gained by the association, since enactment of the 1925 Naval Reserve Act, was now demonstrated. The prestige of the FRA rose to its greatest heights.

The long fight for renewal of shipping-over money came to a successful conclusion when the Navy Department's directive, in the form of an ALNAV, was published directing that commencing on July 1, 1939, shipping-over money would be paid upon reenlistment or extension. A signal victory to a fight begun 6 years earlier.

A decision to permit retired enlisted men to waive their retired pay to accept higher benefits from the Veterans' Administration was made in November 1939. This altered the procedure whereby a man was first discharged before being taken up on the pension rolls.

The success of the financial policy inaugurated a few years earlier was seen in the purchase of a $10,000 Government bond this year. The custom of presenting a sword to the midshipman at the Naval Academy, standing first in conduct and aptitude in the graduating class was approved. This presentation was made for the first time in June 1940.

1940 was a momentous year for men in the Fleet Reserve; with the declaration of a limited emergency in 1939, many had been recalled to active duty and others were "waiting for the wagon." During 1940 suits were filed in the court of claims, and won, for pay due in behalf of enlisted men who were held in naval hospitals after enlistments had expired and to compel payment of the Medal of Honor gratuity.

The unlimited national emergency occurred in May 1941 and the following month the Fleet Reserve Association was able to secure for members of the Fleet Reserve the base pay and longevity rates as incorporated in the Selective Service and Training Act.

The New England region was formed this year; the constitution amended to provide for retention of membership for shipmates who received warrants or commissions; and the body agreed to operate the organization as heretofore in spite of the national emergency.

Members of the association, who had been taken as prisoners of war, were frozen and classified as being in good standing on the membership rolls. Further, the period of extension for other members, who were arrear in dues, was changed from 90 to 120 days because of the war situation.

The organization was particularly successful in securing for the enlisted man the following benefits, which, with the exception of item No. 1, were effective in 1942. Item No. 1 became effective upon date of signature, December 12, 1941, but a court test was necessary to insure its being retroactive and a favorable decision was rendered the association on June 1, 1942:

1. Pay for enlisted men retained in hospitals beyond expiration of enlistment date.
2. Prescribing a clothing allowance for enlisted men.
3. Elimination of reference to Insular Force being put on one-half allowance.
4. Insular Force to receive full allowances upon reenlistment instead of one-half and full dependent allowances for the three pay grades.
5. Insurance of all longevity increases to fleet reservists and retired men for active service rendered subsequent to transfer to fleet Reserve.
6. Establishment of quarters allowances for first three pay grades.
7. Transportation of dependents of fleet reservists to their homes upon retirement.
8. A savings provision retaining fifth class pay at $66 per month instead of $60.

These benefits were due primarily to the appearance of the national secretary before the Senate and House Military Affairs Committee and one would be naive indeed were he to think that these benefits just sprang from the hearts of the Congress without any urging from friendly outsiders. The new pay act was enacted through the combined efforts of all veterans' groups and public opinion, but the features numbered 1 through 8 may be rightfully claimed by the Fleet Reserve Association.

The claim which the organization had filed in the court of claims for the payment of the Medal of Honor gratuity was won in 1942.

The 19th national convention, scheduled to be held in San Francisco, was canceled at the requests of the Office of Defense Transportation. Instead, a meeting of the national board of directors was held at Chicago in October 1943. The main mandate of this meeting was that the national service committee was to seek legislation to give the F–5 and F–4–C fleet reservists, recalled to active duty and completing 20 years of active duty, the same rights and privileges as given to the F–4–D man. How well this fared may be judged by the fact that every man, now in the Navy, is eligible for transfer to the F–6 class. True, it was simple justice that all men with an equal amount of active duty be paid on a parity but it was hard to convince the Congress.

During 1943 a peculiar situation developed; some laws required proof of honorable discharge in order to apply for veterans benefits. A man being transferred to the Fleet Reserve does not receive a discharge and, under the letter of the law he did not qualify as a veteran. Consultation with the Veterans' Administration ironed out the point at issue and for the purpose of interpretation of the laws of the land as regards to eligibility requirements for veteran benefits, a release from active duty, under honorable conditions, was considered the equivalent of an honorable discharge.

The Fleet Reserve Association sponsored legislation, endorsed by the Navy Department, to make permanent, for members of the Fleet Reserve and retired men, advancements in rating while on active duty.

The year 1944 saw the association lower the membership eligibility requirement to 6 years. The logic behind this change being

that a person who had served 6 years would remain in service as a career man. The legislative program for the year contained a provision for support of universal military training; promotion for men detained as prisoners of war; and to continue support of legislation giving members of the Fleet Reserve and retired men their wartime ratings, with pay, upon return to inactive duty status.

A résumé of the benefits of the Fleet Reserve Association for the enlisted man during 1944 and 1945 follows hereinafter. First we would like to say to the sailorman that nothing just happens; there must always be a beginning, as the mighty oaks from little acorns grow. The implantation of ideas in the Navy Department, and their effective presentation at the right time, by qualified representatives, accounted for the following gains:

(a) Rotation of duty for enlisted man.

(b) Spot promotions.

(c) Transfer of patients in naval hospitals to naval hospitals nearer their homes at Government expense.

(d) Transfer to the naval district of their choice for enlisted surveyees when found eligible for shore duty only.

(e) Protection from discharge, by Boards of Medical Survey, for long-time enlisted men and permitting them to serve ashore until qualified for transfer to the Fleet Reserve.

(f) Thirty days' leave for Fleet Reservists and retired men upon release from active duty.

(g) Securing passage for retir d men in naval vessels to the Philippine Islands.

September 1945, under Fleet Reserve auspices, the shipmates saw two bills introduced into the House of Representatives giving Fleet Reservists and retired enlisted men permanent advancement to ratings earned while on active duty, and credit for longevity service earned during active duty. After much jockeying in the Halls of Congress, Public Law 720 became effective in August 1946.

Some benefits of this law were the retention of promotions made while on active duty; retainer pay to be computed on a total of all active time served; all active time in the Armed Forces to be computed for purposes of transfer to the Fleet Reserve and the election of one of two choices for computing retainer pay.

The 1946 convention at Chicago made changes in the constitution by continuing the eligibility of ex-enlisted men who had received commissions; and went on record to secure legislation for the benefits of the F-5 class fleet reservist.

In June 1947 representatives of the organization were called into conference with officials of the Navy Department to consider a revision of the 1938 Naval Reserve Act. This was of utmost importance to the organization, as it enabled its representatives to have incorporated into the act language that would be acceptable to the Comptroller General. Through an interpretation of Public Law 720, by the Comptroller General, some of the features of this law were not accomplished, and it was not until February 1952, after two court actions in the court of claims were members of the Fleet Reserve able to secure justice.

The prestige, which the organization had acquired in the Navy Department, was further enhanced by the recall of the national secretary to temporary active duty on the so-called Roper Board, a Board headed by the Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, to consider a revision of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938. The Subcommittee of the Roper Board appointed to consider Fleet Reserve problems, consisted of the Deputy Chief of Naval Personnel and the National Secretary of the Fleet Reserve Association.

During the month of December 1948 the report of the Hook Commission on service pay was released. This report seemed likely of acceptance and, as the glamor of victory had been replaced with the feeling that the serviceman could be well forgotten until the advent of another war, things looked dark for the active duty man. The feeling against "Treasury Raiders" was mounting and, to some Congressmen and others in public life, all organizations were tarred with the same brush. One of the features of this report, and of most interest to the man on duty, was the provision which would have eliminated transfer to the Fleet Reserve upon completion of 20 years' service and substitution of a straight 25 years' service or age 50. To say that this proposal caused consternation would be an understatement but, to the credit of the Fleet Reserve Association and the Fleet Reserve Association alone, this proposal was defeated. Shipmates, you will never know how close you came to going out on 25 instead of 20.

The FRA represented the enlisted men throughout the deliberations of Congress on the Hook Commission report. This report evolved into the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and became Public Law 351. Also, in 1949, the FRA instituted four test cases in the Court of Claims on four rulings by the Comptroller General in relation to Public Law 720. The most celebrated of the four cases was the Sanders case named after Past National President Christopher C. Sanders. The case contended that a man who retired on 16 years, was recalled to active duty and served enough time to complete 20 years should have his retired pay based on 20 years (one-half base pay) instead of 16 years (one-third base pay). The FRA fought this case through two appeal courts eventually winning in 1952. The result was that over 3,000 shipmates received more than $7 million back pay.

It is service such as this that has kept the Fleet Reserve Association growing in financial and numerical strength. Today we number near 60,000 members and our assets are in the six figure bracket. Continued growth such as this is assured because the Fleet Reserve Association keeps in constant contact with the leaders in Government and the Military Establishment who control the destiny of the enlisted man of our Armed Forces.

Today the retired man and the fleet reservist is fighting for the protection of his medical care on retirement. Due to a legislative misinterpretation of Public Law 569, the Dependents Medicare Act, in the Appropriations Committee Conferees Report of 1961, beds for retirees' needs are not being programed into new military hospital construction.

Two years ago the FRA launched a study on this problem that resulted in their present hospital rights program. Their program has been very progressive and profitable. It was the FRA's action, and their action alone, that brought about the hearings of a House Special Subcommittee to investigate the problem and write corrective legislation. The legislation will be forthcoming in the 89th Congress.

There is a French proverb stating, "The more things change, the more they stay the same." This is certainly true of the needs of the enlisted man. Despite the vast changes in weaponry and the methods of protecting one's freedom the essential ingredient, manpower, remains. The need for an active organization to preserve the rights and benefits granted to enlisted men and their dependents is as evident today as it was in the years following World War I.

The Fleet Reserve Association will not rest on its laurels of the past 40 years. It is looking forward to the challenges of the future: to bring military pay scales to an equal basis with that of the serviceman's civilian counterpart; the statutory right to medical care for retirees and their dependents; the protection of commissary and exchange privileges; improved military housing; continued protection for the career opportunities of the active duty man; and constant support of adequate naval defense for our Nation.

In all these complex problems we have but one goal—a U.S. Navy and Marine Corps second to none, manned by a personnel superior to all.

A Tribute to Senator Strom Thurmond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following column, written by Mr. Ted Lewis, appeared in today's Daily News of New York.

This article is a fine tribute to Senator STROM THURMOND. It shows how he stands out as a man of courage and how he despises the cant and hypocrisy that is all too prevalent in our day, both at home and abroad.

WASHINGTON, September 21.—One aspect of Senator STROM THURMOND's announcement that he is no longer a South Carolina Democrat but a Goldwater Republican has tended to be overlooked.

This is the fact that by changing his party affiliation on the basis of principle, he has posed an issue of political ethics which is peculiarly involved in this year's presidential campaign.

THURMOND had the guts to be forthright about where he decided he should stand. In doing so, it is now realized, he has exposed the hypocrisy of many of his Southern congressional colleagues who feel like he does but lack courage in their convictions.

And in the process he has also made some anti-Goldwater Republicans look bad. They won't quit their party, even if they much prefer Lyndon Johnson to BARRY.

THURMOND has shown the whole lot up. His honest stand is most embarrassing, however, to Southern leaders of the Democratic Party.

THURMOND has decided that his political philosophy jibes with the conservative viewpoint of GOLDWATER. So, for that matter, does the political philosophy of most other Southern Senators and Representatives.

If THURMOND is a narrowminded Statesrighter, so too is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, Senators JAMES EASTLAND, and JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, SPESSARD HOLLAND, of Florida, and ALLEN ELLENDER, of Louisiana, to name just a few.

But none of these has any intention of breaking with his party. Yet their congressional voting records have been straight down the conservative GOP line, as reflected in GOLDWATER's stand on domestic legislation.

Is this an ethical issue or isn't it? We enjoyed the way in which Lyndon's running mate, HUBERT HUMPHREY, flummoxed on this issue in this "Meet the Press" TV questioning, Sunday.

HUMPHREY FINDS A DIFFERENCE

HUMPHREY found a real difference between a southern Democrat like THURMOND who had the decency to switch from his party and a Dixie Democrat who clung to his party

affiliations but surreptitiously knifed the national Johnson-Humphrey ticket.

HUMPHREY preferred the knife-in-the-back type of Democrat to the Thurmond type. He even said he didn't think such switchers should lose their seniority status on Senate committees if they failed to support the national ticket.

Just how ethical is it for an influential politician in either major party to act as an inside termite, when he opposes his own party's national ticket?

There is no dispute over the past records of such Senators as BYRD and HOLLAND in this phase of party loyalty. The Byrd machine in Virginia saw to it that the State went Republican in 1952, 1956, and 1960.

Of course, this year it is hoped that BYRD's machine will operate in behalf of Johnson. This explains HUMPHREY's reluctance to threaten BYRD and others with a possible purge, depriving them of congressional seniority privileges unless they work actively for L.B.J.

THEY AREN'T GOING TO BE PUNISHED

The fact is that even if BYRD and the others who think like THURMOND, but lack his fortitude, doublecross the Johnson-Humphrey ticket, they are not going to be punished. There is a sly threat to do just that, but it is only window dressing.

Such a purge of Mississippi Congressmen was proposed in 1961 after the entire House delegation supported the anti-Kennedy slate of electors. The idea was to deprive the off-the-reservation southerners of their committee seniority rights.

The attempt flopped when it was pointed out that in 1956 Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York, had supported Ike for President, not Adlai Stevenson, and was allowed to keep his committee assignments.

Right now, in an apparent effort to keep Southern Democrats from operating within their party in behalf of GOLDWATER, House Democratic leaders have privately warned of disciplinary action. It is along this line: In committee assignment preference will be given to party members with unblemished loyalty records.

This is not a lot of malarky, and southern Democrats know it. Imagine the mess that would ensue, particularly if the Senate followed the House with such a crackdown. BYRD definitely would be ousted from his chairmanship of the Senate Finance Committee. EASTLAND would no longer control the Senate Judiciary Committee.

THURMOND DESERVES PRAISE

THURMOND has never been one of our political heroes. His longwinded oratory in the Senate is as deadly dull as that of Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon. But his honest break deserves praise. He is not going to stab the Johnson-Humphrey ticket in the back as a Democrat.

And by supporting GOLDWATER and declaring himself a South Carolina Republican, he is also acting ethically—in line with his conservative views.

The effort already underway to discredit him is typical of the way the administration often acts to cut down to size its political enemies. The word is being passed that THURMOND did not act from conviction but to save his own political future.

The Senator, so the word goes, knew that he could not be renominated as a Democrat in 1966, when he must run again. So he decided this was the time to make his move to get the Republican nomination.

This is dirty pool. THURMOND has strong opinions and political convictions and never has hesitated to express them. Above all, he abhors the hypocrisy of allegiance to a party which does not reflect his views.

Albert J. Hayes Gives Case Histories of Poverty in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the great wealth and affluence of this Nation, and it's position as a free world leader, may lead us to forget the millions of Americans who are poor and hungry. In his Labor Day address Mr. Albert J. Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO, makes very clear the plight of our less fortunate fellow citizens. As I believe Mr. Hayes' remarks will be of interest to the Members of this body, I include the text of his speech:

CASE HISTORIES OF POVERTY IN AMERICA

On this Labor Day weekend of 1964, I sincerely appreciate this opportunity to talk to you about what this day really means—or should mean—to all those whose intelligence, skill, education, and training have given America the finest, most efficient, most productive, and most loyal labor force in the world.

Of all our national holidays, Labor Day is the most appropriate for a restatement of the fundamental principles upon which our country was built. And this Labor Day, 1964, is more appropriate than ever before—because, far too many people have apparently forgotten these principles.

For many of you Labor Day is a day of picnics and parades—of cookouts and ball games—of pleasure and of leisure well spent.

And that's as it should be.

Labor Day was created many years ago by—and for—the workers of America as their own special day—as a day when we celebrate not the conquests of war or even the great deeds of national heroes—but rather a day when we honor the inherent, God-given dignity of human beings—and the worth of human labor to our country and its important role in our kind of society.

And yet, it has not always been so. Despite the biblical injunction that the laborer is worthy of his hire—it was no more than a generation or two ago that millions of Americans—including not only men but even women and small children—were not considered to be "worthy of their hire" in terms of decent wages, decent hours or decent conditions of employment.

As in the case in so much of the rest of the world even today—time was—in America, that workingmen and their families had very little hope of sharing in the great wealth and abundance that they, through their own labor, produced.

The good life that so many Americans enjoy today—the higher living standards that this Labor Day typifies for some Americans—did not come easily, or automatically, or through natural evolution.

It came only because at each stage in our industrial development there were always some who rebelled against economic injustice. There were always some who were willing to work, fight and often suffer for greater equity and justice in the relationship between workers and our developing industrial system.

And those who rebelled against these inequities and injustices soon learned that they—as individuals—were helpless and ineffective—in their individual efforts to bring about corrections. The very nature of our industrial system compelled those workers to organize in order to receive any recognition of their just grievances.

Thus notwithstanding the self-serving propaganda about the great potentials of individualism—it was the organized workers whose efforts and sacrifices brought about improved standards of living for millions of our working families.

We hear many criticisms of organized labor today—many demands that the power and influence of unions be curbed. We hear politicians who tell us that we need laws to break up the unions—and to curtail the right to strike in protest against economic injustice.

But it is appropriate on this Labor Day, to once more recall what all wage earners once knew without being told—that the present standards of life of the American people as a whole could not have been accomplished without the pressure of unions for higher wages, shorter hours and better working conditions.

For no matter how some newspapers, magazines, politicians or corporations try to rewrite history, it is important that we remember, on this Labor Day, that it was America's labor movement, its unions, more than any other single institution, that made it possible for millions of American working families to reach higher standards of living and education, to enjoy more leisure through shorter hours and vacations, to secure more medical care, to leave the slums and go to the suburbs, and to look forward, after a life of honest work, to a pension and a measure of decency and dignity in retirement.

But also, on this Labor Day of 1964, we must not believe the propaganda that the race is run or that the battle for social and economic justice in America is won.

It is encouraging to note that many people in recent months have come to recognize what unions have known for a long, long time: that in the midst of all our abundance, in the midst of our productive potential, in the midst of our plenty, millions of our fellow citizens live in abject poverty, which is both unnecessary and unworthy of America.

In this regard it is also encouraging to note that at long last the Congress of the United States has recognized this problem and has taken the first needed step toward its solution.

But in taking this step we must not forget that there are still other millions who are not considered to be poverty stricken but who nevertheless cannot achieve a decent standard of living for themselves and their families.

To my office each month come many letters from people like these—good people, decent people, people who want nothing more than a chance for something better than a hand-to-mouth existence.

They write to describe how hard it is to live on $3,000 or $4,000 a year in a country where the Department of Labor considers that the average family needs at least $6,000 a year to barely maintain a standard of health and decency.

Not so long ago, for example, I received just such a letter from the wife of a member of the Machinists Union that I would like to share with you because I think it says something about America that needs to be said—again and again—and especially should be said on this day that we have dedicated to the dignity of those who labor.

The pertinent part of her letter reads (and I quote): "I have stopped reading magazines telling of the glorious 'American standard

of living.' This is only a slap in the face to the average wage earner.

"Whenever a cost-of-living budget appears in one of the newspapers I read it because I wonder if anyone has actually made a study of the needs of a family. It takes money to care for a baby—and more money each year as he grows older.

"We have no right to bring children into the world if we can barely keep them from starving. There is nothing cute about a hungry baby."

In this letter we hear echoed the true and authentic heartbeat of a great forgotten part of the American people.

This is not the voice of Madison Avenue or the professional prose of a high-paid propaganda artist. This is the voice of a decent and hardworking housewife who, like millions of others, is frustrated to the point of desperation with the almost impossible task of feeding, clothing, housing, and educating a family on the kind of wages that so many workers—not considered poverty stricken take home even in these so-called times of affluence and prosperity.

I think it is important—even necessary—that we listen to voices such as these. For in them we hear the authentic voice of the people.

And by listening we begin to better understand how far and difficult is the road we still have before us.

We have heard much in recent months—and especially in recent weeks—about the rights and the freedoms of man. But freedom has many meanings.

It can mean—and unfortunately to some people it does mean—freedom for economic wolves to prey upon the American people.

It means freedom for the poor to remain poor.

It means freedom for the powerful to exploit the weak.

It means freedom of workers to bear the full social and economic costs of unemployment.

It means freedom for children to attend overcrowded, understaffed schools and be denied higher education.

It means freedom of the elderly to suffer and die because they cannot afford the medical care they need.

To some—these are the definitions of freedom.

But these are not the kind of freedoms that are referred to in basic documents of our country.

These are not the kind of freedoms that will liberate the millions who still live in poverty—nor the millions of others who inhabit the bleak edge of want.

So on this Labor Day, 1964—as we put summer aside—and prepare for the fall and the winter that follow—let us take these few, brief moments to acknowledge once more our country's vast debt to the workers of America—the majority of our citizens who dug the coal, built the railroads, spanned the rivers, built the cities, filled the arsenals, and fought the wars that have kept America strong and truly free.

Without labor—the creation of all wealth—the vast fortunes and great corporations of America—would not have been possible. And in these times when so many people talk so glibly about rights—let us never forget that workers also have rights—rights that are due their great contribution to our society.

And let us remember most of all that a worker is not a material commodity, like copper or fertilizer or steel. A worker is a person—with a God-given soul and spirit.

He is more to be valued and protected than a tin mine, an oil well, an acre of pulpwood—or a financial investment.

And finally, let us recognize that labor is not an abstraction. Labor is work—and workers are human beings—the human beings of which America is made.

The right that every worker—every man or woman who works for wages anywhere in this great country—deserves is the right to receive a fair day's pay—not only because it is just that he or she enjoy the fruits of their toil, but because it is good for society—good for our country.

A thriving, prosperous work force is the most essential foundation of any good and just society.

That is the meaning—that is the true meaning—of this Labor Day of 1964.

Plea for Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, many of us are anxiously awaiting the result of the deliberations now being conducted by the conference committee on H.R. 11865. In the hope that the conferees have not closed their minds, I place before the House an editorial which appeared in the September 17 edition of the Camden Courier-Post and commend it to your attention and the attention of the members of the committee:

KERR-MILLS FAILS THE AGED

Why the Nation needs medicare, which Congress now appears to have set aside for another year, is shown by the statements of Governer Hughes and State Welfare Director Engelman in appeals to New Jersey Members of the House anticipating the floor vote on it that failed to come about.

The elderly people who would benefit from medicare and who are in serious need of financial aid to meet illness simply are not getting it from the Kerr-Mills Act, enacted a few years ago as a substitute.

In the first place, relatively few States have enacted the necessary laws to implement Kerr-Mills, which provides medical assistance to the aged with the Federal Government paying 50 percent of the cost, the States 30 percent, and the counties 20 percent.

In the second place, Kerr-Mills is proving ineffective in those States including New Jersey that have passed the enabling laws.

New Jersey's 1963 legislature enacted the Kerr-Mills program, but so far only an average of 4,700 persons a month have benefited from it. New Jersey has 600,000 persons over the age of 65 and Engelman says that few "have the financial ability to last over an illness of longer than a few days."

Kerr-Mills provides that a beneficiary must be at least 65 and demonstrably in need of its assistance "according to professional medical determination." It also imposes a means test requiring evidence which may be difficult to produce, and which many would be beneficiaries regard as degrading.

Kerr-Mills "meets the need of our elderly citizens in only a small way," says Governor Hughes—and that is the experience of other States.

In its first year in New Jersey, the program cost $11 million, shared on the basis noted above. It supposedly provides nursing home care, hospital and home health care for persons confined 30 days or more, and benefits to cover physicians' calls, medicine, prosthetics, etc. But the record shows that more than $9 million of the $11 million appropriated for the program in this State went toward the care of about 4,400 inmates of nursing homes—a group in which there is little turnover. Nearly all the rest went toward hospitalization.

Hughes and Engelman agree with almost all other unbiased observers that Kerr-Mills is not and never can be adequate. A medicare program under social security can be. The longer Congress procrastinates in enacting it, the more it is responsible for imposing needless hardships on America's ailing aged.

The Hague and Washington: Where Do We Differ?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the Rotary Club of Scranton has, for many years, worked at a program of exchanging students with our great sister nation of the Netherlands. Under the sponsorship of the Scranton Rotary, nearly 100 of our young men and women have spent a year in the Netherlands, learning a new culture abroad to enrich their lives. A like number of young Netherlanders have come to our own community to enrich themselves in American culture by mingling with the fine people of the 10th Congressional District.

On August 31, a program commemorating this exchange program was held at the Scranton Rotary. I was privileged to be present at that meeting, and to hear the Netherlands General Consul, Johann H. Delgorge, from the New York Consulate, address the meeting. Dr. Myron Ball, president of Scranton Rotary, and Dr. Lester Jordan, district chairman for the exchange program, as well as all the other members of Scranton Rotary are to be highly commended for their fine work in the exchange student program, as well as for the delightful meeting they held to commemorate it.

I am pleased to enter the remarks on that occasion made by Mr. Johann H. Delgorge, Consul General of the Netherlands New York Consulate:

THE HAGUE AND WASHINGTON: WHERE DO WE DIFFER?

(Remarks by the Honorable Johann H. Delgorge, Acting Netherlands Consul General in New York, on the occasion of the luncheon given by the Scranton Rotary Club, at the Hotel Casey, Scranton, Pa., on Monday, August 31, 1964)

I wish to thank you for inviting me to be present at this luncheon. I am especially glad to see so many of my young compatriots here who had the good fortune to be invited to spend some time in this lovely country as your guests.

I call them lucky indeed.

I am also glad that so many young people from this area likewise have spent and are spending some time in the Netherlands.

We Dutch are particularly proud that Scranton has selected the Netherlands as the prime country for the exchange of students.

I fully agree with Congressman JOSEPH M. McDADE when he says that: "The inter-

national exchange program is one of the finest instruments conceived to foster international understanding and good will especially as it concerns young people in their formative years."

You have asked me to tell you something about my country.

Almost every American knows the story of the Dutch boy who put his finger in the dike, thus heroically saving his country. It will no doubt surprise you to hear that some years ago very few people in Holland had ever heard about this story. When the GI's and the first tourists came to the Netherlands after the war, they immediately asked to see the spot where this historic event took place. Well, there never was such a spot. So the tourists were disappointed.

On the strength of the great demand, a little village not far from Haarlem decided to erect a statue to the boy. Now all tourists go to Spaarndam and the villagers make a fast buck.

You see, in some ways we do not differ so much.

But where do we differ?

First of all: in size and density of population.

Our first and perennial problem is that we are a small country—twice the size of Connecticut—with a large and constantly increasing population.

Our population is nearly 12 million, which means that we have well over 900 people per square mile—the highest density of population of any country in the world. The United States has only 55 people per square mile, and if the United States was as densely populated as our country it would have a population of 2½ billion people instead of 180 million.

Its density leaves its mark on our people and our national character. In Holland there is always a village within 5 miles. Compare this with the wide-open spaces of this country.

Our population problem is steadly becoming more difficult because we have the highest birth rate of any country in Europe (22 per thousand), the lowest death rate in the world, and the longest life expectancy.

Holland is:

A country with no unemployment.

A country with no slums.

A country where you will find neither the very rich nor the very poor.

A religious country.

A country where a unique health service has been developed to the mutual satisfaction of both patient and doctor.

A country where the problem of public school versus parochial school was solved 40 years ago to everybody's satisfaction.

It will interest you to know that 60 percent of our population lives below sea level. Some parts are even 20 feet below sea level.

When you arrive at Schiphol Airport you will see a sign on the control tower proclaiming that Schiphol Airport is 18 feet below sea level. This is the only place in the world where a plane stands lower than a ship. On the horizon one can see ships sailing on the canal high above.

Land reclamation is an ancient occupation with us. The Dutch have won most of the land by pushing back the sea and keeping the water out by dikes, dams, and pumps. The 17th century French philosopher Descartes once said: "God made the world, but the Dutch made Holland."

And the English poet Hood remarked a century later: "Most of the Dutch are so low, they have to be damned to be saved."

The most remarkable land-reclamation work of modern times is the changing of the Zuyder Zee (an arm of the North Sea stretching down the middle of our country) into dry land. This colossal undertaking started in 1920 by the building of a 20-mile causeway right across the sea and is not quite finished yet. When it is, it will have added 30 percent more arable land to our country. And an even more difficult enterprise is the damming of the waters of the great rivers where they flow into the North Sea. This task—called the Delta Works—was undertaken after the terrible floods of 1953. Its aim is not primarily land-reclamation but to protect our country from the possibility of the sea ever breaking through the dikes again and engulfing the land.

One of the methods of dealing with the problem of harboring so many people in so small a country has been industrialization.

Although the sight of tulips, windmills, and wooden shoes is still important to tourists, today's visitors to Holland see something else, too; a highly industrialized country, small in size but large, I dare say, in many ways.

Formerly, our principle means of subsistence was agriculture, trading, shipping, and banking. In 1782, for instance, the young United States received its first foreign loan from the bankers of Amsterdam—$30 million—a lot of money at that time.

Under the Marshall plan, the United States—I am happy to say—more than returned the compliment. Half our working population is now engaged in industry and of the six largest corporations of the world outside the United States, three are Dutch: Royal Dutch Shell, Unilever, and Philips. This industrialization is the more remarkable because Holland has, or rather had—and I'll explain why later—hardly any natural resources. We have some salt and some coal. The rest has to be imported from abroad. Therefore we have to live by import, by export, deal in services, by shipping.

Holland has always taken advantage of her natural geographical location to establish a unique position. We did not participate directly in the industrial revolution, having no raw materials at that time to manufacture; we became the butter and egg man, the banker, the broker, and the shipper for our industrial neighbors.

Dutch agriculture grows the most expensive produce money can buy, and with some of that money we pay for the grain and other staples raised in vaster lands, such as yours.

The combination of our newly established industrialization and our traditional agriculture have made Holland a very affluent society today This has surprised many who were under the impression that after the Dutch lost their colonies much of our wealth would disappear. This has proved to the contrary. Dutch ingenuity and enterprise have found other ways for Holland to become more prosperous than ever before.

And all this, despite large losses in World War II. We lost: 2 percent of our population; one-third of our capital; 40 percent of our production potential; and 98 percent of our rolling stock.

Still, our prosperity grew; a prosperity which will be greatly accelerated by the discovery of one of the largest natural gas deposits in the world—in fact, a quantity surpassed only by the natural gas wells of Texas.

This gas deposit is large enough to satisfy all the energy requirements of the whole of Europe for at least 40 years.

Now I'll tell you something which shows how much we differ in certain ways.

When a gas deposit or an oil well is struck in Texas, the man living on the land becomes rich overnight and suddenly becomes interested in the gas depletion tax loss.

A Dutchman on whose land gas or oil is discovered doesn't get a penny because, under Dutch law, he only owns the horizontal rights and the Government the vertical. He's lucky if he gets compensation for the part of the land on which the oil derrick is rigged.

Speaking about oil. Before the war all Dutch oil and gas came from abroad. Now, 33 percent of our national needs are covered by oil won in Holland itself. Incidentally, the headquarters of Royal Dutch Shell (from where the worldwide operations of this great oil concern are directed), stands on top of one of the richest oil fields in Holland. Before the war no one knew about this.

These are the raw materials I referred to earlier in my remarks.

The questions often asked are: Where do you stand politically?

Where do you stand economically?

We are realists, and we know on which side our bread is buttered.

In order to be able to produce at competitive prices, it is necessary under modern conditions to apply mass production and mass production makes sense only if one has a big market in which to sell. Hence our Customs Union with Belgium and Luxembourg which has created in Benelux one single market. This is the fourth (and latest) trading unit in the world. (After the United States, the United Kingdom, and West Germany.)

The Benelux foreign trade is nearly half that of the United States.

But we did not stop there. For economic as well as for political and military reasons, we wished to weld the whole of Western Europe together, to create one great European market.

For these reasons the Rome Treaty, creating the European Common Market, was concluded in 1957.

It has always been the Dutch view that: the European organization should be given supranational powers; and should be an outward looking organization.

For these reasons we shall continue to work for strong ties between Europe and the United States.

In this—I trust—we shall have the help of your great country.

Thank you.

You Cannot Vote if You Do Not Register

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement of editorial opinion broadcast by WABC–TV in New York from August 25, 1964 to August 31, 1964.

All of us have the responsibility as well as the privilege of voting. This timely reminder to our constituents is an important one and should be heeded by all.

The editorial follows:

GOLDWATER OR JOHNSON

This is an old story, but it's worth telling again because it's the most important story you'll hear this year. Are you for Senator GOLDWATER or President Johnson? Does it make any difference for the next 4 years? Maybe you think that your vote does not count among the millions cast in a presidential election. Then you don't remember the 1960 presidential election. There were 68 million votes cast for President. Yet Richard Nixon lost the Presidency in one State—Illinois. And he lost it by under 9,000 votes. Maybe there were 9,000 more Illinois voters who supported Nixon. Maybe they didn't think their votes mattered. Maybe they forgot to register. If you have not registered to vote in New York you will not be able to vote in the presidential election this year. And you don't have much time left to register. There are only a couple more days in which you can register.

In New York City alone there are hundreds of thousands of voters who will not vote this year, only because they have not registered to vote. Those voters could well make the difference in how New York's 43 electoral votes will be cast. They could even make the difference in which man, GOLDWATER or Johnson, will lead the United States through 4 years. Those 9,000 Illinois voters who changed history in 1960 could be matched by a group from your State who could change it this year. We ask you to register today. If you don't know how to register, find out. The vote you cast this year could be the most important of your life. Please be sure you're able to cast it.

Aiding the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House an editorial from the Sunday Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., September 13, 1964, which comments on the growing trade between Soviet Russia and our principal ally in the cold war, Great Britain.

The newspaper wonders "whatever happened to the cold war?" We might well consider the same question, in light of the fact that this latest deal is not just trading with the enemy, but by extending him liberal financial credits it is giving him what amounts to "foreign aid."

The editorial follows:

AIDING THE ENEMY

The American taxpayer can hardly be blamed for not taking the "cold war" seriously or even for begrudging the billions of tax dollars the U.S. Government spends to combat communism when he learns that Britain, our principal free world ally, is extending foreign aid to the Soviet Union.

That essentially is what was involved when British and Soviet officials signed the biggest single contract in their trade history.

The agreement, between the Soviet state purchasing agency and three major British companies, covers the supply by the British of the major part of a polyester fiber plant costing approximately $84 million, which will produce what is known in the United States as Dacron.

In addition, the Russians will purchase $140 million worth of capital goods and technical information from the British, mostly in the fields of agricultural chemicals such as fertilizers and pesticides.

The contract represents the first British Government backing for a commercial loan to the Soviet Union; Britain's banks are providing 80 percent long-term financial cover for the deal for up to 15 years. This also is the largest contract ever covered by a British financial guarantee.

Understandably, the U.S. Government made several efforts, unfortunately unsuccessful, to dissuade the British from granting long-term loans to the U.S.S.R. Washington contends, and properly so, that this extension of credits is tantamount to foreign aid.

The British had one answer: Without the credits, the contracts would be lost. The key to British thinking lies in this sentence from a recent news story date lined London—"Some industrialists here believe huge markets are opening in the Soviet Union." Of course, the "huge markets" are dependent upon borrowed British money, as in the present instance.

Perhaps none of those who signed the trade agreement noticed an Associated Press story from Moscow on September 7, in which Premier Khrushchev declared, "The imperialists should remember that the Soviet Union and the Socialist countries have everything needed to deal a shattering blow at any aggressor."

Everything includes a plant to produce a valuable, multipurpose synthetic fiber and vital British technology to bolster a wobbly national agriculture.

Whatever happened to the "cold war" anyway?

Memorial Tribute to the Late Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute to the late Speaker of the House of Representatives Sam Rayburn delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at the Democratic National Convention in Atlantic City, N.J., August 27, 1964:

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SAM RAYBURN, DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE JAMES A. FARLEY AT THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION IN ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., AUGUST 27, 1964

Speaker MCCORMACK, Senator HARTKE, members of the clergy, ladies, and gentlemen of the convention, and my friends, the Congress of the United States is the mighty structure of American liberty. Neither our country nor any other country—neither the American people nor any other people—can call themselves free—unless there is an open legislative parliament where the will of the people can be enacted into law. Indeed, the Congress of the United States is literally freedom in action.

In this 20th century, two great men prided themselves on being "men of the House"—Sir Winston Churchill and Speaker Sam Rayburn. Their accomplishments are such that the 20th century's histories of their countries—and the laws they sponsored—are almost biographies of their lives. In his various capacities Speaker Sam Rayburn caused to be enacted into law more than 100 pieces of legislation. Today, they are the guidelines of every American's daily life. They range from rural electrification and collective bargaining to securities regulations and social security.

These laws, I know, he believed to be both his life work and his monument. No one of them has been repealed. On the contrary, every one of them has been expanded. Since both major parties have embraced their principles in their platforms they are now the dynamic force in the expanding American way of life.

Speaker Sam Rayburn believed—as Pericles and Sir Winston Churchill—that the only victory is in persuasion. And no man in its long history has carried more weight of persuasion in the Congress. When he spoke, Members of the House not only heard. They listened. They listened not because he aroused them with dramatic oratory, not because he soothed them with his mellow voice, not even because he compelled them with his flawless logic. They followed him because they trusted him. They accepted his leadership because he moved them as a sincere and knowledgeable captain of soundest judgment—an exalted and yet practical man—who truly knew whereof he spoke—and spoke only whereof he knew. The breadth of his vision was matched by the depth of his integrity. He was a Texan, and in the Texas tradition his word was his bond.

I have mentioned the more than 100 basic laws because I know that it is for them he would like you to remember him. And so I ask you to recall that in large part:

Because of Sam Rayburn the hard earned savings of the American people are no longer the subject of heartless market manipulation. They are guarded by a Securities and Exchange Commission.

Because of Sam Rayburn, the small deposits of the tens of millions of American working people are no longer in danger of any bank failure. They are protected by the insurance of the U.S. Government.

Because of Sam Rayburn and the late great Senator Wagner, an individual American need no longer stand helpless in the market place, forced to sell his labor as a commodity. He has the protection of collective bargaining.

Because of Sam Rayburn there has been incorporated into the laws of this land the fourth commandment of the laws of God: "Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long upon the land." No longer does our Nation turn its back on the men and women who are too old to work. Social security protects their age and their self-respect. This is not only a matter of the Nation's laws—but because of Speaker Sam Rayburn it is now a part of the Nation's conscience.

Here I cannot refrain from stating that I have known three generations of great Americans from Texas. I know that if Speaker Sam Rayburn were here tonight he would unhesitatingly say that much of what he accomplished he owed to his great teacher, Speaker of the House, Vice President of the United States John Nance Garner who brought him up in the ways of the Congress.

And, presumptious as it may seem, I most earnestly believe that the President of the United States would be the first to say that for much of his effectiveness he is indebted to the instruction and advice of Speaker Sam Rayburn. As a Democrat and an American I am thankful to God, the President of the United States is the representative of that tradition because of the precepts of Speaker Sam Rayburn, the Nation and the world could not be in more knowledgeable, more courageous, nor more honorable hands.

There is one single act of legislation, however, which to me especially hallows the name of Speaker Sam Rayburn. Because of his tremendous efforts it is not the law of our land that children may no longer be compelled to spend the precious hours of childhood at hard work. No longer are little girls in the mills and little boys in the mines part of our national economy. Because of Sam Rayburn they have been elevated to their proper place—the single great asset of our national treasury.

By his generalship in the House, Speaker Sam Rayburn wrote the emancipation proclamation for American childhood—a law which in my opinion gave more freedom to more children—boys and girls—without regard to race, creed, or color, than any document in recorded history.

"Suffer little children to come unto Me," said our Maker—and if this be the mightiest law of all—it is upon it that I commend my old friend to you—the American people—and to God—your faithful servant, Mr. Sam of Texas.

Patent Office Relocation Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I have publicly stated my opposition to the GSA proposal to relocate the U.S. Patent Office outside the Washington metropolitan area on several occasions. In my opinion such a move would be both inefficient and inappropriate and the GSA acted without properly considering the adverse effect such relocation would have on the functioning of the Patent Office as it relates to the public and their representatives of the patent bar, both locally and elsewhere.

The recently published results of a survey of attitudes on this subject made by the Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Research Institute of the George Washington University substantiates this view.

I include the report of the PTC Research Institute here in order that the information contained therein may be readily available to my colleagues:

REPORT OF THE PTC RESEARCH INSTITUTE SURVEY OF ATTITUDES ON PATENT OFFICE RELOCATION

The first consolidated tabulation of the replies to a questionnaire sponsored by the PTC Research Institute indicate an overwhelming preference for retention of a Washington location for the Patent Office. The tabulation refers to a wave of 186 responses received by September 3, 1964, within the first 3 weeks after mailing. After the summer vacation lull another batch of responses may be expected. In all, 505 questionnaires were sent to members and associates of the Research Institute, and a very large majority will evidently respond on the basis of the current showing.

Of the 186 respondents, 151—about four-fifths—unequivocally opposed the transfer. Only 19 favored the move; while 12 recognized both good and bad features of the proposed change, 4 expressed no opinion.

An analysis of the 151 opposing replies shows essentially the same ratio for both industrial companies and for patent law firms, which categories account for the bulk of the respondents. Specifically, 85 of 108 responding companies objected to the move, as did 51 of the 60 law firms that replied. The same ratio also prevails for 15 additional company officials and law firm members who responded on their own behalf.

Two of the 151 replies indicating opposition to transfer came from professional societies. One of these, from the Patent Office Society, stated that the membership of over 1,000 is "generally opposed" to the shift. The reply from an official of one of the largest patent bar associations also indicated opposition.

A geographic analysis of responses shows that distance from Washington exerts no significant influence on the opinions expressed. Thus, 40 of 53 responses from companies located in the eastern States between Washington and the southern boundary of Massachusetts objected to the move. In the next arc, which includes Massachusetts, Ohio, and North Carolina, 18 of 22 respondents expressed opposition. Most of the answering companies located still further away—in the ring including Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Louis, and Miami—also voted in the negative, 13 out of 17.

Of the 11 responses received from still more distant companies, including those in Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and the west coast, 10 disfavored the change. Only five industrial replies have been received from the Washington, D.C., area, but four are opposed. In view of the position taken by industrial companies, it is not surprising that law firms were generally opposed in all areas of the country.

Tabulation by size of responding organizations showed a fairly well distributed opposition. Thus, of the 85 companies objecting to transfer, 27 were large, 31 were medium, and 27 were small. Of the 51 law firms objecting to the move, 9 were large, 24 were medium, and 18 were small.

The questionnaire also solicited the expression of reasons for favoring and for opposing the proposed change. The reasons most commonly cited in favor related to the opportunities to enlarge the available space and otherwise to improve the facilities of the Patent Office. One respondent, agreeable to the move, considered it the "best overall solution." Another stated that it would "avoid mass transportation." Still another suggested that the professional employees of the Patent Office would be benefited.

Opponents of the move concentrated on the advantages of the proximity of other Governmnt agencies and cited the general inconvenience, transportation difficulties, expense, and time loss that would be imposed by a relocation. Almost as important as this category of reasons was the recognition of the unusual richness of the Washington area in law school facilities. It was also feared by a number of respondents that a move could result in a loss of experienced Patent Office personnel. Several opponents mentioned the adequacy of accommodations in contemplated new locations. Companies and law firms tended to emphasize similar points of objection.

Respondents objecting to the move, prefer either enlargement of existing facilities or some other solution within the District of Columbia area. While a few would accept a suburban location close to the District, a number propose the conversion of other existing District facilities.

A comprehensive report, which will also take advantage of additional replies, will be published in a forthcoming issue of Idea, the Institute's Journal of Research and Education. The study is being conducted by Executive Director L. James Harris and Dr. Irving H. Siegel, a member of the research staff.

The Space and Shipping Program in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, a portion of the last paragraph of the article I inserted in the RECORD of yesterday was inadvertently omitted. I would, therefore, like to have the following paragraph inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, to replace the previous concluding paragraph of the article:

When one also considers the almost explosive growth of the petrochemical industry, as represented by Shell, Monsanto, American Cyanamid, Du Pont, Union Carbide and Kaiser, to mention some, in the great parishes of Jefferson, St. Charles, St. John the Baptist, and St. James—fast becoming the Ruhr Valley of America—it is no wonder so many of my colleagues say to me, "How does Louisiana obtain so much?" I like to feel, Mr. Speaker, without being immodest, that the answer to that question lies, at least in part, in the hard work which I have been privileged to do for my district over the years, because of the sustaining confidence and friendship of the people that I represent.

Surplus Food Rein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, though, as noted below, the victory may only be temporary the House struck a blow for commonsense and economy in its recent vote to include an anti-Communist provision in the food-for-peace program.

Some pertinent observations were made on this action by the Sunday Standard-Times, of New Bedford, Mass., and I commend this editorial to my colleagues:

SURPLUS FOOD REIN

By voting a strict anti-Communist provision into the food-for-peace program, the U.S. House issued a timely reminder that to finance a potential enemy is stupid policy.

Most of the credit belongs to House Republicans, 143 of whom combined with 39 Democrats to overrule a coalition of 162 Democrats and 13 Republicans.

It is difficult to understand why, in view of the back-of-the-hand treatment this country has received from the Sukarnos, the Nassers, and the Nkrumahs—who are only on the Communist fringe—that there should be objection to such words as these:

"Any nation or area dominated or controlled by a Communist government or by the world Communist movement may not purchase surplus food from the United States at below-cost prices."

Yet the close vote reflects opposition from both the State Department and the administration against having Congress put any kind of restriction into the program. In fact, two Members of the House made an extraordinary about-face from positions previously taken.

Congressman ROONEY, Democrat, of New York, said he had "new information" that shifted him from championing tighter control of the food program by Congress one night to disclaiming such control the next day. Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, signed a petition urging a ban on surplus food sales to the United Arab Republic the night before he voted against such a ban.

Such reversals only emphasize the mysterious power that prevails in Congress year after year on foreign aid and associated spending programs. This remains the most obvious area in which State Department spenders thwart the majority will of the people. The anti-Communist provision broke the grip, but the victory may be only temporary.

Skilled Labor Shortages Begin To Develop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the tax cut bill earlier this year, a number of economists pointed out that too rapid an expansion of the economy could lead to inflationary shortages of skilled workers even while the overall unemployment rate remained at a high level. The experience of the economy since the tax cut appears to bear out this forecast.

While the unemployment rate in August remained at a high level of 5.1 percent, concern is beginning to develop within the Department of Labor over the possibility that the current economic expansion will result in shortages of skilled workers in a number of job lines. Coupled with the rising pressure of demand upon capacity and a recent spate of labor contract settlements which far exceed the administration's wage-price guideposts, these developments in the labor market could augur new inflationary pressures in the economy.

The possibility of labor shortages in certain lines was developed at a recent press conference by Harold Goldstein, Assistant Commissioner of Labor Statistics for Manpower. I was pleased to note the Department's concern over this problem and to read that it is following up on the possibility by beginning next month a much-needed survey of job vacancies in four selected cities across the country. The need for a series of statistics on job vacancies as means of analyzing the labor market has long been pressing. While progress toward this goal has not been as fast as I think it should have been, Mr. Goldstein's announcement represents a gratifying step forward.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an article from the New York Times on September 18, discussing this matter.

AUGUST JOB RISE BELOW AVERAGE—U.S. AIDS SEE POSSIBILITY OF SKILLED-LABOR SHORTAGE

(By Edward Cowan)

WASHINGTON, September 17.—Nonfarm employment failed to rise significantly in August, but factory hours did, the Labor Department reported today.

These two developments, plus the persistence of a fairly large pool of unemployed persons, raised this question: Are potentially inflationary shortages of skilled labor cropping up in some job lines?

Harold Goldstein, Assistant Commissioner of Labor Statistics for Manpower, acknowledged that "we're concerned about this question."

He said at a press briefing on the new employment statistics that "there may be a development of shortages of workers in some occupations."

To learn more about that possibility, the Labor Department, in conjunction with State authorities, will begin in October a survey of job vacancies in four cities still to be selected.

Other Government analysts suggested that the August spurt in hours and the lack of significant expansion in jobholding meant that employers were showing a preference for overtime, as distinguished from hiring, to increase production. Industrial output rose in August for the 12th month in a row.

The analysts speculated that nonfarm employment would show a good gain for September. The limited data available, they said, pointed to shortages of qualified job applicants only in highly skilled machine-making lines. In any case, they cautioned, figures for 1 month—August—could not be deemed conclusive.

The average factory workweek increased by 18 minutes from July to 40.9 hours in August. The increase, an unusually large one for August, was described by the Department as reflecting "continued strength in the economy."

"Among most individual industries, weekly hours approached the high levels recorded in other periods of peak economic activity, such as 1953 and 1955," the Department said.

Mr. Goldstein said the expansion of the workweek was a "breakthrough reflecting the pressure of demand on employers." A gain of 6 minutes would have been normal for August.

The nonfarm employment total, which had shown better-than-seasonal gains each month since November, staged a seasonal advance of 240,000 in August, reaching a new high of 59,247,000. The previous peak was 59,212,000 in June.

On a seasonally adjusted basis, nonfarm employment totaled 58,944,000 in August, up 15,000 from July. This difference, officials said, was not significant.

The largest single influence in the change in the nonfarm job total from July to August was the layoff of about 110,000 auto workers during retooling for production of 1965 models. While this was a seasonal development, it tended to have a restraining effect on the job total in the absence of notable strength elsewhere.

President Johnson scooped the Labor Department by announcing on Tuesday, in a Miami speech, some of the statistics in today's regular monthly report. Saying nothing about the July–August change, the President observed that the August nonfarm job total was 1.6 million higher than a year earlier.

He also pointed out that factory employment—estimated by the Department today at 17,527,000 in August—was up 300,000 from a year earlier and represented a 10-year high.

The figures released today were based on payroll data furnished by companies.

Monkey Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the detrimental effect of unwarranted Federal interference in our Nation's economy is dramatically discussed in an editorial of Thursday, September 17, of the Blue Island Sun-Standard, Blue Island, Ill.

It is a message that we should ponder, as politically motivated schemes to ruin the social security system come before us.

The editorial follows:

MONKEY BUSINESS

There are certain groups that want Washington to rule and regulate just about everything. This is worth restating now that an effort is underway to have the Federal Government regulate private pension plans which, so far as anyone can see, have been doing a fine job.

The excuse for Federal regulation, of course, would be to protect the plans' members and beneficiaries. In the light of that, the Government's experience with its own pension systems is significant.

The social security fund has been shrinking and at the same time more people are becoming eligible for larger benefits. This means that each new entrant at the age of 20 must put in $1.69 during his working lifetime for each dollar he may be entitled to draw, if he lives long enough to draw anything.

"The pension system for Federal employees happens to be about $35 billion in the red," says the National Association of Manufacturers, and "* * * the thing is in a mess." Substantial increases in contributions to the railroad retirement fund have "* * * had to be instituted to keep it solvent."

These are examples of Government running pension systems. It would seem that it has a lot of learning to do before it monkeys with the private plans.

A Man of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the September 17 edition of the Trenton Times. All too often there is very little public recognition given the efforts of such men as Nicholas De B. Katzenbach, whom I am proud to call a friend.

The editorial follows:

A MAN OF LAW

Nicholas De B. Katzenbach, who is now the acting U.S. Attorney General, hardly needs an introduction in this area. A member of a prominent New Jersey family, he graduated from Princeton University with honors as well as from Yale Law School, also with honors. Later he was a professor of law and attained a brilliant reputation as a teacher and writer. It was Robert Kennedy who brought him into the Department of Justice and as Kennedy departed to pursue his political future in New York City, it was Katzenbach who was directed to take over the affairs of that vast Department.

The Acting Attorney General showed his mettle in recent disputes over civil rights. In a quiet but forceful manner he solved some very difficult situations which might have exploded into violence. With his thorough knowledge of law and of government procedure he had been a trusted emissary during the years of the administration of John F. Kennedy and now President Johnson has seen fit to elevate him to an honored position in the Cabinet.

In exploring Katzenbach's background, it is only necessary to refer to his ordeal during World War II when he was shot down in the Mediterranean while on duty as a naviga-

tor. Here was a man who did not let his courage die with his imprisonment. He managed to pursue a course of study which would help him to return to his university and so pick up the pieces of his career. And that is exactly what he did.

Legislation Limiting Beef Imports Offers Hope to Cattle Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY A. TAYLOR
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the No. 1 industry in our country. The farm problem is second only to that of national defense. A healthy livestock industry is essential to sound agriculture.

Beef production constitutes a large segment of American agriculture and beef producers have been in serious trouble and have lost heavily as the rapid increase in imports during recent years has had a depressing effect on cattle prices.

Last spring I appeared before the Tariff Commission at a hearing in Washington and requested that the Commission take action to limit beef imports and pointed out that the United States is the only major world beef market without import restrictions. In June I introduced legislation to force a limitation of beef imports.

Many other Congressmen felt the same way, and in August Congress passed and the President signed H.R. 1839 creating a new law which will add much needed stability to the cattle industry. The bill was backed by American cattle producers, and I was glad to vote and work for it. Its immediate effect will be to keep beef imports during the coming year about 15 percent below last year's average.

The bill provides that exporting countries will never have more than 6.7 percent of the U.S. market and likely much less. It clearly defines the future levels of beef imports. No longer will the consumer or any cattleman be faced with the erratic effects of dumping of world surplus of beef, veal, and mutton in this country.

In my home State of North Carolina, livestock production is a vital element in the total agriculture complex. The gross receipts from the sale of livestock and livestock products in 1962 was over $344 million. This represents 31 percent of our total gross income from agriculture. In North Carolina the gross income from livestock ranked second only to the income from tobacco. The livestock industry has special significance for the future of North Carolina because it is the direction in which there is hope for expansion.

As we look back over the record of the 88th Congress, we can be pleased that action was taken to provide more protection against beef and veal imports for livestock producers. This places the American cattle industry on a sounder financial basis and in better position to meet the demands of the future.

A Precedent Set That United States Might Note

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the slow deterioration of our position in Vietnam is attributed principally to the policy of vacillation practiced by the Johnson administration through its appeasement-minded State Department.

Columnist Roscoe Drummond's article of Thursday, September 17, in the Chicago Sun-Times dramatically points out the difference between the British firmness in the face of Indonesian aggression and the Johnson administration vacillation in the face of Vietcong aggression.

The article follows:

A PRECEDENT SET THAT UNITED STATES MIGHT NOTE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The events in southeast Asia are both favorable and unsettling.

The decisive British action to wipe out the Indonesian paratroop invaders of Malaysia is all to the good, particularly in view of the United Nations Security Council's intention to greet the admitted Sukarno aggression with an ineffectual slap on the wrist to both sides.

Thus far, at least, the U.N. is showing itself timid and futile. After the latest Indonesian invasion, all the Security Council can summon itself to do is to advise the Malaysian Government to negotiate.

That's what Malaysia has been doing for 2 years. That is what it has been doing ever since President Sukarno tried to seize the North Borneo territories of Sabah and Sarawak, which, under U.N. supervision, voted to join the Malaysian Federation.

The British acted because they are bound by treaty to defend the Malaysian Federation to which they gave full independence.

They have explicitly warned Sukarno that further raids on Malaysian territory will mean bombing of Indonesian bases.

The British are not bluffing. They are matching action to words.

There is one important difference between the problem in Malaysia and the problem in South Vietnam. The Malaysians, with the aid of the British, already have liquidated the internal Communist insurrection.

In South Vietnam, there is still a strong Communist insurrection against the Government. That is why the U.S. defense of South Vietnam is both internal and international.

American military and economic aid to South Vietnam is obviously being weakened by the instability of the Vietnamese Government. The recent noncoup, with Prime Minister Nguyen Khanh disappearing one day and reappearing the next, adds nothing but uncertainty to the war effort.

But these difficulties do not justify losing our nerve or our stamina. The state is not just protecting South Vietnam, but guarding the gateway against a Communist takeover in all southeast Asia.

There is little doubt that we face a long, slogging, painful effort unless the United States decides that North Vietnam cannot indefinitely commit aggression and remain an untouched sanctuary.

To the Indonesian aggression, the British have said to Sukarno: No sanctuary if there are any more raids. That is a sound precedent.

Esther Peterson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, everyone who knows Esther Peterson recognizes her as intelligent, honorable, and dedicated to the public welfare.

As Assistant U.S. Secretary of Labor, she has distinguished herself by the service she has performed. Like her beloved and departed dear friend, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Mrs. Peterson has given much of her life in helping others.

She was a target recently for a most unfair attack by an editorial writer in Printer's Ink. In defense of Mrs. Peterson, I include with my remarks an article by Robert Gerhart, published in the current issue of the New Era, Reading, Pa.:

ESTHER PETERSON

Mrs. Esther Peterson is a name that may not be familiar to you. If you diligently read the New Era's columns each week, you may recognize it as the name of President Johnson's special assistant for consumer affairs. She also is Assistant U.S. Secretary of Labor for labor standards. But more and more she is being recognized as an outspoken champion of the consumer—and that's you and me.

I wouldn't ordinarily devote so much time to extolling the talents of Mrs. Peterson except that she recently came under fire—and that's putting it mildly—from a magazine by the name of Printers' Ink. By its own definition, Printers' Ink is "The weekly magazine of advertising and marketing."

In one of the most distasteful pieces of mis-writing I have ever read, this organ of Madison Avenue launched an editorial tirade against Mrs. Peterson. It begins on the front cover of Printers' Ink with three words emblazoned in big, black type: "Is she ignorant," followed by the rest of the sentence in smaller type, "—or is she deliberately pitting consumers against advertisers for her own purposes?" This kind of question is in the "When did you stop beating your wife" category.

And what is the crime over which the gray-suited lads in the advertising fraternity are so exorcised? Apparently they resent Mrs. Peterson's concern for the well-being of the consumer and the manner in which innocent, unsuspecting citizens are led by the nose by commercial interests principally concerned about making bucks, no matter what.

Printers' Ink considers Mrs. Peterson and her concern for the welfare of consumers as "the most pernicious threat to advertising today." What an odd point of view. This same publication, which is supposed to represent some of the best brains in the business, describes the revitalization of the consumer movement with government as an odd and ominous phenomenon. The dictionary

describes "ominous" as implying a frightening or alarming quality.

In other words, the professional brainwashers don't want anyone else cutting in. They are fearful that Mrs. Peterson will puncture a few balloons or let in a little light which will help housewives and wage earners to make intelligent choices before spending their hard-earned dollars.

And what, I wonder, is so terrible about that?

What the hypersensitive Madison Avenue crowd fears is that the general public will become educated to some of the sales and marketing devices which tell the truth but not the whole truth. Mrs. Peterson, for instance, supported legislation for truth in packaging and for this she was hacked to little bits by the advertising people who want unbridled freedom in such matters. Have you ever tried to compare different-sized packages of the same products and compute, standing in a supermarket aisle, which is the best deal for the money? You need an IBM computer to work it out.

I remember hearing Mrs. Peterson at a White House-arranged conference in Washington several months ago when she described some of the tricks that deprive unsuspecting consumers of their full measure of value. Why, she wanted to know, was inferior-grade produce sold in low-income neighborhoods at prices as high or higher than those charged for top-quality produce in more affluent areas of the same city? Unimportant, you say? On the contrary, it is the low- and middle-income families who must stretch dollars so their children get maximum nutritional value or clothing which lasts more than a few weeks, and the family itself buys merchandise or appliances that don't break down the minute the installer leaves.

Mrs. Peterson believes that advertising should provide full disclosure about an item. She doesn't feel that snob appeal or "keeping up with the Joneses" is a logical basis for making a purchase. Printers' Ink takes the attitude this is none of her or the Government's business. They imply that Mrs. Peterson's consumer crusade is a flop because there has not been a flood of written complaints in the wake of her activity. Then why the fearful concern?

It is scant praise for the noble admen to describe Mrs. Peterson as a woman whose "sincerity and dedication of purpose are indisputable," and then cast here in the role of ogre because she wants to help ordinary citizens in what unquestionably is the most complex aspect of living today—that is, using one's economic resources to rear a family and achieve a measure of security while maintaining a standard of living which is considered normal in our affluent society. In the final analysis it comes down to wise buying within limited income for sustenance, clothing, shelter, transportation, recreation, education and possibly savings. Yes, even savings are bought in the sense that you choose the best return from U.S. bonds, interest on savings accounts, mutual funds, savings and loan associations, or myriad other investment possibilities.

It is unfortunate that Madison Avenue resents the intrusion of Mrs. Peterson in their hallowed sanctuaries. She speaks with a firm voice, not in weasel words. She is dedicated to the task of helping consumers, a fact conceded by even her adversaries. And she apparently is hitting sore spots causing the cries of anguish and pain. Anyone who knows Mrs. Peterson knows full well that she is not waging a vendetta against advertising per se. Instead of fighting her, the advertising geniuses should do a bit of soul searching. Instead of being so sensitive to criticism they should consider listening to Esther Peterson and join in the highly moral task of educating consumers to get the most for their dollars. To say there is no need for the Esther Petersons in our society is to exhibit contempt for the people.

A Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, early in 1964 I submitted a report to my constituents reviewing my activities in Congress in 1963. It was entitled "A Freshman Congressman Reviews His First Year." A limited supply is still available for those who may wish to obtain a copy. This report, is therefore, primarily a review of my activities in 1964. The people have a right to know my record, my efforts and achievements, and my views on major issues.

As I look back over these past 2 years, I am mighty proud of the record of the 88th Congress. To me, a freshman Congressman serving his first term, it was a wonderful experience particularly because it turned out to be a very productive Congress, one of solid accomplishments for the Nation. Some call it the "Education Congress" because of the worthwhile legislation enacted in the field of education. Some call it the "Conservative Congress." Others call it the "Antipoverty Congress," or the "Civil Rights Congress." Actually, Congress has a notable record of achievements in practically every phase of our Nation's interests. It would take too long to enumerate all of the major bills enacted during these 2 years, but let me mention just a few.

WORLD PEACE

Humanity's most pressing problem today is world peace. While the world is nominally at peace, there is much tension and fighting in some areas which are stirred up by the Communist nations. Furthering the cause of peace and a lessening of international tension have been among my primary aims in Congress during the past 2 years, coupled with my support for the security of our country and the strengthening of its defenses and those of the free world. The security of our Nation comes first. The American people must never relax their guard for a moment.

Consequently, I have supported the foreign aid program to help our allies abroad, the highly successful Peace Corps, the food-for-peace program, the test ban treaty to prohibit nuclear testing in the air, space, and under water, appropriations for our national security and the strengthening of our defense system.

MAJOR LEGISLATION

Perhaps the most outstanding piece of leigslation passed is the Civil Rights Act, which is of historic significance and of great moral value. This bill was worked out in the House Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, and I feel deeply honored that I was destined to play some small part in this historic struggle to safeguard the civil rights of all Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed. I hope and trust that we have abolished second-class citizenship in our country for all times.

Next in importance is the tax cut. The importance of the tax cut is not so much the extra dollars in our pay envelope every week, but the fact that this reduction in taxes helps to maintain a healthy and a growing economy, a continuing prosperity, and a high level of employment. Our Nation is currently enjoying the longest peacetime economic recovery in its history—a period which began in February 1961 and is still continuing its phenomenal growth for 44 months in succession. Let us hope it will continue for along time to come.

In the midst of this prosperity we are also witnessing abject poverty on the part of many millions of our fellow Americans. It is estimated that some 35 million people in the country, or nearly 10 million families, live under conditions of poverty. This is nearly a fifth of the Nation's population. In Connecticut, we have some 65,000 families—nearly a quarter of a million people—living in poverty. President Johnson deserves much credit for initiating the war on poverty to help our less fortunate neighbors lift themselves from the depths of deprivation. After a long struggle, Congress passed the antipoverty bill. Programs are now being set up to provide vocational training, work-study, and work-training programs for young people, for needy students and for the unemployed. The central idea here is that through education we can break the recurring cycle of poverty.

CONGRESS HELPS EDUCATION

It is no exaggeration to say that the 88th Congress has done more in the field of education than any other Congress in our history. The following are some of the bills passed:

First. Higher Education Facilities Act, to aid in college construction.

Second. Health Professions Education Act, to increase the number of students in medicine, dentistry, and other fields.

Third. Extension of the National Defense Education Act, to provide loans and other assistance to college students.

Fourth. Vocational Education Act, to expand our vocational education programs.

Fifth. Aid to schools in impacted areas, where Government installations placed a financial burden on local systems. I might add that the first bill I introduced was to extend this program and it was passed last year. Nearly half of the school districts in Connecticut benefit under it and the amount of Federal funds they receive is more than $4.5 million annually.

Another bill, of which I was a cosponsor and which was enacted last year, was the program to help States in combating mental retardation, provide maternal and child health services, and care for crippled children. Today there hangs on the wall of my office in Washington a framed copy of this act and the pen used by our late beloved President Kennedy when he signed it.

Another of my bills to be passed by Congress was H.R. 7710, to assist States in rebuilding their commercial fisheries. I hope in the near future to obtain funds under this act to build a modern pier at Stonington and to revive its fishing industry.

OTHER IMPORTANT LEGISLATION

Other bills of importance passed by Congress are: Hospital and Medical Facilities Act, to modernize and replace antiquated hospitals; Nurses Training Act, to provide more nurses and more nursing schools; Clean Air Act, to study ways to eliminate the danger of air pollution; and the Library Services Act, to build more libraries.

Of particular interest is the Housing Act, which provides 37,500 new public housing units, extension of the urban renewal program, rehabilitation of slum areas, more liberal mortgage terms on one-family homes, housing for the elderly, low-rent housing for migrant farmworkers, grants for park lands and open space areas, and other programs. There is also the Mass Transportation Act, to provide more adequate mass transportation for our cities and towns.

MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

This does not complete the list by far. There are many more, but there is one which I want to mention briefly since it is now the center of a great fight. I refer to the efforts in Congress to provide an effective program of health care for our aged citizens. Today we have some 18 million people in our country who are over 65. Most of them have limited financial means and are dependent on their monthly social security checks. They cannot afford hospital care, nursing home care, doctor bills, and similar other expenses.

The House of Representatives passed a bill to provide a 5-percent increase in social security benefits. When the bill came before the Senate, a medicare program was added which provides hospitalization benefits under social security. I am hopeful that we can succeed in retaining the medicare program in the bill. This would be a wonderful victory for our elderly people, who would be able to look forward to the future with greater security and faith in humanity.

I am interested in this social security measure for another reason. In May 1964, I introduced a bill in Congress to provide social security disability benefits to the blind, if they acquire six quarters of coverage. They now must have 20 quarters. I felt that their affliction should be recognized as a disability. When the social security bill came up in the Senate, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY—now the Democratic candidate for Vice President—submitted my bill on the blind as an amendment to the social security bill. It was passed by the Senate without opposition. If my bill is enacted, some 400,000 blind persons in the country will be entitled to receive social security disability benefits.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

In the past 4 years, under the Kennedy-Johnson administrations, we have made great strides forward which are comparable only to the Roosevelt era of the 1930's. When President Kennedy took office in 1961, we had 4 million Americans unemployed and 2.3 million people were entering the labor market each year. Today our labor force is about 73 million strong, while unemployment has dropped from nearly 7 percent to about 5 percent—the lowest in nearly 5 years. Congress recently voted to set up a commission to study the effects of automation on employment and to recommend ways to lessen its impact on the ranks of the unemployed.

For those in the ranks of labor, these 4 years have chalked up many important gains. Let me enumerate some of these gains:

Nearly 28 million Americans are covered by the minimum wage law which provides for $1.25 per hour.

Factory wages increased from $89 per week in January 1961 to $103 now, thus providing more money in pay envelopes.

The cost of living has increased by only a small margin and prices held steady, while wages increased.

Congress extended an additional $800 million in unemployment benefits to 2.8 million workers who had exhausted their benefits.

Unemployment has been attacked and considerably decreased through training and retraining programs, accelerated public works projects, vocational education, area redevelopment and other programs.

Equal employment rights for women were established to protect them against wage discrimination.

Workers' rights are protected by better and faster disposition of unfair labor practices cases and the handling of labor complaints.

Time lost in strikes has been cut in half, and this was achieved in great measure through the administration's attention to labor-management problems and the improvement of labor-management relations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

During my first term in Congress I introduced a total of 43 bills and resolutions: 31 public bills and 12 private bills. This is a record of which any first-termer can be proud. These bills deal with various problems of national and local interest. About a half dozen of them were enacted, several were included with other legislation, and several private bills were resolved administratively. The remainder will go over for the 1965 session.

In my review of 1963, I listed 19 of the more important bills I introduced. Among those I sponsored in 1964 are:

H.R. 11021, to permit a tax deduction for the construction of treatment works to control and prevent water and air pollution.

H.R. 11210, to permit a veteran to deduct from his income expenses incurred by the death of his wife or a child, so as not to lose his VA pension.

H.R. 11393, to provide social security disability insurance benefits to the blind, if they have six quarters of coverage.

H.R. 12013, to declare election day a legal holiday in order to encourage all U.S. citizens to vote.

H.R. 12354, to provide for a general revision of the U.S. copyright law.

CONCLUSION

The needs of the people of my district always receive primary attention. Every effort is being used to obtain more Government contracts for industry, public works projects, post offices, new industries, in order to provide more work and continued economic growth of the area. I helped several firms obtain loans through the Small Business Administration. Similarly, I have exerted all influence to aid our farmers, particularly the dairy farmers in their struggle with the milk order problem, and the poultry farmers who face terrific competition. I was helpful to all farmers of eastern Connecticut in obtaining aid to combat the army worm infestation, in permission for grazing and harvesting of hay, and also urged the U.S. Department of Agriculture to provide livestock feed grains to farmers suffering from the drought.

In the past 2 years my office handled many personal problems of constituents and many were helped with housing needs, servicemen's hardship cases, veterans pensions, social security, welfare problems, immigration matters, postal service, student aid, and others. As your Congressman, I shall be pleased to continue to serve you in every way possible, as well as to receive your views on the issues of today. All letters receive my personal attention. For any information or assistance, address your letter to me as follows: Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Eglin Activity Teaches a Defense Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Florida Times Union of September 16, entitled "Eglin Activity Teaches a Defense Lesson." The editorial is an interesting one which points to the continued development of Eglin Air Force Base and northwest Florida.

EGLIN ACTIVITY TEACHES A DEFENSE LESSON

The gulf coast region of northwest Florida, sometimes called the "Miracle Strip," is drawing attention this week for two reasons, one of which has to do with the construction of a new bridge in that area, and the other related to military operations at the Eglin Air Force Base.

The State road department has announced that work on the Brooks Bridge, costing nearly $2 million, will begin this week. The span will go across Santa Rosa Sound to Santa Rosa Island as an extension of the scenic 38-mile strech of U.S. 98 from Pensacola east to Fort Walton Beach which is being four-laned.

The phenomenal growth of this area in the past 25 years has been largely due to its natural beauty, but activity like that during exercise "Indian River III" at Eglin defines another reason for northwest Florida's gulf coast boom. Participating in the exercises, which are being conducted by the U.S. Tactical Air Warfare Center, are the famous 1st Infantry Division and the 2d Logistical Command. The maneuver has the purpose of improving the use of aviation to enhance the combat effectiveness of Army units.

Florida lends itself well to use as a training ground by the military. For example, favorable year-round weather and location

brought the Navy to Pensacola, a few miles from Fort Walton, many years prior to World II, to establish a center for aviation training. The story of how the State became a training ground for units of the Army and Navy during World War II is a matter of record, and now the Space Center at Cape Kennedy has become the proving ground for the age of gadgetry.

* * * * *

Relief Ahead for Nurse Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been very proud of the work of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in obtaining passage of the Nurses Training Act of 1964. As one who helped frame it, I was privileged to be present to witness its signature into law by the President.

I was, therefore, very happy to note the strong editorial support given this significant new law by Florence Paulson, editor of the Mountain Lake, Minn., Observer. I place Mrs. Paulson's editorial, which points out the "critical shortage of nurses" in our country today, in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

RELIEF AHEAD FOR NURSE SHORTAGE

(By Florence Paulson)

I am happy to see that an attack is being made on the most critical shortage of nurses in the history of the United States. President Johnson has just signed the $287 million Nurse Training Act.

This money is going to be used for rehabilitation of inadequate nursing schools and buildings of about 30 new schools by 1970; for nursing students loans; for professional nurse traineeships to increase the number of advanced and specialized nurses and teachers.

The following information from Sylvia Porter's column in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune gives startling facts and figures:

So short are our 6,400 hospitals of professional nurses that 20 percent of these positions are now unfilled, and just to fill the hospital openings today at least 70,000 additional professional nurses are needed.

So understaffed are our nursing homes that 1 out of 10 of our 10,000 skilled nursing care homes, serving 350,000 patients, have no full-time professional or practical nurse, and among our 13,000 residential homes for the aged, only 1 in 8 has a nurse.

So serious is the shortage that in many hospitals, underqualified nursing aids are giving 80 percent of all nursing care, against the 20 percent of care they are qualified to give.

Meanwhile, the number of nursing schools has been declining steadily. There are 1,200 teacher positions vacant. Only 10 percent of all professional nurses today have a college degree.

Meanwhile, because of the blunt fact that nurses on average earn less than secretaries, enrollments in nursing schools are lagging far behind demand for nursing services and an estimated 500,000 trained, professional nurses are not practicing.

Representative Long of Maryland Provides Insight Into Congressman-Constituent Relationship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG], recently wrote a thoughtful and constructive article concerning the kind of help Congressmen give their constituents. The article appeared in the August 1964 issue of Coronet magazine. As I am sure it will be of great interest to the Members of this body, I include the text of the article:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN

(Everyone should realize that a Congressman's job is not a nappy one. He spends most of his time helping constituents)

(By Representative CLARENCE D. LONG, of Maryland)

The elderly man held up a white hand towel, on which was woven, in red letters, "U.S. Army." He then handed me a letter from a well-known doctor, certifying that the towel had been removed from him at the Johns Hopkins Hospital. Years before, the man had been operated on in an Army hospital and the towel left in him. As a result, he had been nervous and unable to work. He was receiving a modest stipend as a disabled veteran, but wanted more adequate recompense. Possibly, the towel had affected more than his digestion, for he imparted his suspicion of a Communist plot among Army doctors.

This is one of the thousands of cases that have come to me in over a year as Democratic Congressman from the Second District of Maryland, which consists of Baltimore, Carroll, and Harford Counties.

When I ran for office, after a decade and a half as professor of economics at the Johns Hopkins University, I had the idea that a Congressman's job was to pass laws. Certainly, his vote on legislation is the source of his influence, which has never been greater than now. Not only does Congress spend over $100 billion a year, but—because of the close balance of division in Congress on questions of liberalism versus conservatism—much of its legislation passes or fails by a narrow margin.

Nevertheless, legislation is not what takes up most of a Congressman's time. The citizen has discovered that his Congressman can solve his own as well as the Nation's problems. As a result, two-thirds of my own time and three-fourths of my staff's have been spent not in considering the thousands of bills tossed annually into the hopper, but in bringing business to my district and helping my constituents with the problems they bring to me by phone, by mail, and by visit.

Bel Air, an old southern county seat, was the home of the Shakespearean actor, Junius Booth, who had many children, among them John Wilkes (who assassinated President Lincoln) and Edwin, a Shakespearean actor more famous even than his father. In the post office is a mural by William H. Calfee depicting a performance in 1850 by Edwin Booth at the Bel Air courthouse. The post office was being remodeled and plans were to eliminate the mural to make room for the new air-conditioning ducts. The community was up in arms. "The mural is dear to our hearts," Mayor Buchal wrote me. "We don't want to see it mutilated or destroyed."

"I do wish you could look into the matter and find out which of the architects down there in Washington has holes in his head," a minister wrote.

At my request, the Post Office Department in Washington stopped the work and took steps to see that art could live with air-conditioning.

A man sought my help for his son. Ten years before, the son, then a marine, was having trouble with his wife. He went a.w.o.l. so often in order to reason with her that he finally got an undesirable discharge. He now has a new wife, but his bad conduct record keeps him from a decent job, claimed his father. Could I get his record changed?

Nothing is tougher. I had not previously been able to accomplish this. Nevertheless, I asked my secretary to get through to Marine liaison. While waiting, I asked whether the son had done anything outstanding in the intervening decade to justify changing Marine Corps records.

"Well," the father said, "he served 3 years." He hesitated.

"What for?" I asked.

"Statutory rape," he replied.

"Cancel the call," I said to my secretary.

Recently there arrived this irate letter:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My husband brought me to this country 17 years ago. All he ever does is sleep and put his pay in the bank. Now, he says I'm such a lousy cook that he got the Congressman to send me a cookbook. Could you write me a letter so I can call him a liar?"

I replied that we had no letter from her husband in our files and that we send the cookbooks to all the girls—no reflection on anybody's cooking.

One day I received a letter from a young man who had a wooden arm. He had worked at a local military installation on a hamburger grinder which could chew up 54 pounds of meat a minute. The machine, improperly guarded, had taken off his arm up to his elbow. For this he was given an official reprimand. Without a hearing. The young man wanted the reprimand off his record, in order to get a promotion. After 2 years of appeals, he came to me. I wrote to the commanding general for a hearing, indicating my wish to be present. The official reprimand was removed by return mail. Some colonel may have had a guilty conscience about allowing, first, such a situation to develop; and, second, a reprimand to be administered without a hearing.

Another time, a call came in from a State Department official who lives in my district. On a visit to Panama during the crisis, he had purchased a small, green, Spanish-speaking parrot. Mattie May, quarantined for a health check, had been flown to Washington the previous day. Could someone bring her over to Baltimore? At the close of business, my press assistant delivered the bird to her owner. No service too large or too small.

Congress stayed in session all last year and did not adjourn until the day before Christmas. Since neither my staff nor I had had any vacation during 1963, I let my staff go for 10 days of Christmas recess. This, it turned out, prevented any vacation for me. The entire recess, my home telephone rang with requests for help; and, with my staff gone, I had to do the work myself. Here is the kind of request you cannot put off:

A man requested a military funeral for his brother, a decorated veteran. The local military authorities reported that the honor guard was off on Christmas furlough. This being Saturday afternoon and the veteran

due to be buried on Monday, the matter could scarcely wait until my staff got back. I phoned all nearby military installations and insisted that men be summoned back to bury a man who had fought for his country when it needed him. After nine phone calls, I won him a full military funeral with honor guard, rifle salute, and taps.

A sergeant with 14 years in the Air Force gets orders for Vietnam. He welcomes his dangerous assignment, but—of all things for an airman—suffers from aeroneurosis, a fear of flying; he therefore requests help to get to Vietnam by ship instead of plane. Now they have heard everything.

A farm in my district bids to supply rabbits for medical research at the Walter Reed Hospital in Washington. It is low bidder, but the procurement officials lack confidence in the capacity of the farm—notwithstanding the rabbit's well-publicized talent for multiplication. At my request, the Army looks further into the farm's reproductivity and awards it a contract to supply 3,000 rabbits.

Many of the problems brought to me are trivial, except to those who bring them. In recent months, I have settled a complaint that the post office trucks wake up the neighborhood at 4:30 a.m.; obtained an explanation from the Food and Drug Administration to a firm's objections that fish flour had been ruled unacceptable for human consumption; persuaded the employees' association of the Social Security Administration to contribute $300 to a local volunteer fire department.

Some cases are exasperating:

When a Navy enlisted man, a popular square dance teacher, was ordered to sea, the community got up a petition to have him stay. The Navy felt there were more important matters to attend to elsewhere in the world. I agreed.

A father charges discrimination because his son, a high school graduate, had failed an Army screening test. I learned from the recruiting sergeant that with a passing grade of 31 percent, the boy got only 3 percent. I asked the recruiting sergeant to give him some books to study.

One case involved me in an unusual experience. Neighbors complained of generator noises at a Nike site. The following Sunday while out driving with my son, I went by the installation and decided to pay it a visit. I presented a card, indicating my membership in Congress and on the Armed Services Committee. By way of welcome, the sentry put a clip of bullets in his carbine, searched my car (which bore congressional license plates), then checked with his superiors all the way to brigade headquarters. I was denied admission to the site.

Later, I learned that Army counterintelligence agents attempt to enter missile sites, armed with forged credentials: if they get in, the admitting officers are in trouble. Thus, I was suspected of being—not a Communist spy—but an Army counterintelligence agent pretending to be a Congressman.

The accomplishment of which I am most proud resulted from a visit by a distinguished couple after I took office. Dr. Lomsky and his wife had fled the Communist takeover of Czechoslovakia in 1948, leaving behind—with Mrs. Lomsky's parents, as too young to carry through the hardships that lay ahead—a baby daughter named "Radmila." The Lomskys at length found their way here and became American citizens. In the years since, they have endeavored to get their daughter, now 17, released to join them. They had about given up hope when a friend persuaded them to see me.

The State Department could promise little, aside from offering to admit the girl, if I could get her released. I wrote the Czechoslovakian Ambassador. No answer. I wrote President Novotny. No answer. In the months that followed, I wrote again and again. Same silence.

Then I asked Khruschchev to intercede with his Communist ally. No response from him, either; but several weeks later I received a reply from the new Czechoslovakian Ambassador, Dr. Karel Duda, who said that because of my interest the case would be reopened. No word for another 6 weeks. Then President Kennedy was assassinated. The alleged assassin—though surely acting on his own—had a Communist background and the Communists were concerned over American public opinion. Seeking some small good out of this terrible misfortune, I wrote to the President of Czechoslovakia: "In view of the recent tragedy, releasing Radmila Lomsky might do much to reduce world tension."

A few days later, Dr. Duda phoned his wish to visit my office. I alerted the Lomskys. The Ambassador, a remarkably young-looking man, informed me that the Czech authorities had just called on Radmila to tell her that she could leave.

He then lingered, expressing his admiration for President Kennedy and his many favorable impressions of the United States. When he left I picked up the phone to carry out the pleasantest duty I have had to perform as Congressman. A month later, Radmila came down at Friendship Airport to the arms of her family.

I recently took her to Washington to meet President Johnson and to see the Speaker of the House, JOHN MCCORMACK. Speaker MCCORMACK exclaimed: "What a lovely young lady." And she certainly is—blonde, pretty, well adjusted, she gets high marks at Catonsville High School and was the first person to be awarded a new scholarship for the study of ballet at the Peabody Conservatory in Baltimore.

I shall always treasure the letter I got from her father: "Even though Radmila is now with us and has completely filled our house with gaiety and happiness, my wife and I still find it difficult to believe that our years of heartbreak and anxiety are ended. As one father to another, I offer you my undying gratitude for your humane efforts in rescuing us. Your action in behalf of my family in time of need is especially reassuring to us as new citizens. Where but in America could we have received such personal and persistent attention from a high elected official?"

Cases like this are rewarding, but there are those who deplore this kind of service as keeping a Congressman from his main job of legislation. Indeed, a Congressman could scarcely vote wisely on the thousands of bills introduced each year, even if he spent full time on legislation. With all this busy work, he is good to know the issues on the major bills.

Nevertheless, I have come to appreciate the value of this service work. For one thing, it keeps me close to the people. The hundreds of contacts with people make me a better Representative, for to represent my people I must know what they want.

More important, with the growing size and complexity of Government—the State Department Building alone has 5 miles of corridors—the ordinary person often does not know where to address his prayer for relief.

Here is where the Congressman comes in. He cannot safely close his desk at 5, or seal himself off from the people; for he must go back for reelection every 2 years. And his vote gives him the power needed to get the ear of a too-often indifferent bureaucracy. The Congressman is thus the fellow who humanizes big government. As government continues to grow, the need for the human intervention will unquestionably grow with it. More and more, it is safe to predict, people in need of help will recall the old American saying, "Write your Congressman."

Wage-Price Guidelines Breached

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a number of recent labor settlements, particularly the UAW-Chrysler agreement, have seriously breached the administration's guideposts for noninflationary wage behavior. In an expanding economy where rising demand is already beginning to press against capacity in some lines, these labor settlements signal a possible resumption of the wage-price spiral and a general inflationary trend in the economy.

In striking contrast to the action of the administration at the time steel prices were increased in 1964 and 1963, no sign of official disapproval of these potentially inflationary labor pacts has come from the administration. Evidently the wage-price guideposts will be invoked against business but not against labor.

A recent article in the Washington Post of September 11 discusses four recent labor settlements that seriously breach the wage-price guideposts. Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the RECORD:

WAGE-PRICE GUIDES HIT BY RECENT ACCORDS
(By Frank C. Porter)

The administration's antiinflationary wage-price guideposts stood bent and battered yesterday under the hurricane force of two lush labor settlements which may eventually affect nearly 2 million workers.

Almost overlooked in the controversy over Wednesday's high-prire pact between Chrysler Corp. and the United Auto Workers was an agreement 13 hours later between the Communications Workers of America and the Michigan Bell Telephone Co.

While the Chrysler package increase has been estimated variously from 4.3 to 4.7 percent annually—a clear breach of the 3.2 percent guidepost formula—the Bell settlement appears to call for a 5-percent boost.

And although administration spokesmen have laid great stress on auto negotiations as a bellwether for other industries, the Michigan telephone settlement may be only slightly less strategic. It is expected to serve as a contract pattern for 750,000 Bell System employees throughout the country and influence negotiations involving thousands of other communications workers.

Although both settlements violate the guidepost in the literal sense, private and Government economists here stress that the 3.2 percent standard offered by the President's Council of Economic Advisers is intended as an average, not as the precise target for every settlement. Thus some contracts can be expected to fall below it and others to exceed it.

In the first 6 months of 1964 the average annual wage and fringe benefit increase of negotiated contracts figured out to 3.2 percent, the guidepost level.

The administration warned the UAW and the auto industry as early as last March that excessive contract increases could threaten the extraordinary price stability of the past 7 years by inducing other unions to seek similar gains and thus stimulate a new round of wage-price or "cost-push" inflation.

But UAW officials deny the auto industry is a bellwether. They contend that market forces rather than example determine labor settlements. In other words, few industries could afford to pay the contract gains the UAW expected from the carmakers, whose profit margins are about the highest in the Nation.

While attention was rivited on the auto industry, two major settlements which exceeded the wage guidepost went practically unnoticed earlier this summer.

One involved the Nation's big oil companies and the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union; the other, the big rubber firms and the United Rubber Workers.

The annual wage and benefit gains contained in both agreements have been generally estimated at about 4.5 percent—roughly in the same range as the gains won by the auto workers.

Some analysis suggest that the UAW and CWA pacts merely followed a pattern set in the rubber and oil industries, that it would be unfair to point an accusatory finger at either union when the precedent they followed had gone unchallenged.

And defenders of the UAW and its president, Walter P. Reuther, argue that the union was justified in piercing the administration's wage standard because management had failed to go along with the price guidepost.

The general guide set on wages warns that contract gains should be in line with the national trend of increased annual output per worker, which averages 3.2 percent over the past 5 years. The price guidepost calls on industries where this productivity increase exceeds the national trend—it has been 4.9 percent in autos since the war—to reduce prices.

Although Labor Department figures show a slight dip in car prices since 1958, mostly due to quality improvement, the decrease is not proportionate to the excess of industry productivity gains over the national average.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate debated foreign aid—reapportionment legislation.

House passed supplemental appropriation bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 21779–21796

Bills Introduced: Three bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3200–3202; S.J. Res. 205; and S. Res. 371. Page 21780

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 1927, to revise the pension program for veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict, with amendments (S. Rept. 1591); and

Proposed Agreement for Cooperation regarding exchange of atomic information between U.S. and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its member nations (S. Rept. 1592). Page 21779

President's Communication—Appropriations: Communication from President transmitting proposed appropriation for the fiscal year 1965 in the amount of $500,000 for the Department of Labor was received—referred to Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 97. Page 21779

President's Communication—Appropriations: Communication from President transmitting proposed appropriations and a provision for the fiscal year 1965, as follows, was received: For the Judiciary, proposed supplemental appropriations in the amount of $60,000; for the Executive Branch, proposed provision and appropriations in the amount of $12,283,000; and for the D.C., proposed supplemental appropriations in the sum of $25,000—referred to Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 98. Page 21779

State Highways: It was announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Senators Randolph and Cooper as members on the part of the Senate of special committee authorized by H. Con. Res. 179, to deliver to the American Association of State Highway Officials at its meeting in December 1964 copy of said resolution expressing appreciation of Congress to the association for its service to the Nation. Page 21779

Foreign Aid—Reapportionment: Senate debated H.R. 11380, fiscal 1965 authorizations for the foreign aid program.

Pending at adjournment was Dirksen-Mansfield amendment providing for stay of proceedings for reapportionment of State legislatures.

Pages 21796, 21814–21833

Confirmation: Nomination of Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., of Illinois, to be Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, was confirmed. Page 21833

Nomination: One Coast and Geodetic Survey nomination was received. Page 21833

Quorum Call: One quorum call was taken today. Page 21804

Program for Wednesday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 5:05 p.m. until noon Wednesday, September 23, when it will continue on H.R. 11380, foreign aid—reapportionment. Page 21833

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—SUPPLEMENTAL 1965

Committee on Appropriations: Committee held hearings on H.R. 12633, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965, receiving testimony from Charles S. Stoddard, Bureau of Land Management, and Harold E. Crowther, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, both of the Department of the Interior; Roger L. Stevens, Special Consultant to the President on the Arts; Charles L. Grant, Director of Budget and Finance Officer, and Howard Bertsch, Administrator, Farmers Home Administration, both of the Department of Agriculture; Royal Jackson, on funds for salaries of referees in bankruptcy, Department of the Judiciary; Oscar Cox, Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure; R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., on funds for Office of Economic Opportunity; W. R. Curtis, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, on funds for Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act of 1963; and John B. Duncan and Brig. Gen. Frederick J. Clarke, both of the D.C. Board of Commissioners.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

Appendix

"New Vistas in Space"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, during the last several years, the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee has advocated that our national space program should furnish a broad-based technological basis for the exploration of space that would enable our Nation to achieve its goal of preeminence in space. To this end, we have authorized the appropriation of large sums of money to accomplish this purpose. We have repeatedly defended these funds, on the basis that they should be used to support a well-balanced national space effort, and should not be pegged to an individual program, such as landing on the moon, and should not be viewed in such narrow proportions as merely the accomplishment of a mission of landing on the moon and return. We have encouraged NASA to establish parameters for a broad technological base which will serve this Nation for decades to come, and to look beyond the present, in order to plan for the future.

I am happy to find that knowledgeable people are agreeing with this philosophy; and I take this opportunity to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the September 21 edition of Aviation Week and Space Technology, and written by Editor Robert Hotz. Mr. Hotz has long been associated with aviation and aerospace technological development, and I commend to all the reading of his recent editorial.

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

NEW VISTAS IN SPACE

Even before its first decade is complete, the space age is opening onto new vistas. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration currently is finishing an interesting exercise (see p. 22) aimed at examing the new technology that has been created during the first 7 years of the space age and projecting what can be done with it in the decade ahead. Even a cursory examination of space progress shows clearly that it has far surpassed the rosiest predictions of its early prophets. The new vistas that are opening for the future would have been inconceivable a decade ago.

The fact that the principal legislative architect of the U.S. space program, President Lyndon B. Johnson, is in the midst of a reelection campaign has certainly played a part in the timing of NASA's new exercise. But technical pressure generated by the rapid progress of the past few years made such an exericse inevitable regardless of the political factors. Most of the scientists, engineers and administrators involved in the NASA-industry partnership have been engaged so intensely in pushing specific projects that it has been difficult for them to grasp the full significance of the enormous foundation of new technology they have constructed for the future. Nor do the American people who have enthusiastically supported the national space program, both financially and emotionally, fully understand the implications generated by its early achievements. Thus, we think that NASA's current effort in attempting to sketch this new technological base and project its applications for the future shold serve an extremely useful purpose.

U.S. LEADERSHIP

The first phase of the U.S. space program was strictly a defensive reaction to the pioneering achievement of the Soviet Union. For too many years it was a grueling stern chase that demanded extraordinary financial and technical effort to overcome the gap created by complacency. This phase has just about ended. Although the Soviets still maintain a significant lead in some aspects of manned space flight, the United States has created a much broader foundation of space technology. This Nation has clearly established international leadership in space science and such applications as communications and weather operational satellite systems while slicing the Soviet lead in manned flight.

The hardware for the second generation of U.S. space systems is already in the flight test stage and its feasibility already demonstrated. This is why it is necessary now to organize a new type of national space program based not on the simple concept of overtaking the Soviets but on utilizing the new riches of space technology to serve domestic and international goals of U.S. policy.

Some people may wonder why it is necessary or even desirable now to chart a new space program when the principal goal of the present program—manned landing on the moon—has not yet been reached. There are two reasons why this exercise is necessary now. The first is that most of the basic new hardware that will be used to complete the Apollo moon landing program has been designed and is being constructed and tested. The technological capabilities of this equipment are already clear even though they have not yet been refined and tested by a full-scale lunar landing operation. Second, if the capabilities that are already within the realm of possibility are not now organized into programs projecting them beyond the lunar landing, they will not reach fruition in time to assure the full exploitation of this hardware in its operationally reliable stage.

Although responsible NASA officials have been harping on this subject for the past few years, it is still not widely understood that the Apollo lunar landing program is not an end in itself but rather the focal point for the creation of a new reservoir of fundamental technology that can be applied equally well in unveiling the mysteries of outer space or improving the lot of man on earth. Now that much of this technology is visible, tangible hardware and functioning systems, this point should be easier to understand, even for skeptics such as Senators FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, and PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

SECOND-GENERATION HARDWARE

A few examples will suffice to illustrate the major capability increases possible from the second-generation space hardware now coming into being. The new OGO scientific satellite will be able to provide from 10 to 20 times more data than the IMP satellite now sweeping space in huge elliptical orbits that almost span the distance between earth and the moon. Saturn 5 booster being built for the Apollo mission will have the ability to orbit a 120-ton payload—more than 50 times the weight of the initial Mercury capsules. How to use this 120-ton earth orbit capability will certainly be one of the major questions posed in the current NASA study. A whole new spectrum of power has been created, ranging from the three tons of thrust per second of the huge liquid-fueled boosters through electric, nuclear and ionic power down to systems whose power can be calibrated in micromouse burps and can function for years without servicing. Harnessing these new energy sources for earth as well as space applications may be one of the most technically significant developments of the next decade.

NASA is picking an excellent time, aside from the election implications, to inventory the achievements of space technology and project them into a future format that will give the national space program a focus and purpose beyond the Apollo lunar landings. For the development of space technology will continue to open new vistas for man and his universe that cannot yet be perceived from this point in time with our vision still clouded by the earth's atmospheric sheath.

ROBERT HOTZ.

Address by the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, of South Carolina, on the Occasion of the Commissioning of the Polaris Submarine "John C. Calhoun"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, on September 15, the 26th of our Navy's mighty Polaris submarines was commissioned. She is the U.S.S. *John C. Calhoun*, bearing the name of a great South Carolina statesman. The commissioning address appropriately was delivered by our able and distinguished colleague from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

This fine new vessel will add strength to our Nation just as the statesman whose name she bears was a bulwark of strength to our country during another perilous time in our history. An excellent ship, she is a product of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., located across the river from me in TOM DOWNING'S congressional district. Many of my constituents work in that yard

and have applied their skills and their experience to making each succeeding vessel built there a little better than its predecessor. And so, this is the finest of our Polaris submarines yet to enter active service.

Mr. Speaker, it was fitting that Mr. RIVERS, a worthy successor in the Halls of Congress to the great John C. Calhoun, should make the address on this occasion, and his remarks were so appropriate, so interesting and informative that I commend them to the reading of the entire membership. His address follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, AT THE COMMISSIONING OF THE "JOHN C. CALHOUN" SSB(N)630: SEPTEMBER 15, 1964; NEWPORT NEWS, VA.

About 182 years ago, two boys were born in a new nation—one in the North and the other in the South of this infant, struggling member of that cold and brutal domicile we call the family of nations, this new concept in democracy, only an experiment in self-government, was never before attempted, and it has never since been equaled.

The one child from the North—Daniel Webster—was born in a log cabin on the bleak and frigid slopes of New Hampshire. The other—John Caldwell Calhoun—in the warmer, friendly climate of frontier South Carolina.

Each of these children was destined to become an imperishable cord in the fabric of our American heritage. Each was destined to be part and parcel of the warp and woof of the American loom which was to weave other mental giants. Each was to add to the legacy of every American. Each was to leave his imprint indelibly inscribed in every history book portraying the American story.

Prophetic words were destined to come from the lips of each. In 1832, Daniel Webster said: "If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley, all these might be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?

"Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which united national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No. If these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them, than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw. The edifice of constitutional American liberty."

For this immortal American, a grateful country named her 18th Polaris submarine.

Now the other immortal, who devoted his life to the defense of Constitutional American liberty and States rights, shall be forever remembered as a man who loved his country. Revered its traditions. Protected its mores. Vigilantly defended its form of Government, and never once in his entire life surrendered his principles.

I regard this honor honor of participating in the commissioning of our 26th fleet ballistic missile submarine, named in memory of that other incomparable American—John Caldwell Calhoun—a privilege I shall cherish so long as I shall live.

With pardonable pride and with a sense of deep humility, I count it one of the highlights of my uneventful and unimportant life that I was able to persuade the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy to name this submarine for our own immortal South Carolinian.

In the book I hold in my hand, "Profiles in Courage," written by the late President John F. Kennedy, are these words quoted from Daniel Webster portraying John Caldwell Calhoun: "Much the ablest man in the Senate." The greatest in fact he had met in his entire life. "He could have," declared Webster, "demolished Isaac Newton, John Calvin, and even John Locke as a logician. His speeches, stripped of all excess verbiage marched across the Senate floor in even columns, measured, disciplined, carrying all before them." Webster knew this man. Webster knew Calhoun as no other man did. He met Calhoun on the field of battle, the floor of the Senate of the United States. And there, he felt the wounds of conflict.

Sailors, I am told, are alleged to be somewhat superstitious and conscious of good and bad omens. And therefore, perhaps the name of a ship—and especially a ship as important to the Nation as this one—may have great significance to the two crews that are assigned to her. If so—this submarine will sail over and under the seas protected by the name and memory of an American who has no equal in our history.

Greatness epitomized Calhoun and genius was his at a very early age. He graduated from Yale College in 2 years and, in the process, was elected to Phi Beta Kappa—the acme of collegiate intellectual attainment.

Indeed, John Caldwell Calhoun was a great man. He dwarfed his contemporaries as does the lordly cedar of the mountain tower over the blushing violet of the valley. He was a lawyer, a member of the South Carolina General Assembly, a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, Secretary of War, Secretary of State, Vice President of the United States, and a Member of the U.S. Senate.

There was in his character many of the attributes of those who serve aboard our submarines. He was independent of thought and independent of action. Surely, there is nothing more independent than a Polaris submarine on station far from the shores of America. And, I say to you, his death did not toll the end of States rights.

Calhoun was a lonely man. Not because he lacked friends or family, but because of such superb intellect. He was lonely because he knew that with the death of State sovereignty, came the death of individual freedom. He knew that a powerful bureaucracy meant a weak State sovereignty. He knew that a strong Washington meant a weak Virginia or South Carolina.

He was a brilliant man who preferred to lead rather than be led; he was a genius serving with many who could only aspire to genius.

And in his loneliness, there is a kinship for those of you who will carry with you the awesome responsibility of guarding our Nation from the depths of the ocean or the sanctums of the sea.

All of you who compose the officers and crew of this submarine have demonstrated a capability and a degree of accomplishment that sets you aside from others. You truly can be compared with the man for whom this submarine is named.

Since you will have so much in common with John Caldwell Calhoun, I propose to you that you adopt a motto for this submarine taken from the lips of this patriot. I hope that aboard this submarine in some conspicuous spot you place a plaque and imprint upon it these words of Calhoun: "The honor of a nation it its life."

As she goes forth to sea, I sincerely hope that each of you will be blessed with the ability, the foresight, the determination, the steadfastness, the patience, the stamina, and the personal courage of the man for whom this submarine is named.

Perhaps you did not know that among the many achievements of John Caldwell Calhoun was the unheralded fact that while serving as Secretary of War, he is considered by many to have been the progenitor of the Monroe Doctrine. This may be hearsay in Virginia, but it is history in South Carolina. I am afraid that he would not recognize its application today, but nevertheless it still remains American policy, ignored and shattered as it may be.

And perhaps you would be interested to learn that John Caldwell Calhoun, as Secretary of War, fought to obtain added benefits for members of the Armed Forces. And this is every American's job.

And it was John Caldwell Calhoun who issued these prophetic words many years ago, "However removed our citizens from the great powers of the world and how pacific our policy, we are liable to be involved in war—perpetual peace is a dream which no nation has had the good fortune to enjoy."

As a war hawk who survived the vengeance of the Indian, he knew as no other American, the words of the greatest philosopher, Plato, who said: "Only the dead have seen the end of war."

He knew as did few that peace is only for those who can protect it. He knew that when the war tocsin sounds, only the strong can come forth, and only the ready remain.

Had there been more John Caldwell Calhouns in 1916, and more John Caldwell Calhouns in 1938, and more John Caldwell Calhouns in 1949, perhaps the policy of constant preparedness, for which he fought, would have prevented the wars which have taken so many precious flowers of our American manhood.

John Caldwell Calhoun was a discerning man and an incomparable judge of men. As Secretary of War, for example, he personally screened every cadet at West Point, and 1 year, after the names of 35 Virginians had been submitted to him as possible cadets at West Point, he approved only 9.

Among those nine were three who were destined to become the great leaders of the lost cause—Robert E. Lee, Joseph E. Johnston, and Jefferson Davis.

So, ladies and gentlemen—I extend my sincere best wishes to the officers and men who will man this submarine; I congratulate the builders, and on behalf of the citizens of this great Nation, I welcome this submarine to the ever-growing fleet of ballistic submarines which have become a hallmark in our defense posture.

I also welcome the officers and men of this ship to their home port of Charleston. Certainly, nothing could be more appropriate for this submarine, with its awesome destructive power, with its highly trained crew, and with its monumental responsibility, than to sail into Charleston Harbor—where rests the remains of that restless man—and rekindle once again the spirit of John Caldwell Calhoun among the people of my Charleston, and our people of South Carolina, who revere his memory and praise his name.

You will find that Charleston is proud of America's military might; proud of the knowledge that Charleston is a vital Polaris submarine base; and proud of a ship that bears the name of John Caldwell Calhoun; and proud that while we protect the past, we, too, have concern for the future.

And just as Charlestonians and South Carolinians will be proud of this submarine, so also will they be proud of you—the officers and men who will have the priceless privilege of serving aboard this great addition to the naval might of America—the

only nation on earth capable of leading the free world—long may her land be bright, protect her by your might, Great God our King.

No TV Debates This Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the unfortunate action of 44 Democratic Senators in killing the legislation authorizing debates and other TV and radio appearances by major presidential and vice-presidential candidates has attracted a considerable amount of editorial comment, most of it understandably unfavorable.

In addition, the action is having some very unfortunate results wholly outside the political arena. The defeat of this legislation apparently has forced the cancellation of a television appeal by the President of the United States for the annual charity drive of the United Fund and the Community Chest. The responsibility for this blow to the charity and welfare programs financed by these community agencies must, of course, rest on those who refused to allow passage of this equal time suspension bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some sample editorials on the Senate's action, together with an article published in the Wall Street Journal detailing this unfortunate, but wholly foreseeable, side effect of the Senate's decision.

There being no objection, the editorials and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 20, 1964]

NO DEBATE

The decision of President Johnson to avoid a television debate with Senator GOLDWATER is poor public policy, whether or not it is wise politics. The Senate Democrats were clearly deferring to the President's assessment of his own political interests when they voted to table the bill which would have suspended the equal-time requirement and thus cleared the way for a direct confrontation before a nationwide audience.

It is in the public's interest that a presidential campaign should approach as nearly as possible a coherent and responsive dialog between the two candidates. The televised debates, as our experience of 1960 demonstrated, are valuable in developing that dialog. They could have been especially useful this year in view of the Republican candidate's apparent determination to avoid press conferences and his propensity for repudiating or reinterpreting his previous remarks.

President Johnson is not a man given to underconfidence in his own persuasiveness. His reticence in this instance has put an unfortunate limit on the evidence available to the voters in judging which nominee is better qualified to act as spokesman for this Nation before the world.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 20, 1964]

A BACKWARD STEP ON EQUAL TIME

When the Senate obliged the President by killing the equal time suspension bill, it meant neatly to torpedo any prospect of a 1964 series of debates between Mr. Johnson and Senator GOLDWATER—and to relieve Mr. Johnson of any embarrassment he might have felt at personally turning down the Goldwatr challenge.

But it did more. It deliberately threw a major block in the path of the broadcast industry in its effort fairly, honestly, and fully to cover the campaign. It knowingly denied the Nation's voters the right to have this coverage. Killing the bill (which had previously passed both houses, with overwhelming bipartisan support) was a shoddy bit of backstage political trickstering. And it was clearly dictated, for his own political advantage, by President Johnson.

This was not just a "great debates" bill—though one of its principal purposes was to makes the debates possible. Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934 requires broadcasters to provide equal time for all "legally qualified candidates" in any given race, however frivolous their candidacies (and there were at least 14 candidates for the Presidency in 1960). This had the effect of placing broadcasters in an all but impossibly tight straightjacket. This was loosened somewhat in 1959, with legislation exempting certain types of programs—such as on-the-spot news coverage and bona fide news interviews—from the requirements of section 315. But it still left a broad range of potentially useful broadcasting enterprise, including documentaries about the candidates, under its restrictions, which in practical effect amount to a prohibition.

The bill dutifully voted down by obedient Senate Democrats would simply have suspended section 315, as it applied to candidates for President and Vice President only, for the duration of the 1964 campaign, as was done in 1960 and as President Kennedy had urged for 1964.

The networks, which under the 1960 suspension proved themselves scrupulously, even self-consciously, fair in their campaign coverage, are thus barred from serving the public's right to know to the best of their ability. The public has been told that if it thinks it's entitled to the fullest and best possible coverage, it had better think again. Mr. Johnson says no—and for no apparent reason better than a wish to duck a debate challenge by hiding behind a legal obstacle rather than saying no.

Eventually, section 315 ought to be repealed entirely; what's good for the Presidential race—and suspension would have been good—is good for congressional, State, and local races, too. But the least Congress could have done this year would have been not to take the backward step it took in burying even this limited suspension.

[From the New York Journal American, Aug. 20, 1964]

WRONG CHANNEL

By killing a proposal that would have suspended, for the duration of the election campaign, the equal time provision of the Federal Communications Act as applied to broadcasters, the Senate Democrats have done the public a disservice.

It was a squeaker vote, 44 to 41, and it was dubious strategy.

Whether true or not, the impression will remain that the Senate Democrats (excepting 12 who did not vote with the majority) were influenced by the White House. And whether true or not, the impression will remain that the White House wanted to prevent any chance of televised debates between President Johnson and BARRY GOLDWATER.

The ruling out of TV debates made the headlines, but it is not the primary issue.

THE NETWORKS NOW CRIPPLED

The primary issue is that the networks are now crippled in preventing any special reporting of candidates. If they do undertake such reporting, the equal time provision makes them liable to being forced to offer air time to all other candidates of splinter parties.

As Robert W. Sarnoff, president of NBC, pointed out recently in a reasoned letter to the New York Times, equal time "would limit or preclude programs providing background information on the principal candidates and their campaigns—information to which the public is entitled in the process of selecting a President or a Vice President." Such programs were possible in 1960 when the provision was suspended.

As concerns debates, President Johnson, if he wished, could have declined to participate on absolutely valid grounds.

The tremendous responsibilities of his office—the fact that national security might be endangered by a slip of the tongue in the heat of debate—are solid reasons why he could have declined.

The President also is on record before the public—virtually day by day on policies and decisions, and the determination that went into making them. And this, too, could legitimately make debates unnecessary.

That is why, in our opinion, the question of debates is not a primary issue. Capriciously limiting one source of public information is the primary issue, and that is what the Senate Democrats have done.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 20, 1964]

TV IN THE CAMPAIGN

The Senate made a serious mistake, in our opinion, in voting down the proposed amendments to the "equal-time" law. The bills, which had passed both the House and Senate in somewhat different form, were designed to encourage the presentation of the major presidential candidates to television and radio audiences. They would not, of course, have required debates between President Johnson and Senator GOLDWATER. Their purpose was to facilitate the arrangement of broadcasts related to the 1964 campaign that would have been mutually satisfactory to the two candidates.

It is most unfortunate that the Democratic hierarchy has rejected this limited relaxation of the present law. The case against requiring equal time on the air for the major national candidates and the candidates of obscure fringe parties, if they demand it, grows stronger every year. We think the provision should be not merely set aside in presidential campaigns but repealed outright as to all political contests.

For the present campaign, however, it is a question of using broadcasting facilities to the maximum extent for presentation of the real candidates without any change in the law. Fortunately, the equal-time requirement does not extend to newscasts or to regularly scheduled interviews. Presumably President Johnson and Senator GOLDWATER can appear on such programs as "Meet the Press" or "Face the Nation," for example, without exposing the networks to demands from the fringe candidates. If they were so disposed, it is possible that both could appear together on a regularly scheduled interview of this kind.

It is most unfortunate that the emphasis upon "debates" between the presidential candidates, a form of encounter that ob-

viously met with the disapproval of President Johnson, has resulted in the denial of any legislative relief from the restrictions of the present law. Nevertheless, a great deal of radio and TV "exposure" is possible under the statute as it stands. There is a genuine public interest in expanding legitimate news coverage and interviews to the maximum permissible.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 4, 1964]

JOHNSON MAY FORFEIT TV SPOTS BY REFUSAL TO DEBATE GOLDWATER—EQUAL TIME LAW, IN FORCE THIS YEAR, JEOPARDIZES BROADCAST FOR CHARITY, PRESS SESSIONS

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson's decision not to debate Senator GOLDWATER on television is producing curious side effects: Mr. Johnson apparently won't be able to appear on the TV kickoff of the United Fund and Community Chest campaigns, at least in the traditional format, and he may not be able to schedule any more televised news conferences.

During the election season, the radio and television appearances of the President and all other candidates for office are vitally affected by an otherwise little noticed section of the Communications Act.

Section 315, the equal time law, doesn't say anything about debates or United Fund campaigns, but it does say that if a station permits a candidate for public office to use its facilites it must afford the same opportunity to other candidates for the same office.

The broadcasting industry has long wished Congress would repeal the section, at least for presidential and vice-presidential candidates. The networks have no objection; indeed they're anxious to give the two major parties' top candidates lots of prime time—but not if it means giving equal time to a dozen or so splinter party candidates.

When no White House incumbent was running for reelection, there was no problem. Congress suspended section 315 for the 1960 presidential and vice-presidential candidates, meaning that the TV networks could carry the Kennedy-Nixon debates without having to give time to splinter party candidates.

NO SUSPENSION THIS YEAR

But this year the Democratic leadership in Congress refused to suspend the section. Clearly, Congress and the networks were ready but the White House wasn't. Lyndon Johnson never said he wouldn't meet BARRY GOLDWATER in a TV debate, but the Democratic congressional leadership, according to most interpretations, acted on cue from the White House. Mr. Johnson apparently has no intention of sharing with Senator GOLDWATER the big TV audience that the Presidency commands.

There's no indication whether Mr. Johnson realized that this might bar him from almost any Johnson-only TV appearance that the party doesn't pay for. There may be no more televised White House news conferences until after election day; the FCC is studying this question now. There apparently won't be any special programs featuring Mr. Johnson, such as the United Fund-Community Chest kickoff.

The FCC, in response to a request from the United Community Campaigns of America, ruled that if stations carried a Johnson TV appearance for the charity fund campaign, they'd have to make equal time available to Mr. GOLDWATER and all the splinter-party candidates. United Community Campaigns had arranged with NBC to tape-record a 5-minute broadcast by Mr. Johnson at the White House to be carried on all national networks during prime time September 11.

NO "PUBLIC SERVICE" EXEMPTION

The Commission's Democratic and Republican members agreed in the decision that there's nothing in section 315 exempting Presidential broadcasts that are directed "in the public interest or as a public service." Thus, if stations air a candidate's fund appeal they'll be liable for equal-time demands; it's "immaterial whether or not a candidate uses the time to discuss matters related to his candidacy," the FCC said.

The Commission did offer the thought that perhaps a Johnson fund appeal could be carried in a different format. Congress in 1959, it noted, amended section 315 to exempt appearances of candidates on "bona fide newscasts," news interviews and in documentaries and "on-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events." The FCC suggested that perhaps a tape of a Presidential appeal could be worked into network news programs without incurring the equal-time liability. But the Commission didn't guarantee it would find such an arrangement exempt; it wasn't asked to pass on that question, the agency said.

The FCC's basic decision breaks new ground, though it isn't precedent shattering. During the 1956 campaign, President Eisenhower appeared in a special telecast to talk to the Nation about the Suez Canal crisis. Adlai Stevenson demanded equal time and the FCC turned him down.

Attacks on Supreme Court Have Historic Precedents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in the Congress of the United States today we have a "heads you win, tails I lose" situation. When Republicans are in the minority as indeed they are in this Chamber, the administration is able to ride roughshod over the rights of the minority and use any parliamentary device it desires with little regard to morality of fair play. How clearly this was illustrated in the wheat-cotton bill. But consider the other body where those who favor calling a halt to Supreme Court intrusion in the field of State reapportionment are in the majority as evidenced by several recent votes. Yes, the people of the United States are prevented from expressing their will by a band of liberals who are afraid to let the issue come to a vote. Certainly the citizens of our Nation have a right under the Constitution to insist that the Supreme Court be a judicial rather than a legislative body and that is the purpose of the Tuck bill which recently passed this House. It is also the purpose, though somewhat less clearly defined, of the Dirksen proposal.

Following is an article by Mr. William Buckley, Jr., from the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch, which puts this issue in its proper perspective:

ATTACKS ON SUPREME COURT HAVE HISTORIC PRECEDENTS

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Senator GOLDWATER has opened up an issue than which there is no more important in the domestic scene, it seems to me. And his doing so has elicited howls of pain and rage from—are you surprised?—precisely those forces who pledge their eternal allegiance to freedom of speech and to the imperatives of rhetorical moderation.

The man in Washington most influential in matters that have to do with the Supreme Court, with the single exception of Chief Justice Warren himself and of course the President, is Mr. EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives.

Said he, reacting to Senator GOLDWATER's speech: "—(an act of) violent demagoguery (which) can only incite disrespect for law and order."

To make absolutely sure he had made his point, Representative CELLER urged the Nation to beware of GOLDWATER much as it would beware of Hitler or Mussolini. "One of the first and surest steps to totalitarianism is taking away the independence of the courts of a nation. That was what Hitler and Mussolini did."

The trouble with EMANUEL CELLER's squidlike reaction to Senator GOLDWATER's charge is that it presupposes that any criticism of the leadership of the Supreme Court equals an attack on the independence of the Court. To take such a position is to assume that there never has been, and could not possibly be, such a thing as judicial abuse, or judicial tyranny.

Suppose Mr. CELLER's philosophy had obtained in 1857, at the time the Supreme Court laid down the Dred Scott decision, whose meaning was in effect that Negroes are not human beings, but merely pieces of property? Would it have been an attack upon the independence of the Supreme Court to have railed against that decision—as for instance Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry Thoreau did? And the New York Times? And Abraham Lincoln?

Those who are increasingly impatient with Senator GOLDWATER should consider the difficulty he has in making his points, so poised are his critics to emit their keening criticisms of his remarks.

The Senator said that the Supreme Court in these days is "the least faithful to the constitutional tradition of limited government of the three branches of government." He singled out as examples the two decisions of the Supreme Court respecting school prayer and reapportionment. These two issues are not the subject of this analysis, but rather the question whether it is any longer permissible to criticize the Court.

Now Senator GOLDWATER's point is that the Supreme Court has overstepped its constitutional function by misconceiving itself as a body with essentially legislative rather than judicial functions. Is this an extremist view?

Prof. Edward Corwin of Princeton University, for years acknowledged as perhaps even the foremost authority on constitutional law, a few months before his death deplored the "aggressive tendencies" of the Warren Court. The chief justice of the individual States passed a resolution of censure against Mr. Warren in 1958.

In that same year Mr. Justice Learned Hand, lecturing at Harvard University, remarked acidly that the Warren Court had turned itself into a "third legislative chamber."

Senator GOLDWATER uttered a sentence which in my judgment is a profound as any he or anyone has recently made, when he said in his speech to the political scientists in Chicago: "The question under our system of government is not simply what decision is right, but also who has the right to decide: only when the latter question is answered, should the former be considered."

That is quintessential conservative doctrine, for those who wonder what conservatism consists in, and Senator GOLDWATER brilliantly lives up to his function as a crystallizer of the conservative position by uttering it.

The argument, Senator GOLDWATER is saying, is not whether it is right or wrong under the aspect of the heavens that the regents

of New York State should have prescribed a prayer for those who wished to utter it at the beginning of classes or whether the State of Tennessee gives adequate privileges to urban voters: but rather, what are the means set down by the Constitution for correcting these measures, if indeed they are to be corrected?

The means set down are primarily legislative, not judicial: and it is a friend of the Constitution, and a mature student of a viable political freedom, who has the courage to remark the growth of judicial tyranny.

Legislative Reapportionment: The Hopeless Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "The Hopeless Situation," from the Richmond News Leader of September 22, 1964.

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

THE HOPELESS SITUATION

A litle more than 2 years ago, on April 7, 1962, Governor Harrison signed the reapportionment bill recently enacted by the Virginia General Assembly. It wasn't much of a bill, as this newspaper commented at the time. The new law corrected a few gross inequalities that had developed in the preceding 10 years, but it left some large and obvious discrepancies in the allocation of seats in Virginia's house and senate.

Mr. Harrison did his best to put a good face on the matter. To those who complained that the cities were being shortchanged, he pointed out that 55 of the 100 house seats and 29 of the 40 senatorial districts served urban areas. He dwelled upon the difficulties of fair apportionment in a State that stretches from the Atlantic Ocean to the Allegheny Mountains. "Ours is a large State of diverse interests and habits." He commented especially upon the difference in the task of a legislator who serves a single county or city alone, by contrast with the task of a legislator who serves half a dozen political subdivisions.

Population alone should not be the sole measure of fairness in allocating legislative seats, the Governor insisted. Geography counts for something, and community of interest, and the convenience of the people. By long tradition, Virginia never has divided any city or county in different legislative districts. He felt confident this sensible practice would be preserved. "Virginia would be faced with an utterly hopeless situation were population the sole basis of reapportionment."

We recall these remarks of Mr. Harrison by way of emphasizing how drastically conditions have changed since he spoke 2 years and 5 months ago. Now, by decree of the Supreme Court, population has indeed become the sole basis of reapportionment. Custom, tradition, convenience, community, and geography have been outlawed altogether. Virginia's 1962 act has been declared unconstitutional. In November, the assembly must be summoned into special session to tackle the "utterly hopeless situation."

Now, the problem in this whole controversy over reapportionment is that the equities are sorely divided. It would be so much easier to denounce the Supreme Court altogether, or to uphold the Supreme Court altogether; or per contra, to insist that the States were altogether right, or altogether wrong. No such neat and simplified position can be taken.

The palpable fact is that the State legislatures, over a long period of years, have grossly neglected their plain duty in this field. The record is clear, and the record is shameful. Virginia's course of conduct has been far superior to that of most other States, but even here, the assembly's 1962 reapportionment act complacently provided a Seventh Senate District of 61,700 persons and a Ninth Senate District of 163,400. Those who seek to defend this sort of thing are defending the indefensible.

Thus we are persuaded that the Supreme Court was not wholly in error, in the original Tennesesee case, in concluding that such gross inequities could be made subject to judicial relief. A persuasive case could be made, so long as one were deaf to the history and intention of the 14th amendment, that Tennessee was denying some of its people equal protection of the laws.

If the Supreme Court had been content with a reasonable and restrained construction of the 14th in this application, it is likely that more good than harm, on balance, would have resulted. The most flagrantly offending States would have been nudged into the making of necessary reforms, but there would have been no political revolution.

The Supreme Court was not content with such a course. On June 15 of this year, it handed down its reckless and doctrinaire decision asserting that population, and population only, must be the controlling factor. In that sweeping opinion, one of the great checks and balances of the American political system was nullified. The Court was just as wrong in its direction as the offending States were wrong on their side.

Now Virginia is caught in the judicial whirlwind. Mr. Harrison, to his great credit, has kept his head. He has asked the necessary people to make the necessary studies. He has neither capitulated nor defied. The assembly will try its hand once more. And if the assembly fails to suit the judges' egalitarian fancies? Then presumably the judges themselves will draw legislative districts with judicial pens.

These are the unpalatable alternatives—the rape of fair play on one hand, the rape of the Constitution on the other. In this dilemma, only the Congress of the United States can provide prompt relief by submitting a constitutional amendment that would permit the States to apportion one legislative chamber on factors other than pure population. The very submission of such a proposal might tame the ardor of our Federal judges, and thus provide a breathing space in which abstract "equality" could be made reasonably subject to the demands of commonsense.

Farmer's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERNON W. THOMSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Publisher and Editor Arnott Widstrand, Jr., in his paper, the La Farge Enterprise, calls for greater recognition of the contributions made by the American farmers. In the colorful and historic Kickapoo Valley of Wisconsin, Editor Widstrand is painfully aware that the parity index of 74 percent is the lowest since the thirties and the cost-price squeeze on the American farmers is the most offensive in many decades. His editorial suggests a method of recognizing through a day of public tribute the debt of the consumer to the producers of America's food and fiber. Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include this editorial:

FARMER'S DAY

With the turbulence of our time an idea has struck which might be a step toward solving a social injustice which has long been neglected.

We suggest that a day of the year be set aside as "Farmer Day," a sequel to our Labor Day holiday.

"Labor," that priceless commodity, without which nothing is accomplished, has made great strides in the past 30 years. They now bargain with equality, pride, and effectiveness at the bargaining table. The fruits of labor are now more equally shared by the laborer.

Not so with the farmer. He is disoriented and split on methods and policy in an almost impossible jumble of marketing process. He still takes what is offered and pays what is asked in his selling and buying.

In this day of the NFO we have the farmer desperately trying to raise his income in order that he may live on the same standard as the rest of the citizens. He works harder and longer than most citizens and enjoys less of the fruits of his labor.

Farming today is a highly technical operation. And besides the skill required to make the operation successful, a substantial capital investment must be made.

The family farmer needs help in our new great society and one step is to give him recognition. Surely, we all must realize that the great abundance of food we enjoy is made possible by farmers.

With May, July, September, and November taken up with holidays, we suggest early spring, March or April, when the soil is beginning to awake, and the farmer again is planning to make his gigantic effort and magnificent contribution to our society, as the proper time for the holiday. Let's recognize him as a hard-working man, a shrewd businessman and an equal citizen with a Farmer Day.—Ed.

Keeping an Eye on Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the need for watchfulness against the insidious enemy—inflation, has been voiced by Members of this House, distinguished economists, on both sides of the aisle; and it is hopeful and comforting to note that editorialists are keeping a watchful, perspective eye on the problem.

I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues such an editorial from Newsday, Tuesday, September 22, 1964:

FUEL FOR INFLATION

Walter Reuther having achieved major benefits for his UAW members in contracts with Chrysler and Ford (General Motors still is to come), the cycle of inflation has now been given a trial spin by David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers' Union. The motor contracts have been described by all concerned as noninflationary, on the basis that wage increases and fringe benefits will be paid from increased earnings. Such is not the case with steel, the other bellwether American industry. McDonald says that wages and hours ought to be substantially improved when the union negotiates next year for new contracts. If the auto settlements represent a basis for steel, then the guidelines set up by the President's economic advisers will be breached—and here we go again.

In the last several years, progress has been made toward holding inflation in curb and toward reducing the growth in the cost of living. If steel follows the trend set by autos, unquestionably smaller industries will fall in line. Prosperity, as we all ought to have learned from the late 1920's, can if unregulated become galloping inflation, and the only sequel is a massive depression. Someone, possibly the President, ought to remind the steelworkers that there are limits to what the industry can pay without raising prices.

Johnson's Race Against Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Columnist John Chamberlain appearing in the Washington Post of September 21, 1964. While, in the opinion of some, things appear good for the President at the present time, just what problems he faces in the future are clearly set forth by Mr. Chamberlain.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 21, 1964]

THESE DAYS

(By John Chamberlain)

JOHNSON'S RACE AGAINST TIME

Things look good for Lyndon Johnson. With the polls falling his way, he has been able to cultivate a panic psychology among the more fainthearted Republicans. He will probably win in November by a thumping majority in some 40 out of 50 States if the present conservative apathy persists. Even so, he will, if successful, almost certainly feel that he has just made it by a hair in a fantastic race against time.

The big thing hanging over his head is South Vietnam. There is obviously no government in that country that is worth the name. The assassination of Diem and Nhu and the banishment or imprisonment of their followers vitrually cleaned out everyone capable of running a government.

As Marguerite Higgins, who deserved, but failed to get, the Pulitzer Prize for her Vietnamese reporting, put it, the Diem coup was as disastrous to South Vietnam as the liquidation of the President, the Vice President, the entire Cabinet, the Speaker of the House, the majority leader of the Senate, the Governors of the 50 States, the mayors of all the big cities and the aspiring minority candidates for all top executive posts would be in America.

Yet, despite the inability of the South Vietnamese to find any base or personnel for either a strong anti-Communist civil government or a stable military dictatorship, the ultimate disaster hasn't happened. General Khanh still is in control. The appointment of a new Russian ambassador to South Vietnam, Ilya Shcherdakov, who was head of the Chinese section of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee during the development of the rift between Moscow and Peiping, portends a continuing struggle between the two big Red powers for the control of North Vietnam. So the United States plays in luck here. Since the disaffected students have given General Khanh 2 months in which to "democratize" his South Vietnamese regime, he will probably be around until after the American presidential election is over.

What will happen then will be of great moment to the world. But if Thich Tri Quang, the Buddhist troublemaker who got his indoctrination in subversion from the North Vietnamese, emerges next year as a neutralist head of state in South Vietnam, all BARRY GOLDWATER can do will be to say from his Phoenix retirement, "I thought this would happen."

Another thing hanging over Lyndon Johnson's head is the coming inflationary impact of the Chrysler and Ford labor contracts. When General Motors and certain automotive parts companies have all signed similar agreements, the pressure will be on every other union in the United States to come up with equivalent victories. The steel union bosses, in particular, will be put on notice by their followers to "stand and deliver." Higher steel wages will, of a certainty, mean higher steel prices, and these will either have to be absorbed by fabricating companies (at a cost to profit margins) or passed along to the consumer (at a cost of diminished turnover).

None of this spiraling process will be readily discernible before November, however. It will be something for a victorious President Johnson to deal with next year. And again, all BARRY GOLDWATER can do will be to say from his Phoenix retirement, "I thought this would happen."

Lyndon Johnson is skillfully working his slight margin of time for everything that it is worth. The election of an anti-Red President in Chile was a good break for him. The stock market holds up. With everything going for him in the short term, Mr. Johnson misses no chance to cultivate the feeling that this is 1820, that we are in the middle of the Era of Good Feeling, and that he is a standin for a man named James Monroe who got every electoral vote save one. The man who wants to be "everybody's President" probably will succeed in his effort for just long enough to make it to his next inauguration.

The ravens are gathering, however. The pressures of a rising money supply are already pushing up prices on a broad front. The bloom is off the housing boom. And the Vietnamese crisis, with its portent for Australia and New Zealand as well as for Malaysia and the rest of southeast Asia, will not wait forever.

Maybe BARRY GOLDWATER will be lucky if he does not win.

A Success Story Unmatched in a Lifetime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, it has been a generation since the actions of Congress have offered so much hope and opportunity to millions of Americans.

In education, health and welfare, human rights, the national economy, natural resources, national security, international affairs, and science and technology, the 88th Congress has made possible national programs which will profoundly change our country for the better, will extend new and broadening opportunities to many people, and will assure the permanence and stability of the great society we are building.

EDUCATION

In the field of education particularly has the 88th Congress distinguished itself. It has—

Authorized a 3-year program to build new medical, dental and related-type teaching facilities and to offer student loans;

Passed a 3-year program of loans and grants to aid colleges and universities in financing academic construction;

Approved a Manpower Development and Training Act to train youths and adults for new jobs;

Revamped completely the vocational education programs to provide better training for the new technology; and,

Authorized a broad new 5-year program to build nursing school facilities and provide financial help for students.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

This Congress has done these substantial things for the health and welfare of our citizens:

Strengthened the air pollution control program by encouraging prevention and enforcement activity;

Adopted a 5-year plan to increase aid to States for maternal and child health services for crippled children's programs; provided for grants to be made for maternity care and research projects to prevent mental retardation;

Authorized a 3-year program to aid States in providing mental retardation research facilities, construction of community mental health centers, and so forth.;

Increased direct loans to nonprofit corporations and cooperatives for construction of housing for elderly;

Extended for 2 years the juvenile delinquency control program;

Improved and extended Hill-Burton aid for construction and modernization of hospitals, nursing homes, and other medical centers;

Increased payments to widows and other dependents of veterans who die of service-connected disabilities; and,

Authorized 5-year program of aid to States on matching basis for nursing home facilities.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Certainly the 88th Congress and this national administration will go down in history for incorporating into Federal law finally, those rights which assure each individual equality and freedom in matters of voting, public accommodations, education, job opportunities, and access to public facilities.

Growing concern for the legal rights of poor individuals faced with criminal prosecution in Federal district courts has resulted in a new law to authorize the courts to appoint public defenders.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Faced with three major recessions from 1953 through 1960, the administration, first under President Kennedy then President Johnson, resolved to cooperate with the leadership of Congress to restore dynamism to the national economy. To achieve this the 88th Congress has done these things:

Lowered rates of personal and corporate income taxes; changed tax laws for net reduction of $11.5 billion—partially effective in 1964;

Created the Office of Economic Opportunity to administer job corps of urban and rural youth, work training and work-study programs and to encourage community action to reduce poverty;

Authorized 3-year program of grants and loans to help States and communities provide mass transit facilities and service;

Authorized Federal contribution for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the construction of primary and secondary State highways and city extensions; and for road projects in national parks, etc.;

Established a National Commission on Food Marketing to study trade procedures and price relationships from producer to consumer;

Set up a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress to provide answers on how to cope with the loss of 40,000 jobs a week because of new machines and methods;

Imposed a tax on purchases of foreign securities to stop the flight of investment dollars to more profitable foreign businesses;

Adjusted basic pay rates of postal and classified Federal employees and other Government officials to make them more comparable to salaries in private business and industry;

Amended Bacon-Davis Act to require Federal contractors to match wage and other customary benefits when determining standards; and

Improved the Area Redevelopment Act.

NATURAL RESOURCES

In conservation and in natural resource development the 88th Congress compiled a record which has been called "the most outstanding in history." This "Conservation Congress" has—

Passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to assist States in developing outdoor recreation programs;

Established a National Wilderness Preservation System on 35 million acres of parks;

Authorized improvements in 11 river basins, navigable streams, flood control, and waterpower projects;

Approved 5-year program of aid to States for development of commercial fisheries;

Authorized 10-year program to finance water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and universities; and

Established three new major park and recreation areas and authorized several new historic sites.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The 88th Congress, ever mindful that a strong America stands as the bastion for the free world against Communist forces, reinforced our armed strength when it—

Provided substantial funds to the armed services for manpower and hardware to keep our defenses modern and efficient;

Extended Presidential authority to fix priorities, allocate defense materials, and expand manufacturing capacity under Defense Production Act;

Authorized extension of loans to 12 countries of 40 U.S. naval vessels;

Continued mutual security programs; and

Approved legislation supporting the President's action ordering U.S. forces to repel attacks against them in southeast Asia.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

A durable peace in this troubled world depends not only upon America's military strength but also upon firm alliances with other peace seeking nations. Our country's efforts include many programs to which the 88th Congress gave substantial support.

The Congress—

Authorized funds for research and the operations of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

Extended the Export-Import Bank for 5 years and increased the Bank's lending authority;

Increased the authorization for the U.S. Peace Corps and raised the number of volunteers to 11,300;

Approved the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere in outer space, and under water which was drafted by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union;

Increased U.S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank; and

Authorized the United States to participate with 16 other nations in the International Development Association.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Advances in modern science and technology depend in greatest degree upon fantastically expensive research and development financed by central governments. The total annual cost to the people of the United States for this Nation's preeminence in space sciences, electronics, nuclear energy, weapons, medical science, and so forth, has been over $15 billion. Whole new industries are based on these expenditures the size of which only a few decades ago would have more than amply supported the total Federal Government.

The 88th Congress reflected a national concern over the direction our Nation's research and development is taking by authorizing investigations and exploring ways its various committees can avail themselves of expert advice on how to legislate in matters affecting scientific policy. This is important development if our form of constitutional democracy is to remain vital and responsive in a world being revolutioned by new knowledge.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I look forward to the guidance we will get when we deal with the national space program.

CONCLUSION

I have particularly been concerned in better utilizing the brainpower and the resources of our district and Minnesota. On several occasions I have been instrumental in bringing together Federal Government officials and leaders from Minnesota business, industry, colleges and the university in an effort to find ways to exploit our area's rich capabilities in resources and manpower, and to develop new opportunities for economic and scientific growth.

I have sought in a variety of other ways to bring the interests of the Federal Government and our district together.

Of special importance is the building of Capital Center in downtown St. Paul. Federal urban renewal funds will make it possible, with the cooperation of local businessmen and city officials, to tear down many obsolete or deteriorated buildings and erect modern office structures and stores thereby increasing and strengthening the local tax base. I am pleased to note that the proposed new Federal building, soon to be started, will be one of the first, major moves in the imaginative proposal to revitalize downtown St. Paul.

Recognition of the importance of our district for Federal Government operations can be seen in the many new branch post office buildings which have opened, the just-completed annex to the St. Paul Post Office and Custom House, the new U.S. Department of Agriculture Lake States Experiment Station, and the advanced planning for a new Federal building at Fort Snelling and a regional post office garage.

I believe this 88th Congress has proved to be one of the most important in history for the Nation and our district. Its record of cooperation first with the administration of the late President Kennedy and with that of President Johnson shows that our democracy can be a dynamic and progressive force which is well-suited to meeting the challenges and problems of a particularly crucial era.

I have considered it an honor to represent the fourth district in this Congress and look forward to the opportunity of helping further to build the great society.

Self-Employed Retirement Trust Program Falling Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, Include the following article from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of September 15, 1964:

SELF-EMPLOYED RETIREMENT TRUST PROGRAM FALLING SHORT

WASHINGTON, September 15.—A 2-year-old law giving self-employed persons a tax break if they set up retirement programs hasn't proved as popular as its supporters once hoped.

It appears Congress will have to authorize greater tax concessions before most self-employed decide to take advantage of the program.

"The law—enacted in October 1962, after years of consideration—permits the self-employed to put as much as 10 percent of earned income, up to $2,500 each a year, into an approved retirement trust with half of the contribution deductible from Federal income tax.

DIVIDENDS NOT TAXABLE

Dividends earned from the trust investments are not taxable, and beneficiaries pay no tax until benefits are collected after retirement.

The basic purpose of the law was to give self-employed persons tax advantages similar to those enjoyed by corporations which set up pension programs.

But the benefits fall short of the corporate tax advantages. This led Representative EUGENE KEOGH, Democrat, of New York, one of the authors of the law, to seek liberalization this year but without success.

Moreover, self-employed persons must include under any pension program all employees with 3 or more years' seniority.

RULE DISCOURAGED SOME

This rule has discouraged some of the self-employed from setting up a trust. A druggist with five such employees, for example, might feel it not worth the expense of instituting a retirement system because of the costs involved and the turnover of workers.

All told, about 9 million self-employed persons are eligible to set up retirement programs under the law—from physicians and dentists to attorneys, accountants, druggists, barbers and corner grocery store owners.

No one knows for sure how many of these have set up retirement trusts but various sources agree the number is not large.

Only about 4,000 physicians and their employees have signed up under the American Medical Association's prototype program, according to latest count. And, fewer than 800 attorneys and their employees have elected to come under the American Bar Association master plan.

Insurance companies—which seek to sell such trust programs along with other types of insurance—have filed 213 prototypes; commercial banks have filed 132. Some mutual funds, the insurance industry's chief competition, are getting into the field.

The Internal Revenue Service recently reported 432 prototype retirement plans have been approved.

Spokesmen publicly insist the total is in line with original expectations but their off-the-record comments reflect disappointment the figure is not larger.

Most association spokesmen say the biggest handicap to selling the self-employed is that only half of the contribution is tax-deductible.

A druggist with five eligible $4,000-a-year employees, for example, would have to pay $2,000 a year into a retirement trust for his workers but could deduct only half of that from his tax, leaving him an out-of-pocket cost of $1,000.

The Man Who Strengthened the Federal Home Loan Bank Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include a very fine article commending Joseph P. McMurray, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which appeared in the American Banker on September 17, 1964, as follows:

THE MAN WHO STRENGTHENED FHLBB

It is a fine job that Joseph P. McMurray has done as Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the entire financial community is the stronger as a result of his efforts.

Perhaps the most important accomplishment of his more than 3 years in office has been the conversion of the FHLBB from an organization which served primarily as a lobbyist for the savings and loan industry into a forceful regulatory agency.

The timing was important in this, for the savings and loan business had been booming—and indeed, continued to boom under Mr. McMurray's leadership—but needed strong discipline to consolidate its gains. Mr. McMurray's success in imposing that discipline, particularly in the areas of reserve and liquidity requirements, met with strong and vocal opposition from some leaders in the industry. But it would be difficult today to find many who do not agree that these efforts were justified, and that the industry is on a sounder footing because of them.

In the process of establishing discipline, Mr. McMurray necessarily created a good deal of commotion in the industry. Needing to be tough, he also was vigorously outspoken. At times he took public positions which he subsequently had to modify. As a consequence, he created some difficulties which may not have been necessary.

But at the same time, in the substance of his objectives and in the enthusiasm with which he pursued them, he attracted considerable attention to an agency which previously had not made much news. And in this respect, because he was seeking higher standards of responsibility for one segment of the financial community, he contributed to a growing awareness of the importance of these standards in all segments of it.

Nothing if not candid, Mr. McMurray acknowledges freely that not all the steps he has taken have met with complete approval by the industry he was appointed to regulate. "When I took over," he recalls, "many of the rules and regulations governing the industry were vague and indistinct." He set up a task force to look into the whole problem, got recommendations from it as to what should be done, and determined upon a course of action. "I decided to spell out in more detail what was expected of home finance institutions," he says, "and I think this has paid off."

The result has been a marked increase in rules and regulations from the FHLBB, leading inevitably to some complaints from the industry that Washington was trying to regulate it too closely. But Mr. McMurray now states: "I think that in the long run most of them appreciated the more specific guidelines."

But along with clarification of responsibilities, Mr. McMurray also has set up procedures through which the Board has been brought into closer touch with the problems and objectives of the industry it regulates. One of his chief accomplishments has been the establishment of a division of research; in his personal operating practice he has made a major point of seeking out what the industry wants and needs, on the one hand, and keeping it fully informed of his intentions on the other.

The result has been a new vitality and effectiveness in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which has resulted, in a comparatively short time, in the strengthening of the savings and loan industry.

Mr. McMurray will be leaving his agency and the industry it regulates in better shape than when he took office—and for that all members of the financial community will have benefited from his service.

Noted Jurist Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the passing on September 20, 1964, of Judge John J. Connelly, presiding justice of the Boston Juvenile Court, brought to a sudden and tragic end a most useful and productive life. Judge Connelly was nationally famous for his efforts to make juvenile court an extra part of the judicial system. It was my pleasure to have known Judge Connelly for many years. His brother, Boston Police Lt. Albert Connelly, and I served together in the South Pacific during World War II as special agents, in military intelligence.

My deepest sympathy is extended to the judge's widow, Catherine, their two children, and to Lieutenant Connelly.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles, one a news story from the Boston Globe and the other an editorial from the Boston Herald of September 22, 1964:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Sept. 22, 1964]

DEFENDER OF YOUNG: YOUTH LOST FRIEND IN JUDGE CONNELLY

Though they may not realize it, the young people of Boston lost a friend Sunday.

He was Judge John J. Connelly, 57, presiding justice of the Boston juvenile court for the past 20 years. He died at his Chestnut Hill home.

Judge Connelly never believed that the modern teenagers were the worst in history, and that they were madly dashing downhill to their own damnation.

He believed: "American youth is the best in the world."

"We constantly talk about crime and juvenile delinquency," he once told a communion breakfast audience, "but the basic nature of children has not changed in 2,000 years. The world around them has changed.

"They must indeed by confused for we are their leaders, and we have created confusion in their world.

"Youth needs no defense. But it needs leadership. And the responsibility for leadership lies with the adults of the cities, States, and Nation."

Judge Connelly cannot be described as a hard judge, though he believed that sparing the rod all too often spoiled the child. The best word to use would be firm.

And because he ruled his courtroom with a firm hand, countless hundreds of young people who might have gone astray are now responsible citizens and a credit to the Boston community.

He delighted in recalling the time he attended a Boston Rotary Club luncheon and spotted two of his former juvenile delinquents at the head table. He had handled both young men when he was a juvenile probation officer, a post he held prior to his court appointment in 1945.

Judge Connelly was not a man who believed in shipping a wayward youngster to a reformatory simply for the sake of punishment. He consistently tried to make the punishment fit the crime.

One time, four boys appeared in his court charged with vandalism following a Thanksgiving Day football game.

The judge told them they had acted like babies and deserved to be treated like babies.

So for the next 24 hours, the four lads were required to wear diapers. They were fed only by nursing bottles, and had to eat spooned baby food.

In addition, they were rubbed with olive oil and doused with talcum powder, and required to play in a baby pen. Needless to say, the four teenagers never appeared in Judge Connelly's court again.

He believed religion should play an important role in the lives of all youngsters.

"Children should be taught there is a God, and the desire to worship God should be stimulated in the home by example, and not by the church alone," he declared.

Once he used shock treatment to impress two rock-throwing youngsters who appeared in his court.

He sentenced them to spend a day at the Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, so they could realize what harm a thrown rock can do.

They were further sentenced to wear a patch over one of their eyes, so they would learn what the loss of an eye can mean.

The penalty served its purpose. The boys never returned to court.

Yet, if Judge Connelly was stern with youngsters, he was sterner still with their parents. The judge estimated that 80 percent of the youngsters who appeared in his court came from homes ruled by adult delinquents, who failed to provide a proper example for their children.

Once he sent a mother of three small children away when she neglected her children. And it was while the woman was separated from her children that she came to realize how much they truly meant to her.

Youngsters who appeared in his court charged with carrying weapons were quickly punished. He once sent a 15-year-old boy away until his 21st birthday for carrying a 13-inch foreign-made dagger.

"There is no second chance in my court for juveniles found armed with anything that they plan to use as a dangerous weapon," he stated.

John J. Connelly was reared in the Prairie section of Roxbury, "where the first kid to get home at night rated the bed."

In his younger days, when he was a probation officer, the fact he resembled the legendary Babe Ruth endeared him to the many youngsters he met.

He was constantly bringing youngsters to his own home, or to the homes of relatives, in an attempt to give them "that extra push" he felt would put them on the right track.

He loved children. He hated the word: delinquent.

He berated "well meaning, but weak and indulgent parents who are responsible for making inadequate homes for their children."

However, he refused to place the entire blame "upon the home."

"When you say that the mother and father are entirely at fault when a child gets into trouble," he said, "then you forget to take into consideration that all the forces in the community—the home, the church, the school, and the neighborhood—have something to contribute to his welfare."

He was firm, but he was just.

And his methods paid off. A large percentage of the boys' cases that come before us, and 90 percent of the girls, never come back again."

The vast majority of boys and girls who appeared before Judge Connelly did not go astray again.

They went on to lead good, useful lives.

A solemn requiem high mass will be sung for Judge Connelly at 10 Thursday in St. Ignatius Church, Chestnut Hill.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald, Sept. 22, 1964]

A FRIEND OF CHILDREN

John J. Connelly, presiding justice of the Boston Juvenile Court for the past 19 years, was probably best known to the general public for his outspoken criticism of parental laxity in the discipline of children.

"Parents," he used to say, "are confused. They have absorbed too many theories of permissive childrearing and progressive education, and have accepted doctrines which blame strict parents for frustrating children's natural urges."

Naturally enough, these views did not meet with complete agreement. While many responsible persons in professions associated with the problem of juvenile delinquency felt that he had gone to the heart of the matter, others equally responsible felt that youthful misbehavior was not attributable to any single cause.

But there was deeply respectful unanimity, among professionals and amateurs alike, on Judge Connelly's capacity for, and dedication to, the task of turning delinquent children into law-abiding citizens.

Under his firm and capable direction, the Boston Juvenile Court's rehabilitative arm, rather prosaically called the Citizenship Training Group, Inc., won a worldwide reputation for rehabilitating deliquent boys between the ages of 12 and 17. While other juvenile courts in the Commonwealth had to institutionalize between 10 and 15 percent of the boys coming before them, the Boston Juvenile Court, working hand-in-glove with the citizenship training group, compiled an amazing institutionalization rate of just 3 percent.

Over the years, approximately three out of every four boys assigned by Judge Connelly to the CTG training center at 48 Boylston Street in downtown Boston have gone on to live productive adult lives.

CTG is an interdisciplinary agency, relying upon the professional skills of doctors, social workers, psychologists and psychiatrists. Its central operating premise is that a boy who has done wrong must accept responsibility for what he has done—and for whatever he may do in the future.

This is the enduring monument to Justice John J. Connelly, friend of children, now dead at the age of 57. May his successor preserve and cherish it.

Constitutional Crisis in Apportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, judicial intrusion into the composition of legislative bodies strikes at the very root of our governmental system of divided power. In order that my position may be clearly known on this fundamental issue, I include a statement made by me in testimony before the Judiciary Committee of this House on July 29, 1964, and the text of a report to the people of my congressional district dated July 2.

We have long been taught to respect the independence of the judiciary. It is time our people also respect the importance of an independent legislative branch, answerable not to the courts but to the people.

The material follows:

STATEMENT BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON JULY 29, 1964

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for permitting me to appear before your committee in support of House Joint Resolution 1050, introduced by me.

That proposal would incorporate into the Constitution a limitation upon the judicial power in the following language: "The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity for the apportionment or method of apportionment of representation in a State legislature or either house thereof, nor for the composition of any legislative or administrative body in any political subdivision of a State."

Since the decision in *Baker* v. *Carr*, the Supreme Court has asserted Federal judicial power to interfere with the composition of State legislative bodies. A logical extension of the Court's reasoning will vest in the Federal judiciary like control over the composition of legislative and, perhaps, administrative bodies in the political subdivisions of our States.

My proposal is intended to withdraw the Federal judiciary from the political thicket into which it has wandered, both at the State and local levels. The proposal would do so by declaring a limitation upon the extent of Federal judicial power, approaching the problem in precisely the same fashion as a much earlier threat to our federal system was removed.

In *Chisholm* v. *Georgia*, the Supreme Court entertained jurisdiction of a case instituted by a citizen of one State against another State. To prevent further occurrences and to overrule *Chisholm* v. *Georgia*, the 11th amendment to the Constitution was submitted by Congress and ratified with "vehement speed," to use the words of Mr. Justice Frankfurter.

I anticipate that a proper amendment, submitted in this present constitutional crisis, would likewise enjoy speedy ratification. I speak the conviction of an alarmed citizen, when I say the recent incursion by the Federal judiciary into the apportionment of State legislative bodies is revolutionary and is destructive of our constitutional system.

The separation of powers into three coordinate branches of Government, each of equal station with the other, is a keystone in American Government. The idea that the judicial branch can exercise power over the makeup of either the legislative or executive branches of Government would place the judiciary above the other two branches. Such reasoning is destructive to the system itself.

Until *Baker* v. *Carr*, it was settled law that Federal courts would not take jurisdiction of State legislative apportionment cases. These cases were recognized for what they are; the resolution of political questions. The law was that Federal courts concern themselves with legal rights. Political questions, on the other hand, were to be resolved by political processes. The method of apportionment of the members of a legislative body and the arrangement of legislative districts are questions of political power.

Political power is properly vested in the people and in their chosen representatives. Federal judges, who are not chosen by the people, or at any time answerable to them, are not the representatives of the people. It was never intended that Federal judges should be vested with political power. Their assertion of such power is erroneous.

We want no judicial dictatorship over our political institutions. But, if the Congress

and the country accept the power of an appointed, politically unreachable judiciary to define the makeup of our legislative bodies, then I submit that the political power has shifted from the people and their elected representatives to the courts. For, if this court can rightfully say the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment requires a particular kind of State legislative apportionment, a later court may change it, and in the Federal court; then, and not in the people, rests the political power to determine what kind of a legislature they shall have. We should not accept this overreaching of power by the judiciary.

It is my belief that our duty is to submit to the States a proposal which would lead the court away from the political thicket and restore to the people of each State their rightful, political power to define their own political institutions of government.

I submit that it is inconsistent with our Federal system that the judicial branch of one sovereignty, the central limited government, can hold sway over the political composition of the legislative branch of another sovereignty, a State, which with its people, holds the entire residue of political power.

Because of this reasoning, I shall not be satisfied with a proposal which would permit apportionment of one house of a bicameral State legislature on factors other than population only if the other house is apportioned on a population basis alone. This approach leaves the Federal judiciary in control of the field, much as it has been since *Baker* v. *Carr*. In every case, the contention will be that the house based on population is not actually so based, and the court will continue to fashion the legislative branch of the States. Nor does such a proposal reach the problem which will arise in the case of a unicameral legislative body, either at the State level or in the political subdivisions of a State.

Even if our Federal Constitution contained a provision permitting apportionment of one house of a bicameral legislature on factors other than population only if the other house is apportioned on a population basis alone, it would not prevent the Federal judiciary from meddling in the apportionment of Nebraska, nor in the apportionment of a legislative body of a political subdivision of a State. In sum, that proposal seems to me to be too narrow in scope to meet the evil, and I urge, rather, the more encompassing approach of House Joint Resolution 1050.

I desire to make one more point, Mr. Chairman; a point, I believe, of some importance and perhaps not reached by other witnesses on this issue. It is apropos the suggestion that the Congress might work a solution to this problem through legislative act rather than contitutional amendment. Let me say that if, in the opinion of your committee, this matter can be resolved legislatively, I would be in favor of that course of action, perhaps in addition to the submission of a constitutional amendment. But, to make my point: The 14th amendment contains rather broad prohibitions of power against the States in this Union. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

These phrases lend themselves to many different meanings. So far as I know, the Congress has never undertaken to define any of them, although the amendment specifically vests in Congress the power by appropriate legislation to enforce the article. Lacking any congressional definition, the courts have supplied some. It is my understanding that the courts have construed the privileges and immunities clause very narrowly, so narrowly, indeed, as to make it practically useless. The due process clause, on the other hand, has been most broadly interpreted, even to the finding of substantive rights in this language which, on its face, is merely procedural.

The length to which the Court is ready to extend the equal protection clause is evidenced in the issue we now consider.

In retrospect, Mr. Chairman, might we have had a more politically responsible situation if the Congress had undertaken to define the privileges and immunities of citizens, and the meanings of due process and equal protection? Instead of a court legislating to implement the Constitution, the Congress would be doing so, acting under the grant of power given to the Congress by the 14th amendment. The role of the Court might then be more orthodox, accepting legislation on these matters from Congress rather than legislating itself.

Is it now too late, Mr. Chairman, for Congress to undertake its proper function? We are still the elected representatives of the people and, if we would strengthen the people's branch of this government to assert again the coordinate power of this branch in our system, we should attack this dictatorship by the judiciary by every means available to us.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that your committee explore the untested possibility that the 5th section of the 14th amendment—the enforcement provision—vests in Congress the power to define the term "equal protection of the laws," and so, by that provision, declare what all evidence in the history of the amendment substantiates, that "equal protection" does not reach the apportionment of State legislatures.

NEWSLETTER TO THE FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, JULY 2, 1964

SUPREME COURT NEVER VESTED WITH POLITICAL POWERS

The Supreme Court of the United States was never vested with power to dictate the governmental structure of any State in the Union, and its present assertion of such power in the apportionment cases is manifest error on its part. The Federal judiciary was not conceived to be an instrument of political power. Here is a branch of government not chosen by the people or at any time answerable to them. Federal judges are appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for life.

Political power in our system was recognized as vested in the people and their elected representatives. Federal judges are not those representatives. The resolution of political questions is not their prerogative, nor their rightful power.

The Congress has a responsibility to lead the Court out of this political thicket into which it has strayed.

IN POLITICAL QUESTIONS THE PEOPLE MUST PREVAIL

It is fundamental in our governmental system that, if a political question is put to the people in an election, their decision at the ballot box must prevail.

You may recall that at the regular State election in November of 1952, the people of Michigan were asked to decide whether they wanted a legislature apportioned on a straight population basis in both the senate and the house—the "one man, one vote" slogan—or whether they wanted a legislature with a house of representatives apportioned every 10 years on a population basis and a senate with fixed districts defined by the constitution—the so-called balanced legislature concept followed by the Federal Constitution. The people overwhelmingly chose the balanced legislature, rejecting the "one man, one vote" theory.

In April 1963, again at a regular State election, the people of Michigan adopted a new State constitution which directed the apportionment of house seats on a population basis and senate seats on the basis of population and area.

In these decisions we heard the voices of the governed, speaking with all of the political power inherent in them.

But there are forces at work composed of those who think the people were wrong in their decisions. For them, the voice of the governed, spoken through the ballot box, decided nothing. Despairing of their ability to win over the people to their philosophy themselves, they asked the Federal courts to overturn the people.

Until 1962 no Federal court imagined it had jurisdiction to meddle in the apportionment of State legislatures. The issue of apportionment presented political rather than legal questions. Moreover, the issue involved the fundamental question of how the lawmaking body of a State was to be composed, a matter to be decided only by the people of that State and a matter wholly inappropriate for adjudication by a Federal court which is not part of the State at all. In 1962 the U.S. Supreme Court nevertheless instructed a Federal court in the State of Tennessee that it did have jurisdiction of such a case.

Armed with its new-found jurisdiction over the composition of the Tennessee Legislature, the Federal District Court immediately struck down a 1962 legislative districting act not to its liking. In 1963 the legislature tried again, creating a House weighted somewhat on area—which the court accepted—and a Senate apportioned on a strict population basis.

Thus it appeared that in a two-house legislature one house could be based on factors in addition to population if the second was apportioned solely on a population basis. Such were the standards fashioned by the very court to which the Supreme Court gave jurisdiction in 1962. But now, even this slight concession to the concept of a balanced legislature has been tossed aside by the High Court.

It was also in 1962 that the people of the State of Colorado were asked at an election to choose between a legislative apportionment plan with both Houses based strictly on population—one man, one vote—and a balanced legislature with a House based on population and a Senate with fixed districts. It was the same issue Michigan resolved in 1952 and the people of Colorado resolved it in the same manner, approving the balanced legislature plan in every county in the State. Once again the people had spoken with all of the political power inherent in them to decide a political issue.

THE COURT ASSERTS PEOPLE ARE WRONG

But on June 15, 1964, the Chief Justice of the United States, speaking for a majority of the Supreme Court, asserted the people of Colorado were wrong. In effect he said they had no power to fashion their own legislature on any basis other than straight population. This decision, if generally respected, will do inestimable harm to our system of checks and balances. It can destroy our local governmental structure. It makes a shambles of the traditional legislative system of every State in the Nation.

The concept of balancing legislative representation by giving some weight to area as well as population is as sound today as it was when the framers of our Federal Constitution gave us a House of Representatives apportioned on a population basis and a Senate on area alone. And, in every single instance where they had an opportunity to indicate their wishes through the medium of the ballot box, the people have endorsed this concept and rejected the implications of one man, one vote.

Look Who's Squawking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Richard Starnes from the August 5 edition of the Washington Daily News contains some interesting comments on the concern recently expressed by Europeans and their newspapers in the coming presidential election:

LOOK WHO'S SQUAWKING
(By Richard Starnes)

The specimen American voter can survive a diet that an ostrich with a craw full of plowshares and discarded bedsprings would quickly succumb to.

Old boobus Americanus can listen to the most lunatic maunderings since Sister Aimee went keening off to her reward, and react only with rustic gargles of approval.

For example (and the midden from which examples could be drawn is boundless), windy hucksters of instant statecraft enliven the dog days by warning Europeans to keep their effete noses out of the Republic's election year convulsions.

This is a ploy that wins approbation from clods of every political hue—from yahoo racists planning to vote for BARRY to ne'er-do-well reliefers whose heart belongs to Lyndon. No one pauses to reflect that Euorpeans, and other civilized persons, are properly concerned at the prospect that our election may bring them a measurable step closer to annihilation without representation.

It is plainly of tremendous consequence to Europe and Europeans if, say, the witless American yeoman votes to turn over operational custody of nuclear weapons to people who might well have stepped out of the nightmare pages of "Catch 22."

Ordinary enlightened self-interest entitles the rest of the world to be concerned at our antics, but there is more to it than that—there is quid pro quo in it as well. If Le Monde goes into shock over the nomination of Senator GOLDWATER, how many acres of woodpulp has the Chicago Tribune consumed decrying the egocentricities of General de Gaulle? We Americans, forsooth, are the greatest busybodies in the world and it ill becomes us to pretend outrage when alien commentators profess interest in our quaint folkways.

With the possible exception of Rome and the British Empire, no other nation on earth has ever claimed the right to dabble, moralize and interfere the way the United States has in the years since World War II. We have pressured Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium to dissolve their colonial empires. We have destroyed legal governments in at least two friendly nations by extra-legal means, and we have frequently conditioned foreign aid on our approval or disapproval of other nations.

We insist we have the right—indeed, the duty—to take U–2 photographs of other nations, to din patriotic piety at them through the "Voice of America," to attempt to install CIA agents in their defense ministries, and to sell goods in their bazaars. And yet we howl blue murder if some nearsighted Fleet Street drudge suggests the world would be a better place if our election went one way or the other.

In his game of 20 questions with correspondents, Sir BARRY suggested that one of his campaign themes would be the decline of U.S. prestige throughout the world—a tactic that was used with some success in the late John F. Kennedy's campaign. It was as phony in 1960 as it is in 1964. The only genuine doubters of American power and influence are to be found among self-seeking politicians at home.

Sophisticated foreigners, friend and foe alike, know us for what we truly are—an adolescent giant whose strength may not yet be matched by his intellect. They have a genuinely justified interest in our affairs, and we would do well to brace ourselves for more of it.

Nikola Petkov

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the last war ushered in a long period of misery and misfortune to a host of nations in Europe, and the nations in the Balkan Peninsula were to have their share under Communist tyranny. Even before the end of that war Bulgaria was engulfed in a Communist sea, and it was quite impossible for the people of Bulgaria to extricate themselves alone from the ever-tightening Communist grip. Under the powerful steamroller of the Kremlin all opposition groups and irreconcilable elements were ruthlessly crushed and their leaders liquidated. This was done so systematically that gradually most of the groups were more or less forcibly reconciled with the Moscow-imposed Communist regime.

But there was one sturdy and strong element that did not bow to the Soviet dictate. That was the rough and rugged peasant or the agrarian group, led by its inimitable and incorruptible leader Nikola Petkov. With all the means at his disposal he tried hard to frustrate the Communist attempt to rob Bulgarians of their freedom. But the Communists were determined to accomplish this, just as they were determined to liquidate all those who delayed or imposed their treacherous moves in all directions.

Soon Nikola Petkov found himself with only a handful of supporters. Of course the large mass of the populace were with him, heart and soul, but the populace was subdued and silenced by the regime. Still Petkov carried on the struggle in the face of Communist threats, blackmail, arrests, imprisonments, and terrorism. Early in 1947 it was quite obvious that Petkov's Communist foes were out to eliminate him by an elaborate legal process. So early in 1947 he was arrested, tried in a people's court on charges of conspiracy and high treason, which charges Petkov consistently denied, and on September 23 he was executed.

Thus was silenced the clearest shrill voice against communism in the Balkans, and in the judicial murder of Nikola Petkov the Bulgarian people lost their most outspoken champion of freedom, while the free world lost its leading exponent of real democracy in the Balkans.

The 88th Congress Hailed by President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues two recent articles in the Baltimore Sun paper. The first article deals with the 88th Congress and outlines clearly the record of progress that we have been able to establish. The second article shows the strength of our economy under the Kennedy-Johnson administration indicating the need to continue sound programs that balance human needs with financial requirements. I think the articles will be helpful to my colleagues:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Aug. 20, 1964]

THE 88TH CONGRESS HAILED BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON—CHIEF EXECUTIVE CITES LEGISLATION ENACTED IN YEAR VIRTUALLY WITHOUT PRECEDENT

(By Muriel Dobbin)

WASHINGTON, August 19.—President Johnson tonight pinned a medal on the 88th Congress for enacting more major legislation this session "than any other session of this century or the last."

"This has been a year virtually without precedent in the history of relations between the executive and legislative branches of our Government," declared the President.

THE INTENDED WAY

He was speaking at a musical salute to Congress attended by more than 1,000 guests in the flood-lit dusk of the south lawn of the White House. Senator GOLDWATER did not attend but sent regrets.

Stamping the Congress as "constructive, compassionate and cooperative," the Chief Executive stressed, "I believe that this is the way our system was intended to function. Not with Presidents and Congresses locked in battle with each other, but locked arm-in-arm instead, battling for the people we serve together."

President Johnson said he wanted the American people to be aware of the record written by the 88th Congress and of the relationship existing between the President and Congress.

"That record and that relationship testify to the reassuring fact that there has been this year no stalemate in our system, no deadlock in our democracy," he emphasized.

Mr. Johnson expressed his belief in the philosophy of President Theodore Roosevelt, "a great Republican."

A CONSTRUCTIVE CONGRESS

He recalled that President Roosevelt had said, "I have a very strong feeling that it is a President's duty to get on with Congress if he possibly can and that it is a reflection upon him if he and Congress come to a complete break."

The 2d session of the 88th Congress, observed Mr. Johnson, was distinguished most by the fact that at no time had there been any question of the President and Congress getting on together. It had been a constructive Congress, passing such measures as the test ban treaty, the tax cut bill, and education measures, he said.

It had also been a compassionate Congress, passing the civil rights bill, a food stamp

plan and approving a program to attack poverty, he continued, and it had also been cooperative because both Republican and Democratic votes had achieved many of these measures.

The President emphasized that it was from full debate and advocacy of principles and devotion to convictions that strength had been forged into the laws enacted.

"This Congress has expressed on the record the commitment of the American people to the pillars on which our system and our society stand," he declared.

He added that our economic system of private enterprise had received "the most significant vote of confidence in our time with the enactment of the legislation reducing taxes for both individuals and corporations."

He reminded that $11,500 million had been returned to the pockets of American families and American enterprise in the confidence that private initiative would put these dollars to work, creating jobs, opportunity, and greater effectiveness in competition with the world.

The President and Mrs. Johnson were both present at a musical presentation of historic campaign songs produced by a cast of such groups as the "Back Porch Majority," "The Bitter End Singers," and "The Electioneers."

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Aug. 20, 1964]

ECONOMY IN UNITED STATES IS HELD STRONG—FIVE PAST, PRESENT ADVISERS PREDICT TAX CUT

(By William Knighton, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, August 19.—Five past and present Presidential economic advisers today painted a rosy picture of the Nation's economy for President Johnson.

The consensus of the experts, according to Dr. Walter W. Heller, current chairman of the Advisory Council, was that with increasing Federal revenues, a new tax cut can be expected within a year or so, and possibly with increased Federal contributions to State-aided programs.

If the economy continues its rise sufficiently, some reductions in the national debt could be accomplished along with the other two actions, Dr. Heller said.

GOOD JOB SEEN

The Presidential adviser said he was struck by the unanimity of the five, including two advisers to President Eisenhower, that the $11,500 million tax cut this year is doing a good job of stimulating business.

He also replied after the 45-minute conference with Mr. Johnson that the consensus was that the outlook for continued prosperity was good and there was no current danger of inflation.

Others meeting with the President were Edwin G. Nourse and Leon H. Keyserling, who served under President Truman, and Arthur F. Burns and Raymond J. Saulnier, who were chairmen of the council under General Eisenhower.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

Earlier, the President declared that since January, 1961, when President Kennedy was inaugurated, "we have created more new jobs in America than the total of the populations of nearly half the countries of the world."

He also said that during this period "make-work and handout answers to unemployment" have been rejected and "first things have been put first to enlarge private payrolls—not public relief rolls."

These statements were made during a ceremony in the Cabinet room when Mr. Johnson signed the bill creating a national commission on technology, automation and economic progress.

Automation is not an enemy, he said—rather, it can be an ally to prosperity "if we just look ahead, if we will understand what is to come, and if we will set our course wisely after proper planning for the future."

Should the Powers of the Federal Government Be Limited by the Proposed States Rights Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the country are vitally interested and many of us are concerned over the proposed States rights amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

On June 26 of last year, a debate on whether the three proposed States rights amendments to the Constitution should be adopted was broadcast over radio station WMOX–TV, St. Louis, Mo. Participating in the debate were Mr. Justice Millard F. Caldwell, of the Supreme Court of the State of Florida for the affirmative, and Hon. James O. Monroe, Jr., circuit judge of the Third Judicial Court of Illinois for the negative.

I personally strongly support the negative in this debate but I think it well for my colleagues and those who read this RECORD to note the debate on both sides of this critical question and I submit herewith the transcript of the proceedings carrying the discussion:

SHOULD THE POWERS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BE LIMITED BY THE PROPOSED STATES RIGHTS AMENDMENT?

(Transcript of proceedings at taping of TV program, June 26, 1963, taken at studios of KMOX–TV, St. Louis, Mo.)

Moderator: Mr. Parkel Wheately, KMOX–TV.

For the affirmative: Hon. Millard F. Caldwell, justice, Supreme Court of Florida.

For the negative: Hon James O. Monroe, Jr., circuit judge, Third Circuit of Illinois.

Reported by: James W. May, official court reporter.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Good evening. Should the powers of the Federal Government be limited by the so-called States rights amendments? A debate tonight with a justice of the Florida Supreme Court and a judge of the Circuit Court of the State of Illinois.

Should the powers of the Federal Government be limited by the proposed States rights amendments? Speaking for the amendments tonight is the Honorable Millard F. Caldwell, justice of the Supreme Court of Florida and former Governor of the State of Florida. Justice Caldwell was special guest of the Madison County Bar Association Wednesday night in a debate on the question of Federal power and States rights. Speaking against the proposed amendments is the Honorable James O. Monroe, Jr., judge of the circuit court of the Third Judicial Circuit of Illinois.

Justice Caldwell, as our guest in the Illinois-Missouri area, and as a proponent for this debate of the so-called States rights amendments, what are they, please?

Justice CALDWELL. Well, I just use the language of the Council of State Governments which overly simplified them last fall by saying that the first amendment is one to revise article V so as to modify the provisions for State initiation of amendments, without the necessity for a convention. It does this: It gives 34 States to the Union the right to propose an amendment, which can be then submitted to all of the States, and which may, upon the approval of 38 States be made a part of the Constitution. That is the first one.

The next one has to do with the matter of apportionment, legislative apportionment within the States. And this amendment is designed to take from the Federal Government a power which the proponents say it never had; to take from the Federal Government the power to interfere with the State right of apportioning its own legislative representatives.

The third amendment is one which sets up what is called the Court of the Union, which is to be composed of the Chief Justices of the several States, and to which may be submitted one question only, and that is whether any decision of the Supreme Court of the United States has attempted to exercise a power which does not belong to the Federal Government and the Federal judiciary. That question may be raised upon the application of five States, noncontiguous.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Judge Monroe, is this the way you define these amendments?

Judge MONROE. Well, I think in regard to the first one, he has accurately stated it.

First of all, I want to welcome a superior jurist from the State of Florida, and pay my respects on behalf of the judiciary of Illinois and Missouri.

He has stated the first one quite accurately.

He stated the second one not quite as I would state it. I believe the apportionment matter is a matter not of taking away powers of the Federal Government, but of depriving citizens of States of the equal protection of the laws that they deserve under our principles of proportional representation.

The third matter is accurate. It sets up what I call a super court of State judges, 50 of them, above the Supreme Court of the United States.

You asked to define rather than to criticize at this time. It is fairly accurately stated.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Judge Monroe, I think we should hear from Justice Caldwell why he favors these amendments in the large.

Justice CALDWELL. On the first amendment, I think it is bringing back to the States the concept the authors of the Constitution had originally. They thought at that time that constitutional amendments should be proposed in one of two ways: by the Congress or by a constitutional convention. The latter method has never been used because the Constitution itself is so indefinite and so vague no one knows how it would be called. No one knows how it would be composed no, how representation would be apportioned, so it's an impossible sort of thing.

Now the only thing that is left in the Constitution as it is written now is that the amendment must be proposed by the Congress. But you see what has happened is that when people go to Congress they are inclined to see things in the Federal focus. They have lost contact with States rights and States thinking. And they have become Federalists. Don't ask me why. Nobody knows, but they are there, basking in the sunlight of power, and it just happens that way.

Now what I would like to see done is to put back in the States the rights to propose an amendment. And I see no good reason why 34 sovereign States of this Nation—that

is they were sovereign before the Supreme Court got hold of them a few years ago—34 sovereign States of this Nation cannot propose an amendment, and why that amendment when proposed cannot be approved or disapproved by 38, that is three-fourths of all of the States.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Justice Caldwell and Judge Monroe, may we pause here a moment and then Judge Monroe, your contravention.

Judge Monroe, do you disagree with Justice Caldwell's notion in support of the proposal that 34 States may propose an amendment and three-fourths may ratify it?

Judge MONROE. I disagree as decidedly as respect permits. The present arrangement for initiating an amendment to the Constitution calls for national approval by a national body and involves national debate, because this is most in order. We are not a confederacy; we are a united nation. And I would like to see it kept that way by providing national debate. What this does—it takes the Congress out of the picture, because it makes it mandatory on Congress to submit to the States a proposed amendment when two-thirds of the States, that is 34, would submit to the Congress an application therefor. Now this takes out of the picture any national consensus, any national debate, any national approval. It takes out of the picture the National House of Representatives which is the only national representative body chose in numerical proportion.

It throws this matter back to the States, and 38 States could, by initiation and ratification adopt these. Now these 38 States because of the misrepresentation, the disproportionate representation in those States, those 38 smallest States in the Union compose about 40 percent of the population of the United States. The 38 percent of 40 percent, Mr. Wheatley and Your Honor, is 15 percent. So State legislators representing 15 percent of the American population could put through an amendment to the National Constitution which could violently and critically endanger our form of constitutional government. I oppose it for these reasons. That is the first one.

Justice CALDWELL. Now I don't agree with his mathematics but you see when figures get more than two broad and two deep I have to get an accountant to handle mine, so I will not go into that. But 15 percent roughly of the people in this country would be something like 25 million people, wouldn't it? Nine men—no, take it back—five men have usurped this power we are talking about; five members of the Supreme Court have amended the Constitution within the last few years. Five men never elected by anyone, answerable to no one, there for life. Now it seems to me that 38 States ought to have as much power as 5 members of the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Congress ought to be taken out of the picture so far as the proposal of amendments are concerned, unless you are willing to adopt this amendment and give the States a right, and let the Congress have the rights it has now. It can propose amendments; let the States propose amendments. All the power the Congress has was given to them by the States, and no one is better qualified to say what is given than the giver.

Mr. WHEATLEY. A brief reply, sir.

Judge MONROE. In regard to the matter of the Supreme Court, there is a decided difference. The form that the control by the legislators representing 15 percent of the people could take is not the simple negative kind of judicial veto exercised by the Supreme Court, which cannot act at all unless and until a case comes before it, and then must find justification in the Constitution. The control exercised by this, the legislators representing 15 percent of the people, would be the affirmative kind of action exercised by legislators acting whenever the legislators choose, on any question they choose, and with no justification in the Constitution but on their own determined policy.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Judge Monroe, Justice Caldwell, thank you very much. We commend this proposed amendment to your study. About Monday night and the late show in just a minute.

Our guests tonight, Justice Millard Caldwell, Florida; Judge James Monroe, Illinois. Monday night, Supervisor Roos, St. Louis County. The late show is the best of CBS, "The Prince and the Showgirl," with Marilyn Monroe and Lawrence Olivier. Good night, have a good weekend. Many, many thanks.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Good evening. Should the powers of the Federal Government be limited by the proposed States rights amendments? Part 2 of a debate with a justice of the Florida Supreme Court and a judge of the circuit court of Illinois.

Should the powers of the Federal Government be limited by the proposed States rights amendments. Again, a debate. Speaking for the amendments, the Honorable Millard F. Caldwell, justice of the Supreme Court of Florida and former Governor of the State. Justice Caldwell was special guest last week of the Madison County Bar Association in its Wednesday night meeting and debate on this question of Federal power and States rights and was with us on Eye on St. Louis Friday night.

Speaking against the proposed amendments again is the Honorable Judge James O. Monroe, Jr., judge of the Third Judicial Circuit of Illinois.

Honorable sir, will you recapitulate your views on that first amendment?

Justice CALDWELL. Yes, but I am going to change that question a little bit. I conceive the question as being, Should the dual sovereignty system of Federal-State relationships as contemplated by the office of the Constitution be reestablished?

Mr. WHEATLEY. Dual sovereignty. What does that mean in our language.

Justice CALDWELL. That means that the Federal Government has certain sovereign powers and the States have certain sovereign powers, and I take the position that the States have lost much of their powers by usurpative methods used by the Federal Government. Now the question is, Should they not be reestablished as the authors of the Constitution contemplated them to.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Judge Monroe, will you accept that question for the moment?

Judge MONROE. Yes. We pointed out—Honorable Justice Caldwell pointed this out Friday, and I contended that these new changes could be made by legislators representing some 15 percent of the American population as a whole. This frightens me because the types of changes that could be made are as one writer has listed them, "to change the presidency to a committee of three, hobble the treaty power, made the Federal judiciary elective, repeal the fourth amendment, make Catholics ineligible for public office, and move the national capitol to Topeka." That may sound fantastic, but not so when we realize that in our national history some 4,000 constitutional amendments have been proposed. I suspect the first under this might be the Bricker amendment, maybe then the $25,000 income tax limit, and I certainly would fear drastic changes in the 14th, 1st, and the 5th amendments.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Would you object to such changes if made under these proposals?

Justice CALDWELL. You know, I would not even object to some of the things that the Judge says might happen.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Justice Caldwell, could you sum up quickly for us your views on that first proposed amendment and then Judge Monroe his, and then we will go ahead.

Justice CALDWELL. Yes. I take the position that the first amendment is sound in that it permits 34 States of the Union, two-thirds, to propose an amendment, which may be adopted by 38 of those States or three-fourths. The Congress has that power; I think the States should have the same power. Now that in a nutshell tells you what I want.

Mr. WHEATLEY. And Judge Monroe.

Judge MONROE. I say it is a dangerous and unwholesome proposition because it deprives our Nation of a national debate on these things by relegating this initiating process to State legislators, who in themselves in many States are not representative on any concept of democratic numerical proportion as we understand it in a democracy.

Justice CALDWELL. Now let me just say one word there. I can see the problem that the Judge proposes, but I do not concede that anything that 38 States can do should be done more easily by five members of the Supreme Court who are not elected by anyone.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Gentlemen, a point of information and clarification. Under the proposal, two-thirds of both Houses may propose amendments. That is the present situation.

Judge MONROE. That one is still retained. This is in addition.

Mr. WHEATLEY. All right. Now then if legislatures of two-thirds of the several States propose, they may, but three-fourths must ratify, is that correct?

Justice CALDWELL. Just as they do under the present amendment.

Judge MONROE. That's right, with this one exception.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Yes, sir.

Judge MONROE. Under the proposal, States may ratify by legislative action only. Under the present law, States may ratify by their legislatures or by statewide conventions. Again, the democratic, the representational aspect is taken out. Under the proposal it would be by legislatures only. This is a proposal for State legislators, and I suggested it rises from their resentment at *Baker* v. *Carr*, which brings us into proposal No. 2.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Justice Caldwell, Judge Monroe, so that we might get to this major amendment, the Court of the Union, can you in 30 seconds or so each state your positions on the second amendment concerning legislative districting?

Justice CALDWELL. The amendment proposes to take from the Federal Government the right which the States do not concede it ever had: to meddle in the business of legislative apportionment in the several States. My position is stated very accurately by one of the Supreme Court Justices who dissented, Justice Frankfurter, in which he said that when *Baker* v. *Carr* reversed a course of decision established by a dozen cases in the Baker case, it unanimously rejected a state of facts which had been presented to it 5 years ago and now overturns. And as Justice Frankfurter says, "this destructively novel judicial power may well impair the Court's position as the ultimate organ of the supreme law of the land. A new legal claim which manifests an odd—indeed esoteric—conception of judicial propriety." And then he goes on here to say, "this case provides no guide unless the judges of this Court are to make their private views of political wisdom the measure of the Constitution."

Mr. WHEATLEY. Judge Monroe, will you reply after this message, please, sir?

Judge MONROE. Surely.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Judge Monroe, we have about 3 minutes remaining for everything. Your point on the second.

Judge MONROE. On the second proposal, I simply think that Justice Frankfurter was rationalizing or protecting his position in *Colegrove* v. *Green*, which he had handed down and which was now overruled virtually. I say that the second proposal to restrict the Court's jurisdiction in reappor-

tionment matters is a destruction of a guarantee of equal protection of the laws provided by the 14th amendment. If this proposal were to pass, it would be the first diminution of any national constitutional guarantee in our history. And I say it will continue the evil of disproportionate representation whereby a rural legislator representing relatively few voters has as much legislative voice and vote as an urban legislator representing far more voters. This is a matter of equal protection of laws. Those city voters are entitled to that equal representation if we believe in democracy.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you, Judge Monroe. Justice Caldwell, we have about 2 minutes, a little more, remaining to discuss the Court of the Union amendment.

Justice CALDWELL. That amendment is designed to set up what is called the Court of the Union to be composed of the chief justices of the several States, that is 50 of them. To that court upon the application of five States not contiguous——

Mr. WHEATLEY. Not next door.

Justice CALDWELL. Not next door can be submitted one question, one only. Does an opinion, a decision by the U.S. Supreme Court impinge upon rights which the Federal Government was never granted by the States. That is the only question to be determined. I think it has a great deal to commend it and I am for it.

Mr. WHEATLEY. More vigorously than for the other two even?

Justice CALDWELL. Yes, I think so. I think so.

Mr. WHEATLEY. And Judge Monroe?

Judge MONROE. It is possible that State judges are more wise and better suited to national affairs than Federal judges, and this is not to deprecate our distinguished guest at all. I say this proposal would set up an institution, 50 judges, too big for any rational deliberation or any rational consensus of decision, meeting too seldom to form any tradition or establish a set of jurisprudence. In this Court of the Union, a decision could be rendered by a majority which is 26. Again we come to matters of minority rule. These chief justices from 26 States, the smallest States in the Union, could come and speak for 30 million out of our 180 million. This is 16 percent.

I believe that the State judges would be subject to the pressures of legislatures and people in their States as is demonstrated by the distinction at times between State judges in the South, and the Federal, the 58 lonely but courageous judges in the South who are part of the Federal judiciary. It's the first proposal I have ever seen where a lower court judge goes up above the court that is above it, and I think it is too fantastic to contemplate.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Judge Monroe, Justice Caldwell, we are very grateful for your appearance, for the Madison County Bar in bringing you to us. All we can do is study this problem more, discuss it. More about the late show and tomorrow night in just a moment.

Realtor Says Peanuts Secret to Longevity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we from the peanut growers area, think that this will be good reading for the Members of the House:

[From The Hanford Sentinel, Sept. 19, 1964]

REALTOR SAYS PEANUTS SECRET TO LONGEVITY

LOS ANGELES.—Louis Rich, a Hollywood real estate man who will be 100 years old October 29, attributes his longevity to eating peanuts.

Rich, the oldest member of the Los Angeles Real Estate Board, was honored Thursday at a city council ceremony.

When Rich said peanuts contributed to his long life, comedian Danny Thomas, who participated in the ceremony, quipped:

"I'm 50 and I'm going out right now to buy a bag of peanuts."

TELLS OF HABIT

In a firm voice that belies his age, Rich told of his peanut eating habit. Asked what kind of peanuts he eats, he replied:

"Just fresh roasted peanuts. A peanut is a peanut. Just so long as they're freshly roasted. I buy them in a grocery store, canned peanuts, they're shelled. I can't get them with the shells unless they're stale. I used to get them from vendors with push-carts, but now you can't get them anymore. I buy just cocktail peanuts."

Rich said he's "been eating peanuts about 80 years.

DEVELOPS HABIT

"I started on the railroad train. I was a newsboy on the Union Pacific out in the West. This fella, my boss, gave me a basketful of peanuts. They were fresh. He said, 'Now when you go through the train, put a bag in the lap of every passenger and watch what happens.' I filled the basket three or four times. People ate them. They were good. They have no food value that I know of. I started eating them, too. I eat about an ounce and a half a day, the equivalent of a 5 cent bag—about half after lunch and half after dinner.

"They're salted a bit. I can't get them any other way in cans," Rich said. "If you can get fresh peanuts with the shells and skin on it's better, but you can't get them."

Councilman Harold Henry noted that "Mr. Rich is still in his office every day from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m."

Strong Local Effort Needed To Obtain Full Benefit of Excellent Educational Advances by 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this Congress will go down in history as the Congress which has done more for education in this country than any other Congress.

The 88th Congress, in 1963 and 1964, under the leadership of President Kennedy and President Johnson has indeed wrought significant advances. The inspired and responsible leadership of the Kennedy-Johnson administration and the Democratic leadership has produced these important advances in education in the course of 2 short years. I am proud that the Democratic Party has always vigorously pursued the need for education improvement and that it has acted decisively in the 88th Congress.

In July 30, 1964, President Johnson said:

Onto my desk each day come the problems of 190 million men and women. When we consider those problems, study them, analyze them, evaluate what can be done, the answer almost always come down to one word: education.

Here is part of the record of the 88th Congress:

Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963: will aid college construction over a 3-year period. Appropriates $1.2 billion for building classrooms and other facilities for graduate schools, 4-year colleges, and 2-year community colleges, technical institutes.

Health Professions Education Act of 1963: will help increase the number of professional health personnel—medicine, dentistry, and so forth—through construction grants for facilities and through low-interest loans for students of medicines, dentistry, or osteopathy.

National Defense Education Act extension: increased funds for NDEA student loan programs, for science, mathematics, and foreign language training programs, and for counseling services.

Vocational Education Act of 1963: will authorize a total increase of $956 million in Federal support for vocational education in the next 5 fiscal years; will bring enrollment in State vocational education programs from 4.2 million—1963—to 7 million in 1968.

Impacted areas aid extension: increase Federal funds available in areas where the presence of Federal installations places a financial burden on local school systems.

Mental Retardation Facilities Act of 1963: provides grants of $51.5 million covering 3 years for the training of 20,000 teachers for mentally retarded, handicapped children.

Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments: Federal assistance to State and local communities for preventing and treating mental retardation.

Library Service and Construction Act of 1964: authorizes $25 million aid to develop and expand existing libraries to cover urban areas as well as rural areas; also appropriated $20 million for new library construction.

But all this will be to little or no avail without clear understanding, firm leadership and courage on the part of those State and local officers responsible for the operation of our school system to keep pace with the current and future needs of our educational system and to resolve the major educational problems.

Recently the Village Post, a new, exciting, and a definitely interesting publication in my congressional district with Mrs. Kathryn Hall Proby as publisher and Fred Shaw as editor, published an excellent article which discusses this matter.

The author is Jack D. Gordon, a well-known and outspoken member of the Dade County School Board. In presenting this article by Jack D. Gordon the Village Post says:

Jack D. Gordon has looked into many a musty corner and has sung out "git along, little dogie" to many a sacred cow. Here he examines what he considers some of the major educational problems of our times.

Mr. Gordon is education minded and well informed on methods to improve teaching techniques and a firm believer in the three R's. He has served several years on the Dade County School Board. The school system in Dade County is huge, in fact it is the seventh largest in the Nation. Its budget is over $100 million; it has 8,000 teachers, almost 200,000 students, and a junior college with 10,000 more pupils. Jack D. Gordon thus has an impressive background of practical experience as well as formal education from which to draw.

In this article he makes a most valid point that there must be appreciation of the idea of learning and a recognition of intellectual achievement as the most important aspect of education. I certainly agree with him on this. Without this acknowledgment and effort at the school system level, all that the Congress can do and has done will be diluted and dissipated. The principal thrust of Mr. Gordon's discussion is urgent and timely.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this important article in the RECORD at this point so it may be thoughtfully considered by the Members of this body and others throughout the country interested in the educational problems of today:

GORDON EXPLORES PROBLEMS

Education is the most important function of government. It touches every part of the community and every facet of American life. Because the operation of our schools is enormously complex, there is a useful role that everyone can play in making the schools responsive to current and future needs. The very act of freely giving time and thought to this community effort serves as a good example of the kind of public participation in governmental affairs which is essential to democracy.

During my 3 years on the school board, I have reached certain conclusions about our schools. Even though we have often traveled a rocky road, I am pleased with some of our progress. Yet it seems to me that there are four general areas of continuing concern—particularly if you believe, as I do, that the focus of the educational system has to be on the place where learning takes place, the classroom.

We have to realize the children in school today are being educated for life in the 21st century. This year's 11-year-old sixth grader will be just 48 years old in the year 2000. Thus we have to provide him with the foundation for a 21st century education without knowing what life will be like at that time.

This means that today's teaching process must provide a framework of knowledge and experience within which future judgments can be made. It also means that learning cannot be fact-oriented; it must be structure-oriented. Instead of just memorizing the multiplication tables, we have to know why mathematics works. We also have to recognize that education is going to be a self-education process for every individual. Therefore students must learn to appreciate the idea of learning and to recognize intellectual achievement as the most important aspect of their schooling.

Only teachers who have that same respect for the intellect can give students the leadership they need. Even more important (and I consider the lack of a major flaw in our local system) teachers have to be led by principals and administrators and supervisors (call them what you will) who are intellectual leaders and have a strong commitment to the importance of intellectual achievement.

Our school system requires that teachers and administrators have a much broader world view. We tend to think of many of our problems as being purely local when they are national and even international. We spend far too much time studying the geography of Florida and little or none at all on trouble spots like Asia or Africa or Latin America. We have no decent program of study leaves to permit our teachers to get to know other parts of the world at the expense of the school board. I am a firm believer in this kind of investment in teacher education.

Our school system has grown far more rapidly than the provision of management techniques to control it and direct it. Too many operating decisions are still made on the basis of personalities involved rather than systemwide policy. This problem is particularly evident in the area of personnel policy; there is, for example, no real policy for promotion to positions as assistant principals or curriculum assistants, and the procedure for selecting principals is very subjective.

Time won't wait for us. We must develop a great sense of urgency. Our world is changing very rapidly. Unless we adapt our educational process with the same rapidity, we are simply turning out obsolete products. We have to stop wasting our time going through so-called pilot studies of matters which have already been studied and researched elsewhere. There is nothing so different about living in Dade County that we cannot rely on work done in other States. We don't have the time to develop our own courses of study in mathematics, for example, when Yale, Illinois, Stanford, and other universities have already developed curriculums and have experimented with them in various school systems. I am aware that operating at this level of urgency makes great demands upon teachers, who will be forced to involve themselves in continual retraining in order to keep pace with curriculum developments. However, the teaching profession's problem is no different than that of most other professions where the explosion of knowledge is causing great changes to take place.

There is a saying in the "Ethics of the Fathers" to the effect that we do not have to complete the task, but we do not have the right to refuse to participate altogether. That's my feeling about our schools; I'm obligated to contribute my share, recognizing that the resolution of today's problems will bring new questions for tomorrow.

Educated laymen who believe in intellectual achievement within an ethical framework must involve themselves in the educational enterprise because it is much too important to be left completely to professional educators. That is why I do not believe anyone need be apologetic about delving into school problems or trying to come up with answers. We simply cannot move forward as rapidly as we need to unless there are enough people who understand the complexity and urgency of the problems we face today.

Marketing Our Cattle and Beef Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, it is well-known that our domestic beef cattle industry, boasting an outstanding production, and quality record, has had its difficulties during the past few years, with heavy increases in imports from other beef-producing Nations a significant factor in these problems.

There has been a recent intensification of the effort of the domestic industry to market its fine product in other areas of the world which are deficient in beef production.

As of interest in this connection, I include an article by Mr. C. E. Murphey of the Agricultural Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture:

FACTORS IN SELLING U.S. CATTLE, BEEF TO EUROPE INCLUDE PRICE AND SPECIAL IMPORT PREFERENCES

(C. E. Murphey, USDA Agricultural Marketing Service, reports on a 5-week study of cattle and beef requirements in the United Kingdom, Belgium, the Netherlands, France, West Germany, Switzerland, Spain, and Italy. The study was part of a market development program of the American Meat Institute and the Foreign Agricultural Service to promote the sale of U.S. livestock products in Western Europe.)

During 1963, the eight countries' beef imports—accounting for one-fifth of their total consumption—were the highest on record, have continued upward measurably in 1964. These imports for the most part came from South America, Australia, and New Zealand, as they have for many years.

Now, however, with traditional suppliers unable to meet Western Europe's increasing needs for imported beef, the United States has a real opportunity to share in this market—provided, of course, that our beef is competitive in price.

Fresh beef is in biggest demand. Chilled and frozen beef offer longer range possibilities for U.S. exports.

MARKET FOR LIVE CATTLE

In at least three countries—Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands—the preference for fresh beef is so strong that any exports from the United States will probably be live cattle for subsequent slaughter.

In Italy, where the live cattle export outlook appears most promising, importers have felt that the best solution to their beef shortage is to purchase 500 700-pound feeder cattle from the United States and feed them to 800–1,000 pounds before slaughter. Italy has already purchased some 2,500 head of U.S. feeder cattle over the past 3 months, and the importing of week-old U.S. Holstein calves for veal is underway.

Since last October, Italy has also imported some 50,000 Holstein steers from Argentina. Those being slaughtered at the time of my visit were 2 to 3 years old and were producing carcasses that would grade mostly low standard. (The U.S. grades in descending order: prime, choice, good, standard, grade, utility, and cutter.)

The Netherlands and Belgium were importing live cattle—mostly steers—from England and Ireland for immediate slaughter. Those from England, 2 years old and weighing about 1,000 pounds, would grade mostly U.S. good; cattle from Ireland, about the same weight, but 3 to 4 years old, would grade mostly U.S. standard.

U.S. CHILLED AND FROZEN BEEF

In addition to sales prospects for U.S. cattle, Western Europe offers long-range possibilities for exports of U.S. chilled and frozen beef—again, if our prices are competitive with those of other non-European suppliers. (Chilled beef is usually refrigerated to about 29°–31° Fahrenheit, will keep for a much longer period than fresh beef—which is held at around 36°. Solidly frozen beef will remain in good condition for several months.)

Generally speaking, U.S. standard grade beef—which accounts for about 11 percent of all beef produced in this country—has many

of the characteristics sought by European importers. However, Europeans do not evaluate beef as we do here.

Under the U.S. grading system, the primary emphasis is on the quality of the lean—its color, texture, firmness, degree of marbling, and the maturity of the animal from which it came.

CONFORMATION AND FATNESS

Conformation is also a factor but is generally subordinate to quality. For example, a carcass with choice conformation an daverage standard quality would be graded standard; but a carcass with unusually deficient conformation—say, utility—and good, would still be graded standard.

In Western Europe, by contrast, the emphasis is on both conformation and fatness, with practically no consideration being given to the quality of lean beyond what would be classified U.S. standard quality. Waste-conscious Europeans especially want beef that combines thick muscling with only a very thin covering of external fat.

A number of countries also prefer to import specific parts. For instance, in France, Switzerland, and Italy—and to a less extent in Belgium—the preference is for the "pistola." In terms of U.S. cuts, the pistola includes preferred portions of the round and the loin, and part of all of the rib. The pistola has practically all the flank and plate removed, plus kidney and pelvic fat, and the tail vertebra.

Switzerland and Italy also prefer to have the hind shank and shank meat removed. Because their beef has such a thin layer of external fat, these pistolas are nearly case ready, can be made into retail cuts with a minimum of trimming.

In addition to these general requirements, most of the countries visited had some distinct preferences.

The United Kingdom—which imports more beef than any county on the Continent, over half of its total beef consumption—is more tolerant of fat and prefers a higher quality beef than the other seven countries.

QUALITY MARKET IN UNITED KINGDOM

The majority of United Kingdom beef would grade U.S. good, a considerable amount, standard, and a smaller percentage, choice. While there is a general preference for beef with only a modest covering of external fat, Scottish beef—which commands the highest price on the Smithfield market—has as much fat as most U.S. choice beef.

There is also a growing demand for lightweight, young, very lean beef that would grade U.S. standard and good. Sizable shipments of this kind of beef were being received from Yugoslavia.

Conformation is a major consideration—beef with less than U.S. good conformation would not be well accepted regardless of its other characteristics. Choice grade beef would be readily acceptable if it were plump muscled and did not have much external fat. However, without an educational program to convince consumers that U.S. choice beef is a premium product which merits a premium price, it is doubtful that a higher price could be obtained for choice than for good.

In Italy, the second largest beef importer in Europe, the demand would be for very closely trimmed pistolas—preferably with three ribs, produced from young animals. Pistolas from 450- to 600-pound standard grade carcasses would be preferred, with at least good grade conformation and having not more than two-tenths inch of fat at the thinnest point over the ribeye. There is a definite preference for chilled over frozen beef in Italy.

West Germany, third largest beef importer, would probably purchase only frozen beef. Meat inspection regulations require that imported beef be in carcass form only. Apparently, West Germany puts less emphasis on conformation than any country visited, except Spain. The preference is for relatively young standard or good grade beef weighing 550 to 650 pounds, with not more than 0.3 inch of fat over the ribeye. As in the United Kingdom, U.S. choice grade beef with these same characteristics would also be acceptable but probably would not command a premium without intensive promotion.

SPAIN'S TIGHT SPECIFICATIONS

In Spain, the Government purchases all imported beef, which is frozen and in the form of full carcasses. Purchases are made on very limited specifications; weight (130 to 170 pounds per quarter); maturity (less than 3 years old); bone (not more than 18 percent); and fat (not more than 8 percent). The last beef purchase was from Argentina at 32 cents per pound. By U.S. standards, locally slaughtered beef was by far the poorest of any country visited. Very little of this would grade better than U.S. utility. It was produced almost entirely from cows and bulls.

Switzerland, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands rank about equally as beef importers.

The Swiss want to import only pistolas, rumps, and loins (the forepart of the pistola). Preferences appeared to be almost the same as those in Italy, except that the Swiss prefer pistolas from carcasses weighing at least 550 pounds.

In France, the demand is again for pistolas, preferably containing eight ribs. French beef was notable for its heavy weight and thick muscling. Because there seemed to be less discrimination against mature beef in France than in the other countries visited, the possibilities of our exporting utility grade beef seem greatest in France. However, to be acceptable, U.S. utility grade beef should have a much higher degree of conformation than required by U.S. standards—preferably at least average good. Also it should not have more than 0.3 inch of fat over the ribeye at the 12th rib.

In Belgium and the Netherlands, the preference is for relatively young beef. As in France, importers want it to be heavy, thickly muscled, and have a thin covering of external fat.

Representative John J. Rooney's Address to the Polish-American Congress Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and pleasure to introduce to the executives and members of the Polish-American Congress gathered in Chicago for its quadrennial convention my esteemed friend and colleague, Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY, of New York.

Congressman ROONEY is almost as well known to the Polish-American leaders throughout the United States as he is to his own people in Brooklyn. Polish-American organizations have recognized his deep dedication to the same goals which motivate them in their desire to see the enactment of legislation which benefits the people instead of special interests. These organizations that have fought the battle for decent immigration laws which will permit America to benefit from the skills and professions of immigrants, those who have fought for aid to education, broader social security rights, and the score of other needed progressive measures, all know JOHN ROONEY as a friend and champion.

It is my pleasure at this point to insert in the RECORD Congressman ROONEY's remarks made to that great gathering of Americans proud of their Polish descent:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN J. ROONEY BEFORE THE QUADRENNIAL MEETING OF THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS AT CHICAGO, ILL., SEPTEMBER 19, 1964

Mr. Chairman, reverend fathers, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure to be here. I am always eager to join with the Polish-American leaders in their important gatherings. I welcome the chance of meeting more of your fine people and to renew the friendships I have established with so many of you over the years.

My appearance also affords me the opportunity to thank you personally for the fine support you have given me and other Members of Congress who have been fighting for enactment of legislation to accomplish the results which you individually and as an organization have sought to attain. In mentioning legislation I want you to know it was my distinct privilege and honor to work closely for 8 years with that distinguished legislator, the Senator, the majority leader, the Vice President, and now the President, Lyndon B. Johnson. I shall always be grateful for his deep understanding and his warm response to the problems of funding our essential programs to aid the distressed people of the world, and particularly the construction of the American Children's Hospital in Krakow. I quote President Johnson's message to you last year when he said, "The objective of the United States is and shall continue to be—to see freedom returned to Poland and the other nations of Eastern Europe."

I want to mention again the great experience which I had 2 years ago in visiting Poland in company with Under Secretary of State Crockett, Commissioner Farrell, and Assistant Secretary of State Cieplinski, who are here with me again. I well recall every minute of a more than an hour long conversation at the Polish Institute in Rome with His Eminence Cardinal Wyszynski immediately previous to the week we visited in Poland. Not only did I have a chance to see the impressive cities which the people rebuilt with their own hands as well as the magnificent countryside, for which Poland is justly proud, but I had the satisfaction of meeting and talking with many of the people in the heroic capitals of Warsaw, Krakow, and the marvelous monastery of Czestochowa. Not only did I have the opportunity to see firsthand what our Government is doing in behalf of the Polish people, but I saw, too, the great things that you and your membership are doing.

My visits to the public schools, the industrial plants and the farms were both highly informative and extremely enjoyable, largely because of the friendliness and warmth of the people.

Nothing which I saw or was told impressed me more than the firm conviction which all of us felt, that the spirit of independence was not dead but burned hotly, and that the Polish people still feel much of the warm bond of friendship which has so long existed between the people of our two countries. They are eager to create "those bridges of friendship" of which President Johnson has spoken.

I want also to join those who have commended you for the magnificent contribution which your Polish-American Congress and

its constituent member groups continue to make throughout this country. America is indeed far richer because of your fine civic and philanthropic programs which are not confined to just your own members or restricted to Polish-Americans alone.

For all of your work and your accomplishments you well merit the happiness and satisfaction that come from knowing that you have given to America far more than America has given you. But my friends, the need of your help and your powerful support is not over. It is needed today and I foresee even an increased need in the days to come if you and I and others who love freedom are to succeed in protecting our own American heritage against those who would destroy it, and if we are to preserve any semblance of world peace. Your active help will be needed if we are to keep the way open for continuing the American tradition of welcoming a reasonable number of immigrants and refugees, victims of Communist oppression; for continuing the American tradition of helping the people of other countries to obtain or maintain their independence; and for continuing the American tradition of doing everything possible to eliminate the specters of hunger, of want and of unemployment from our beloved Nation.

To those of us who have a public responsibility it is most gratifying and most reassuring to realize the extent to which Americans can rely so heavily upon Polish-Americans for the finest type of support and civic service.

Tribute to Luis Muñoz-Marín

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my sincere words of tribute to the many already spoken and printed extolling the statesmanship, leadership, and brilliant accomplishments of the great Governor of Puerto Rico, Luis Muñoz-Marín.

It has been my pleasure and privilege to meet with Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín on numerous occasions, and to discuss with him the problems of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the plans for the continuing improvement in the general welfare of his people as well as those of Puerto Rican birth in the United States. There are many persons of Puerto Rican birth now residing in my congressional district, the 22d District of New York, and I found my conferences with the Governor of inestimable value. My concern has always been to help Puerto Ricans overcome the tremendous handicaps to be found in the New York area, to render all possible assistance. The Governor's love for his people has always been evident, and in speaking with him, one could not help but realize how fortunate the people were to have such a champion and leader.

Under Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín's able leadership, Puerto Rico has become known throughout the free world as a workshop of democracy. His vision and ability to inspire his people have made his program Operation Bootstrap a rousing success; the goals of education, industrialization, and agricultural diversification have achieved a rise in the literacy rate to 90 percent, industry boasts of 700 booming factories and aims for 2,500 within 10 years; the agricultural advancement is outstanding. And this phenomenal advancement and success of a people are mainly due to the compassion and efforts of a man who was disheartened and heartsick over the poverty of the Puerto Rican people and who determined to tackle the formidable job of helping them achieve decent living standards, education, and a stable economy. The present showplace island of Puerto Rico is the wonderful legacy of Governor Muñoz-Marín upon whom the title "teacher of democracy" has been lovingly bestowed.

When Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín refused to accept a fifth nomination for Governor, it was stated that he "struck an almost unique blow for democracy." He gave to the people one of the greatest gifts of all; he gave them the opportunity to prove to themselves that they could continue along the paths of freedom, justice, and progress, without depending upon the leadership of any one man. He has served the people since 1940, first in the island senate, and since 1948 as Governor. Had he wished to continue in this high post, he would have been overwhelmingly reelected. However, as a dedicated advocate of democratic principles, he insisted upon stepping aside, and his decision to relinquish the far-reaching power that had been entrusted to him, has been hailed as the greatest act of his career. It must be acknowledged that men in power very seldom step aside voluntarily and at the height of prestige; yet, when we consider that the Governor is a man of many talents, is more than a politician, a man recognized as a philosopher, poet, lawyer, writer, possessed of the qualities of kindness and modesty, and above all a love for his fellow man, then we are not surprised at his selfless action and his placing ideals above personal ambition.

It is gratifying and heartening to know that he is not entirely retiring from public service; he has announced that he will return to the Puerto Rican Senate. He will continue to watch over his people and to serve as their elder statesman. With the example he has set, with the benefits the people will have with him as a "teacher" keeping and enhancing their faith in a representative government, we know that all will continue to go well with Puerto Rico. For Governor Muñoz-Marín I wish many more years of happiness and success in his many endeavors and all the gratification which a job well done can bring.

Nikola Petkov Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the gallant people of little Bulgaria have given more than their quota of brave men who have fought and died for freedom and democracy. Among these true soldiers of freedom, Nikola Petkov holds a high place. This dauntless foe of all forces of darkness and deceit, nazism, fascism, and communism, defiantly challenged all forces opposing freedom, and for his courageous stand he made the supreme sacrifice.

September 23, 1947, when Petkov was treacherously executed by Communists, was a black day for the Bulgarian people, for all peoples in the Balkans and for the free world.

Today on the 17th anniversary of the death of Nikola Petkov, we honor his blessed memory, and I gladly send my cordial greetings to the Bulgarian people.

Support Our Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is not hard to understand that a society which seems to have less and less moral indignation should look the other way while a tragic disservice is being done to the real bulwark of our American system of law and order, the police officer. I have taken the floor on several occasions during the past 4 years to commend our law enforcement officials for their patience, dedication to duty and restraint in the face of real peril. Today's peril comes less from the gun than the organized, insidious attack by groups who desire to discredit the police and have a catchall to cover their assault, "police brutality."

Pick up the average paper and you no longer are shocked when you read that white youths at a sea resort in Massachusetts or New York engage in full battle with the police. You might read an account of the Philadelphia riots or more recently about the Negro youths who hurled bottles and obscenities at the policemen in McComb, Miss. While the civil rights upheaval and the encouragement from some leaders to "oppose the law when it is wrong" may have added some impetus to the attack on our law enforcement officials, the problem is much deeper than this and it certainly deserves our careful attention. My point is that we should be shocked at blatant insurrection and resistance to the lawful orders of policemen and we should all resolve to support our law enforcement officials in what has come to be a difficult and unappreciated job.

The charge of police brutality is being used throughout the United States wherever it serves the purposes of agitators and demagogs. Certainly the Communist Party, U.S.A., has consistently used this foil and smear. I personally observed the restrained manner in which Washington police handled student rioters at a hearing of the Committee on Un-American Activities last year. The Com-

munist press charged police brutality and gestapo tactics, as usual, but this time they failed. The fact that they have been very successful in this accusation in the past is a cause for great concern, however, and certainly their leadership in this smear of law-enforcement officials has had its effect.

Thugs and petty delinquents have observed that a gold mine lies in the charge of "police brutality" and "civil rights" when they are apprehended. It is getting to be a standard operating procedure to hurl these charges as a defense. Simply by being charged, a police officer must defend himself and I do not need to tell you what a bad effect this has on good law enforcement. In Harlem, posters were displayed everywhere which proclaimed "Wanted for Murder—Gilligan the Cop." Officer Gilligan was exonerated but what policeman wants to get himself into a similar position in the future?

In an outstanding series of articles which I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Lorain (Ohio) Journal outlined the sordid story in which prisoners actually held a kangaroo court behind bars and carefully laid their plans to harass arresting officers by a contrived story of police brutality. They were smart enough to throw in the words "civil rights" and the next thing they knew, the Federal officials were jumping to their assistance like they had been shot out of guns.

This is not to discredit the civil rights movement. It is an unfortunate fact of life that many petty thugs have found that they can resort to looting and lawlessness if there is a pretext of civil rights in rioting and disorders in our metropolitan areas. This appears to be exactly what happened in Philadelphia. But who is the man in the middle—you guessed it, the policeman. In many instances, he cannot draw his gun and probably has orders not to use his nightstick to quell civil rights disturbances.

Moreover, groups like the American Civil Liberties Union make life more difficult for law enforcement officials. I documented one instance of their handling of a criminal charge in New York City wherein they were in my judgment, totally unfair to the police officers involved. A wanted murderer was given more consideration than the safety of the arresting officers. While lawyers should use every honorable defense in representing their clients, policemen should not be made a scapegoat to secure an acquittal. Courts have demonstrated a tendency in the past few years to be easy on the felon and harsh on the law enforcement officials.

All of these trends point to an eroding climate for law enforcement officials throughout the country. They can be shot at, cursed, jeered or struck by beer cans and the public they are charged to serve and protect sits back and turns past these news stories to the sports page. It is high time that we start saying a good word for the cop, for the sheriff, for the highway patrolman, for the detective—yes, for the chief of police too—and everyone in the fine fraternity which wears a badge.

Possibly because they wear a badge and are the symbol of authority in a world of ferment and strife, the officer has become the target of attack whether it be by civil rights enthusiasts who have valid gripes against the "system" or young college students who just want to rebel. Whatever the cause, this disrespect for law and order, for the uniform, for the badge should not be tolerated and only through an incensed public indignation and massive public support for our law enforcement officials can we hope to abate this trend. Only through rekindling the respect which we now seem to be lacking can we nurture the love of country, patriotism, and the belief in our great institutions which makes it possible to live in an orderly, peaceful society.

Once more the Lorain (Ohio) Journal has taken a lead in this cause. Their September 15, 1964, issue contains an excellent editorial "Police Fight Back" which would be an ideal rallying point to start a national campaign to "Back Our Police." I commend it to your reading:

POLICE FIGHT BACK

Police of the United States, harassed by unfounded charges of brutality, shorn by court decrees of powers essential for proper law enforcement, and made the butt of ridicule by scoff laws, are going to fight back.

This was the essence of a decision reached at a recent meeting of the board of directors of the Grand Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police held in Louisville, Ky.

A committee was appointed to draw up a resolution embracing the position of law enforcement in relation to lawlessness.

That the national conference of the police organization will strongly endorse the recommendation of the directors can be regarded as a certainty. Police officers everywhere are becoming keenly aware of the ever-growing obstacles to their maintenance of law and order.

This represents the first organized step of police to strike back at their detractors. Their purpose is to preserve their powers to perform their duty of safeguarding people and property. All citizens except those who live by pillage, plunder, and crime, should hope fervently that the police succeed in halting the trend to law-enforcement obstructionism.

The Fraternal Order of Police is a national organization with a membership of more than 60,000 working police officers. The need for the lodge to fight for police rights was brought into focus at the directors' meeting by discussions of the Lorain case in which two police officers are being charged in Federal court with brutality.

The two are targets of a civil rights action by Federal authorities. To emphasize the hazards to the general welfare that can spring from excessive official militancy in such matters, we repeat four paragraphs from an earlier editorial in this newspaper:

"Shrill denunciations of civil rights demonstrators against police brutality may sometimes, albeit infrequently, be justified. But if protests are accompanied by such remedies as defiance of law enforcement, deliberate abuse of the police or refusal to help them in time of emergency, the cure becomes far worse than the disease.

"Police are the shock troops that guard our governmental system and our way of life against lawlessness, upheaval and utter chaos. They stand in a thin blue line between order and disorder.

"The police do not have the resources and the manpower to hold the line against vicious assaults of nihilists unless they have the backing, the cooperation and, if necessary, the direct help of the general public.

"Thus the point evolves all too clearly that if the civil rights champions weaken or destroy legitimate police power, they will have no 'rights' at all—nor will other citizens."

The Philadelphia incident, when spectators screamed "police brutality" while police were attempting to check rioting, destruction of stores, and looting, was illustrative of the abuse aimed at the men whose duty is to enforce the law.

If the Fraternal Order of Police can turn the trend in law enforcement from abuse and interference with the police back to respect and cooperation, the accomplishment will stand as a renewed bulwark of freedom in this Nation—freedom from the anarchy of lawlessness.

The War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on September 3, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, delivered a significant address entitled "The War on Poverty" at the fourth annual Labor Day observance sponsored by the Right Reverend Coleman F. Carroll, of the Catholic diocese of Miami.

This is an able and meaningful address and I am sure my colleagues who observe it will appreciate it:

WAR ON POVERTY

Your Excellency Bishop Carroll, ladies and gentlemen, and my fellow trade unionists, it is obvious enough that you have honored me by inviting me to address this great occasion, so recently and yet so magnificently begun. Yet in choosing the subject of the "War on Poverty" for your fourth annual Labor Day observance you have honored all those men in Washington today, and those who preceded them who have brought this great moral issue to the center of our national concerns.

An interesting question about the war on poverty is where it began. I can personally recall, as a young man—as I thought—a boy in reality listening to a great American, then Senator now Representative Claude Pepper debating the question of the poll tax at Town Hall in New York City. The issue of the poll tax is now happily behind us, but the things that made it an issue are not. I can still remember Claude Pepper's description of poverty in America, particularly rural America. He was asked at one point by a faintly hostile person in the audience "Was a dollar really a lot to pay for a man who really wanted to vote?" And I shall never forget his reply: "Down our way we have a saying that a dollar ain't much if you've got one."

That is a remark of which my grandfather would have said has the look of truth about it. And it has been just that kind of direct confrontation with reality that has brought about the war on poverty—and done so in the face of a good deal of official indifference to the problem and academic insistence that it no longer existed.

The universities in particular turned their attention away from the problems of poverty in some degree because the problems were thought to have been solved, in the sense that the process of solution was well under

way. The post-World War II depression did not materialize, and those who had most anticipated it seem almost to have overcompensated in a confusion of surprise and disappointment. It was evident that incomes generally were rising, and it appeared that low incomes were rising fastest of all. Clearly, the world had changed. As S. M. Miller and Martin Rein report, "in a spirit of 'dazed euphoria' American social scientists formulated a new natural law of income equalization."

We were wrong. At almost the moment of the pronouncement of the beginning of the end of the historic inequalities of wealth, the distribution of income in the United States froze. In 1947 the 20 percent of the families with the lowest incomes received 5 percent of the national income. Fifteen years later it was still 5 percent. The proportions were exactly reversed at the top, and remained exactly unchanged.

We deserved to be wrong to the extent it was supposed that anything happening generally in the United States would also be happening specifically. The Nation is too vast and much too varied. And as it turned out by the 1950's things were getting relatively worse, not better, for many specific groups of people. By the end of that decade Robert J. Lampman of the University of Wisconsin was able to show that income shares generally were not changing, and since then Oscar Ornati and Herman P. Miller have demonstrated that for persons with certain characteristics of age, color, sex, area, and occupation the situation was in fact deteriorating.

Because our statistics separate them out, the experience of Negroes during this period is the one that can be seen most clearly. The majority of the poor are not Negro—four-fifths are white—but a near majority of Negroes are poor. What has happened to them is probably not unrepresentative of the common experience of the poorest groups during the great postwar prosperity. And what happened was awful. Real incomes did rise, and opportunities for Negroes with education and training did open up as never in the past, but by and large things got worse. In the first place, Negro wages relative to white wages, after moving ahead at a very good pace during the 1940's, suddenly began to fall behind—possibly for the first time in history. In 1951 the average male Negro wage earner was receiving 62 percent of corresponding white earnings. By 1962 he had dropped back to 55 percent.

Simultaneously Negro unemployment began its seeming inexorable rise: 4.4 percent of Negro male workers were unemployed in 1951; by 1962 the rate had almost tripled to 11 percent. Unemployment among white men rose, but by 1962, at 4.6 percent, it was only two-tenths of a point higher than the Negro rates a decade earlier. In the meantime the massive migration to the cities continued, so that by the middle of the 1950's the signs of social morbidity were unmistakable to anyone who cared to notice. The Negro family structure began to crumble under the impact of unemployment, dislocation, and possibly also the peculiarly savage welfare policies of the Federal Government which practically required that families break up as a condition of welfare assistance. With the family base eroding, there was less and less to build on as the years went by.

The American gross national product rose by $100 billion in the first 36 months of the new Democratic administration in Washington, but still the poor remained. At the current rate of attrition the prospect would be that the actual number of families living in poverty would begin to rise, reaching as much as 11.4 million by 1975.

The easing of the cold war, with the prospect of defense cutbacks, released a good deal of energy and, potentially, resources as the new administration passed midterm. The great upsurge of Negro militancy was an unavoidable fact that demanded and was entitled to a mature and generous response. But there was another factor: the stalemate of social progress as defined in the institutional terms of the 1930's and their aftermath. The New Frontier came to power with an impressive list of things to be done, but most of them were defined as extensions of earlier programs or reassertions of earlier ideas. Many of these incremental battles had been fought and lost previously, and before long it became clear that they were being fought and lost again. Then came the surge of hostility from the business community toward an administration that was profoundly and earnestly probusiness, not in the sense of being anti anything else, but rather in the automatic assumption of the mutuality of interests in a complex and creative economy. It was clear the Nation urgently needed a new definition of the social problem that would unite rather than divide, and a tract from the distant and almost forgotten world of apocalyptic ideology provided it: the issue was proverty. When President Johnson proposed that we go to war against it, he added just that measure of activism that the proposition needed. The stalemate was broken. A whole spectrum of program ideas that individually were deadlocked and doomed were put together, added to, and before anyone could have believed it, enacted by a coalition in Congress and a body of opinion in the Nation that could not have been conceived a year earlier.

What we have had is a great stroke of luck. After two decades of immobilism, the old rigidities are giving way and the Nation is moving ahead in an area where deadlock was turning gangrenous. The object now must be to exploit the opportunity. Almost certainly this will require an intense effort of analysis to understand much more about what has been the trouble, and how the present effort must proceed if it is to achieve its objective, an effort which must now involve the world of scholarship.

The vrst question is, What is the nature of poverty in the United States? It is curiously not a simple question. The problem is that poverty is the normal, historical condition of human life. It has always been that way, and in terms of world averages, it still is. But certainly mass poverty—and we have that—is hardly the necessary condition of life in a nation whose wealth grows by $30 billion a year, whose economists routinely assume the economy will have grown another fourth by the end of the decade.

"For ye have the poor always with you" quoted Congressman AYRES of Ohio at the outset of the hearings on the President's poverty program and that may very well be, but the question remains whether the reason will always be the same. There is no justification for simply ignoring a proposition that in one form or another has been with us from the beginning of the industrial revolution; namely, that the same processes that produce industrial wealth also produce poverty, that the two go hand in hand.

We are not far from the centenary of Henry George's "Progress and Poverty" which put the matter in terms that still must be contended with:

"The masses of men, who in the midst of abundance suffer want; who, clothed with political freedom, are condemned to the wages of slavery; to whose toil laborsaving inventions bring no relief, but rather seem to rob them of a privilege, instinctively feel that 'there is something wrong.' And they are right."

We must now talk not of the masses of men, but of the minority, but that does not alter the conditions of the individuals involved.

I will venture that there is something of this kind going on, that the paradox of poverty amidst plenty in the United States is in some important respects only a surface reality, that underneath the relationship in a number of specific instances is causal.

The first and most familiar fact is that of advancing technology. The essential source of our prosperity lies in the unsparing application of technology to the processes of production. The word is unsparing; the effect is demonic when compared with the way other peoples altogether as anxious to get rich as we are, nonetheless manage to restrain themselves. The new technology (or more correctly, recent technology) is fundamentally a creative process, but in that process it destroys communities, destroys jobs, and destroys people. These are the new poor.

The destruction of the American coal miners is a prime example. It would not be accurate probably for us to state with Orwell that "Our civilization, pace Chesterton, is founded on coal," but it is fundamental to the production of ferrous metals and electric power. We have the cheapest coal in the world, and in measure thereby just about the cheapest steel and the cheapest power. We also have the cheapest coal miners. In the 12 years from 1950 to 1962 almost 65 percent of the soft coal mining jobs in the United States were eliminated, with such indifference to the effect on the lives of the miners and their families that it is hard to think of it as a contemporary event.

The coal miners of whom Orwell wrote went through a bitter era of unemployment during the 1930's, but it would be all but impossible for it to be repeated today. British productivity is improving and employment in the mines is being cut, but as a general proposition it may be said that not a single miner has been thrown permanently out of work for a quarter century. It is perfectly clear that this policy has required that inefficient mines be kept open, and that is what has happened, period. For a variety of reasons, some better than others, the British and most of the nations of the Continent can no longer conceive of throwing a whole industrial population on the slag heap.

We can and do. A similar case is that of our agricultural workers. The United States has the cheapest food in the world. This has come about through the application of science and technology that has driven in recent years millions of farm families off the land, into the cities, with little or no preparation for the life they then have to lead.

Through all this there is a steady, if essentially impersonal bias against the unskilled and the ill equipped. The notion that automation is about to do away with the work force altogether, or bring about some such domestic upheaval may conceivably be true, but there is no evidence of it. Productivity increases over the past years have simply not been that great. On the other hand, there is evidence of a continually rising standard of minimum acceptable abilities, so that more and more those at the bottom are left out. In 1962–63 for example, output per man-hour in nonagricultural activities increased less than 3 percent, hardly a sign of cybernation. But in agriculture, where there are still many marginal producers, output per man-hour increased 7.4 percent, a change brought about not by an increase in production, but by a reduction in workers.

This bias is painfully evident in the area of job creation. From 1957 to 1963, when the population of the United States grew by 18,097,000 only 300,000 new full-time jobs were generated by private demand. Since 1957 almost half the jobs added to the American work force have been in State and local government, positions that tend to be skilled, and almost invariably today require examinations and accreditations of various sorts.

This is a major explanation of the problem of youth unemployment. During 1963 every

additional teenager entering the work force caused a net addition of the number of unemployed youth. In the first half of 1964, stimulated by the tax cut, for the first time since 1957 there was marked and dramatic improvement in the unemployment situation in the United States. From the second quarter of 1963 to the second quarter of 1964 employment moved up by 1.8 million. In July 1964 the unemployment rate finally fell below 5 percent—for the second time since 1957. But in contrast with other groups, the job picture for teenagers actually deteriorated in comparison with 1962. At 15.7 percent in the second quarter of 1964, the unemployment rate for teenagers was as high as for any year in the postwar period—nearly half again as high as during the comparable period in 1957.

This situation is clearly worse among the children of the poor. Again using the Negro statistics because they are available, as late as 1948 unemployment among male Negro youths was actually below that of whites. Since then it has risen from 7.6 percent to 25.4 percent in 1963 and is now almost twice the rate of white youths.

It may be the characteristic fault of modern society will not be the exploitation of the poor, but their exclusion, based upon means tests of ability and training. Nature is not nearly so generous in passing out the brains as liberal social policy tends to assume. A quarter of the population has an IQ under 90. Such individuals are born pretty much at random throughout the upper, middle, and low income groups, but while a middle class upbringing will compensate for limited abilities, particularly by strengthening special talents of which most persons have some, the poor child of limited natural ability grows if anything worse, and is in turn unable to help out those of his own offspring who should happen to be born with a superior potential.

A cultural pattern is involved here. Industrial progress does not have to produce poverty, but with us it seems to be doing so, for some groups at least. By contrast, although returns are not altogether in, it appears very likely that the industrial democracies of Northern and Western Europe, without any particular travail, have in the course of the past 15 years quietly put an end to poverty in their own nations. It is as if it were too obvious a thing not to do if it could be done, and when the resources became available it was done—and not just in Scandinavia.

Here again the American experience appears to be related to qualities that are peculiar to us. The most striking quality of the American Nation is the size of the country and the diversity of its people. There is nothing in history to match the incredible mixing of "race, color, religion, and national origin," superimposed on a continental territory that stretches up and down and across the globe. Surely a great measure of our vitality, energy and creativity derive from the Noah's Ark quality of the Nation, with its incomparable potential for permutations, tensions, and excitements.

The advantages gained from this diversity in the population are real, because the differences are real. At the same time there are disadvantages, and these too are tangible. Because of them Americans have been unable to reach sufficient agreement on a whole range of issues involving "race, color, religion and national origin," not to mention region, to the point that we are almost unique among modern nations in the absence of certain types of uniform public services. The most important of these is education. Are we not the only industrial democracy in the world that does not have a national system of support for elementary and secondary education? The result is that persons who live in the poorest States and communities in America get the poorest education, with the resultant tendency to perpetuate that system. Perhaps the major social discovery of the postwar period has been the work of men such as Theodore W. Schultz and Edward F. Denison, demonstrating that investment in human capital—not physical capital, not technology—is the major source of contemporary economic growth. That being the case, our inability to establish national minimum levels of support for education has very likely had the effect of accentuating the difference between investment in the human capital of the well-to-do communities, as against the poor ones.

Size and ethnic diversity is probably also the main source of what might be called the discontinuities of the American social conscience. The hard luck of one group of Americans is not that easily perceived by another despite our enormous willingness to help one another. The problem is one of communication. If the white middle class knew the conditions of life among the American Indians, would they accept it? Probably not, but they don't know. In this sense ethnicity and size are a barrier in America similar to that of social class in the European past.

THE PROMISE AND DANGERS OF THE FUTURE

It is no answer that things are getting better for almost everyone, even if at differential rates which widen the gaps between top and bottom. Everyone is vastly better off today as compared with even the recent past, but the inequalities that persist still offend against the light. So long as excessive disparities exist between those who inherit privilege and those who inherit disadvantage, the social order is out of balance.

That is why unemployment for the moment is the master problem. The essential sin of which our society is capable is not that of allowing people to remain poor, but in making them useless. In an age of overactivity, to be unemployed is to be guilty. The evidence is strong (although one would think that by now much more would be known about the subject) that men on the margin of the work force, recurrently or even permanently out of work, suffer the worst kind of personal disintegration. The victims in the main of utterly impersonal forces, they nonetheless take it personally. Their families suffer and their children are deprived in ways unknown to the prospering majority.

If our society has any moral purpose, if we acknowledge any common responsibility for the minimum well-being of all, then surely our understanding of natural rights must extend to the subject of employment. Labor, in the words of Pope John XXIII, is "both a duty and a right of every human being." Right, repeat, right. In an industrial world that has not yet come to terms with the question of leisure, men without work are deprived of an essential condition of human dignity, and there has not been a week in the past decade when by any counting there have been fewer than a million such in the United States. (The number of unemployed reached 5.7 million in the month after President Kennedy took office, the highest point since the depression, but not all of these were marginal workers.) We have not understood this clearly until now, and perhaps not even now. Full employment is an accepted ideal, in our economy, much as perpetual motion would attract the managers of a generating plant, but the idea that it must be achieved, even at a price, because the cost of not doing so is intolerable, is not generally accepted.

We are still a long way from Sir William H. Beveridge's declaration to wartime England: "Full employment * * * is something that the British democracy should direct its Government to secure, at all costs save the surrender of the essential liberties. Who can doubt that full employment is worth winning, at any cost less than surrender of those liberties? If full employment is not won and kept, no liberties are secure, for to many they will not seem worthwhile."

It would be naive to think of Beveridge's proposition only in terms of the unemployed themselves. The very fact of unemployment, although it may involve relatively few, threatens many. It is the source of the untold rigidities and fears in the world of industrial and social relations.

Next to the problem of unemployment is that of low wages for men with large families. The United States is singular in the general absence of arrangements for adjusting income to family size. One can even detect a general assumption that families are smaller than they actually are. The City Worker's Budget prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and on which most conceptions of minimum living standards are based, assumes a family of mother, father, and two children, which is somewhat below the national average of families with children anyway, and almost irrelevant for a family of 10, of which there are a good many.

In 1961, 24.5 million children, or 37 percent of all children under 18, were in families with four or more children. These constituted 11 percent of all families, and about 18 percent of all families with children. In 1961 nearly half (48 percent) of all children in families with incomes under $3,000 were in families of four or more.

One of the most disturbing indexes of social disorganization in the Nation are the selective service rejection rates. If all young men of 18 were called up for examination, a third would be rejected as unfit for military service. (In actual practice more than half are rejected, but not all are called.) Roughly one in six would fail the mental test, which measures minimum achievement at about the level of a 13-year-old schoolboy. Seventy percent who fail below the mental standards come from families with four or more children and about half come from families of six or more.

Clearly we require a strong wage system, and a strong trade union movement to maintain it. But it may also be special adjustments should be made for family size at low-income levels.

At this point a warning is in order. Although it is no problem to describe in general terms what needs to be done, it is essential to emphasize that these simplicities are turning out to be difficult of achievement, and that in fact most "natural" forces seem to run contrary. The overwhelming danger we face in the area of poverty is that we will not have the energy and social creativity to make our system run properly, but will instead settle for making up for its shortcomings by massive programs of public assistance.

Despite all of those who sincerely feel these programs are already too large, the plain fact is that they exist, and the course of least resistance is to let them go on getting bigger. It would be disgracefully expensive to do so, but also, somehow, easier. Life surely provides examples of how often people individually and collectively will pay a price for not having to change their ways.

The American welfare system is one of the proudest achievements of a generous and compassionate people. But it must not be allowed to become the economic system of a permanent subculture. Men need jobs, families need fathers, communities need independence. This must be our objective and it is an objective entirely compatible with the fullest care for those individuals who find themselves temporarily or even permanently unable to look after themselves. It would seem we know very little about what changes things for a family or an individual. No one would deny that our best minds have been otherwise engaged over the past several decades, but it is past time that we righted that imbalance. In the mean-

while social policy must seek its own pragmatic solutions. We must share the courage and optimism of the President who declared, in signing the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, "The days of the dole in our country are numbered."

This is the object of the President's war on poverty, with its emphasis on jobs and job training, education, and community action. It is within our power to change the course of recent events, and we fail to do so at the risk of all that is strongest and true in the American heritage.

Confidence Is Keynote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most widely read features of the Newark Star-Ledger is "Jersey Business," by John Soloway. In addition to being a discerning observed and able writer himself, John selects as guest columnists outstanding men from the New Jersey business and industrial community. Earlier this month such a columnist was Mr. George J. Haney, director of New Jersey operations of the brokerage house, Auchincloss, Parker & Redpath, Inc.

No one in the New Jersey financial community is more respected than George, both for his demonstrated ability and his personal integrity. And while the column he has written is directed principally to those engaged in commerce, you will see that his point is equally applicable to men in other walks of life, including our own. And for this reason, I would like to place it before my colleagues. As George has said, "Confidence is the keynote—solid confidence predicted upon the good character of our Nations, its leaders and its citizens." Establishment and maintenance of that confidence is the responsibility of each and every one of us.

The column follows:

JERSEY BUSINESS

(By John Soloway)

FINANCIAL: CONFIDENCE IS KEYNOTE IN FIGHT ON INFLATION

(By George J. Haney)

One of the most intriguing words in the English language is "confidence."

Webster defines it as "reliance," a particularly apt description.

In the world of economics, it is, strangely enough, never given the importance it deserves.

The study of money and currency is extremely difficult because after you have mastered the formalistic theories, you find that actually you know very little, inasmuch as any practical understanding of the subject is almost completely a matter of confidence.

Imagine what would happen if the pepole of this country and the rest of the world suddenly lost confidence in the value of the U.S. dollar? Economic chaos would result which would affect every nation in the world and all of the gold stored in Fort Knox wouldn't help the situation.

A nation's currency is what people believe it to be collectively, i.e., a matter of confidence.

Runaway inflation has occurred frequently in recent history and the currency of the nations involved has been rendered temporarily worthless. Germany and China are good examples of this, and the prime motivation for the denouncement of creeping inflation into a runaway inflation has been a steady decrease in confidence in the currency of the realms involved.

Every informed citizen should be deeply concerned with the different elements which go to make up confidence in the currency of a country. The character of a nation's government is perhaps most important. Paying debts on time, willingness to help less fortunate nations without being stupidly wasteful, keeping its word in diplomatic and business matters, quality of production at a high level, all of these are most important in establishing confidence in its medium of exchange. You will note that I make no mention of gold or other currency backing as the most important element in the creation of confidence. Gold and silver reserve is one element of confidence but history proves that its importance is sometimes exaggerated as opposed to the presence of national character.

As a prime example today, take the case of the Soviet Union. This powerful nation has probably the largest gold reserve available in the world today but its currency medium of exchange (the ruble) is held in very low esteem by all of the countries in the world because of the lack of character of its present communistic form of government.

The character of a nation is easily the most important confidence factor to nations outside the one being judged. What are the most important elements affecting confidence within the country itself? Once again, belief in and pride in the government of a nation and the character of its administrators is the single most important element.

In some cases, undesirable traits in the people of a country like delusions of economic grandeur and extreme nationalism have been contributors to a false confidence which eventually was unmasked with dire consequences to the nations involved. Confidence based upon a deception of the masses by a government's leaders has always been doomed to failure if history can be considered a competent teacher. Most recently, Nazi Germany was an example of such deception.

Mismanagement by government, business, and labor can be important contributors to the destruction of confidence within a nation. Evidence of a total lack of public morality on the part of these sectors of a nation sets the stage for a Nero-like collapse of the entire country.

The successful government leaders have always been those who were able to feel the pulse of public confidence before undertaking new ideas and experiments which were important to the economy and hence, the currency of a nation.

In the United States today, the most important problem facing the leaders of our Government is the possibility of a severe credit inflation affecting the confidence in which the U.S. dollar is held with the inevitable runaway inflation resulting.

Through a combination of circumstances which would take too much space to explain here, this administration does not wish to utilize the classic method of raising short-term interest rates; i.e.; a tight money policy to combat a possible runaway boom in business in the near future. There are many who feel that a general rise in interest rates would help our balance-of-payments situation. Opponents argue that any tightening of rates would cause a sharp slide in business and the stock market.

The American people are therefore faced with a great challenge, the necessity for retaining prices and wages at sensible levels, the necessity for realistic economy in Government, and, most of all, a practical understanding of the terrible evil of inflation and the factors which can cause it, regardless of the great affluence of the Nation involved.

Even if inflation continued at its present rate, a college education 15 years from now will cost 25 percent more than it does today, a $7,500 life insurance policy, which matures in 20 years, will buy only as much as $5,600 will today. A pension of $200 per month, taken 25 years from now, will only provide the same standard of living $150 a month would today.

The purchase of common stocks has often been considered one of the better hedges against inflation. However true this may be, it is much more important that every individual do all in his power to help destroy the chances of runaway inflation becoming a reality in this country.

Confidence is the keynote, not a false confidence relying upon spurious notions, but solid confidence predicated upon the good character of our Nation, its leaders, and its citizens. No more important challenge faces the people of this country today.

Wool Import: 30 Mills Closed and 6,450 Jobs Lost—Proves Point That Administration Doesn't Really Care for the American Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished constituent of mine, George Dorr, president of the Dorr Woolen Co., of Newport, N.H.—Post Office Guild, New Hampshire—just retired as chairman of the Northern Textile Association. In reporting to the association's 110th annual meeting recently held in Portsmouth, N.H., Mr. Dorr pointed out that 30 mills had closed and 6,450 jobs had been lost in the past 2 years because the wool import problem remained unsolved.

Although this administration has promised restrictive quotas, they have not kept their promise, although they did keep a similar promise to cotton textiles. The recent passing of the beef import quota legislation proves that when this administration wants to, they can get quotas promptly and cheerfully. To put it bluntly, they are selling the wool manufacturers down the river and, as a result, jobs are being lost, mills are being closed and whole communities are suffering.

The Newport (N.H.) Argus Champion reports on this matter in an interesting article which I shall include in the RECORD following these remarks.

Reading between the lines, the sorry story of broken promises and total disregard for an important industry, makes shocking reading for anybody who believes that citizens should be permitted to trust their Government to keep its promises and to foster an industry of

vital importance to the national security and to the national economy.

The article follows:

DORR REPORTS—WOOL MANUFACTURERS WANT IMPORT CONTROLS

PORTSMOUTH.—An effective system of import control of wool and man-made fiber textiles and apparel tops the Northern Textile Association's aims for the year ahead.

Reporting to the association's 110th annual meeting here today, President William F. Sullivan and retiring Chairman George A. Dorr, Jr., will give the membership detailed reports on both wool and cotton textile import problems and steps in progress toward their solution.

NTA represents New England's cotton, wool, and manmade fiber textile manufacturers.

Mr. Dorr, president of Dorr Woolen Co., Guild, pointed out that 30 mills had closed and 6,450 jobs had been lost in the woolen industry in the past 2 years largely because the import problem remained unsolved.

"There will be no long-term commitments for capital improvements of the magnitude to keep the wool segment of the textile industry virile until a solution of this problem is reached," he added.

Gordon Osborne, president and treasurer of Warwick Mills, Boston, Mass., was elected chairman of the association to succeed Mr. Dorr. Mr. Dorr was elected a vice president.

Mr. Sullivan listed the association's aims for the coming year as:

"1. An effective system of import control of wool and manmade fiber textiles and apparel on a category and country basis.

"2. Continued control of cotton textile and apparel imports by firm enforcement of the long-term cotton arrangement.

"3. The exclusion of textile and textile products from the Kennedy-Round under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

"4. Permanent Federal legislation which will make cotton available to American mills at the same price that it is available for export.

"5. Extension of the National Wool Act so as to insure the continued production of wool in the United States.

"6. The effective enforcement of U.S. labeling laws on imported textile products.

"7. Increased understanding of the importance of the textile industry to New England and the maintaining of our mills in a competitive position in the textile industry."

Fort Pickens History Recounted for Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request permission to include in my remarks the following article by Mr. J. Troy Pickens, of Ireland, W. Va., giving an accounting of the history of Fort Pickens, W. Va. This is the story of Company A, 10th West Virginia Infantry Volunteers, during March 1862. I was pleased to speak at the dedication of the Fort Pickens Marker in Duffy, W. Va., recently and this historical presentation proved immensely interesting as a documentation of early history in West Virginia.

The article follows:

FORT PICKENS AND THE MEN WHO BUILT IT—FIRST KNOWN AS CAPT. MORGAN A. DARNALLS, CO. A, 10TH VIRGINIA

Company A, 10th West Virginia Infantry Volunteers, enlisted and built their fort during the fall and winter of 1861, and was mustered into U.S. service by Captain Bainbridge (at their Fort Pickens), March 13, 1862. Trained and joined other forces.

After more than 3 years of struggle it stood before Richmond from Christmas Day, 1864, until the fall of that fortified city and at the close of the war. Then it returned to Wheeling and was mustered out of U.S. service on August 9, 1865.

They were privates: William D. Anderson, William J. Anderson, Andrew Adkison, Nathan D. Bennett, William O. Barnett, Edward H. Ballard, John H. Barlow, Lushus C. Baker, Washington Boggs, William T. Bull, Gilbert Buckhannon, Thomas Buckhannon, John Cunningham, William P. Cunningham, Jesse Cunningham, Jennison P. Cunningham, Abel H. Cunningham, Abram L. Crites, Lemon S. Clothier, Robert C. Clothier, Isaac G. Chipps.

John Curry, Abram F. Curry, George W. Claypool, Patrick Callahan, Jeffrey Collins, Arch Collins, John F. Davis, William L. Davis, Thomas L. Davis, William C. Ewing, Murty Ford, David H. Grimes, Henry Harper, Peter Harper, Enoch Heater, Zachariah Howel, Samuel H. Loudon, John D. Loudon, Benjamin F. Lake, Andrew L. Leslie, Thomas McQuain, George P. Moss, Ezekiel C. Marple, John M. Marple, David Moor, Joseph Moor, William Marley, James Marley, John R. Mealey, John A. Mealey.

John T. McKisic, William N. McCarty, Elijah W. McCartney, Nathan McCord, Walter Mick, William Pickens, James Pickens, Charles Peatt, Benjamin Potts, Alfred M. Rexroad, Palser Rexroad, John Roby, James S. Roby, Peter Riffle, William M. Richardson, Silas G. Slaughter, Christian Simons, Jonas Simmons, Samuel Swecker, Aaron Shirtliff, General J. Shaw, William J. Smith, James H. Shawver, Commodore P. Townsend, James T. Underwood, Charles L. Underwood, Elihu Wimer, Morgan Wimer, Thomas M. Warner, William D. Warner, John F. Warner, Levi R. Warner, William Warner, James C. Wilson, Loudon B. Watson, Nelson Wanless, Andrew Wanless, George D. Walton, John Walton, George Williams.

Officers: Capt. Morgan A. Darnall; 1st Lt. Jos. G. Bouse; 2d Lt. Ausbin Wilson.

Sergeants: First, Ignatius Burbridge; Thomas Williams; Right B. Curry; William F. Detamore; Timothy Ford.

Corporals: James J. Anderson; Enoch Cunningham; John D. Armstrong; Maranda H. Rexroad; Elkanah H. Roby; Robert H. Ewing; John C. Harold.

Field and staff officers: Col. Thomas H. Harris; Lt. Col. Moses S. Hall; Maj. Henry H. Withers; Adjutant Oliver P. Boughner; Suregon George C. Gans; Assistant Surgeon Johnathon R. Blair; Quartermaster Samuel Adams; Chaplain John Branch.

A brief description of the fort and what took place there might be of interest.

It was erected on the lands of James Pickens, Sr., at Duffy, near the southern extremity of Lewis County, W. Va.

It was built as an outpost and as it was located on the Pickens land it became known as Fort Pickens.

It was two stories high and was constructed with double thickness of hewed log walls and was approximately 30 by 45 feet inside dimension. It was equipped with two chimneys with large fireplaces in which wood was used for both heating and cooking. (Some cooking was done outdoors in fair weather). The location of the chimneys is evidenced by two mounds remaining of the clay of which they were constructed.

After Company A left here and joined other forces, the fort was still used as an outpost and as a recruiting station. Several enlisted here as cavalrymen and went to other points to be mustered in wherever they were needed in the ranks.

The fort was also used as a way station and many soldiers including some from Ohio and Indiana were stationed here for short periods.

Somehow the enemy was always stopped short of reaching the fort and the only engagements here was with bushwhackers which came through the community as raiders. According to tradition, one such group from Webster County came through and attacked the fort and a member of Company A was slightly wounded in the skirmish.

There was a door in each end of the building but there were no windows, however light was admitted by a row of portholes conveniently placed around the top walls of both the upper and lower rooms.

The lower room had mostly a ground floor with exception of one corner where hewed boards called puncheons were used to cover what was referred to as the "tater hole" in which potatoes, turnips, apples, etc. were stored under the floor. Some bunk beds could be laid up in this room when needed.

The upper room was reached by two flights of stairs, one at each end of the building. It was equipped with bunk beds three tiers in height which were constructed without nails, being mortise and tenon work made in such manner that one man might easily assemble or disassemble them. In the case of an enemy approach the upper beds could be lifted off and the defenders stand on the lower beds to shoot through the portholes.

Each bed was wide enough to accommodate two soldiers and were made in units of several beds side by side extending the full length of the building which was about 45 feet long. The soldiers entered the bed by climbing in at the foot and slept with their heads near the wall.

The gunrack, which was about 30 feet long, stood in the middle of the room between the heads of the two flights of stairs at the ends, and the two rows of bunk beds on the sides. It was made to hold more than 100 guns in upright position.

Each gun was held by wooden pegs (which were also used for hanging shot pouches), from falling over and banging the gun next to it. While under the rack was space where the soldiers might put their boots when they went to bed.

And by the way, I was about to forget to mention that on each side of the gunrack was a bench extending its full length on which a soldier might sit while putting on his boots.

As stated above, Company A was mustered into U.S. service on March 13, 1862, by Captain Bainbridge. Not long after being mustered into U.S. service, they went to Buckhannon to work and train with Company B. Then in September of that year (1862), they, together with several other companies of the 10th (it seems there must have been as many as eight including Company A and Company B) went to Bulltown where the first muster work of regimental tactics took place.

Then they were ordered to join General Milroy, so they broke camp on November 4, 1862, and set out by way of Beverly to Winchester where they arrived January 1, 1863. While camped at Winchester they made several raids in the Shenandoah Valley. Then on May 10 they were ordered back to West Virginia and added to Gen. W. Averill's brigade and sent to Buckhannon.

On the 7th of June 1863, they were sent to Beverly at which place they were attacked by a Confederate force under Col. William L. Jackson on July 2 and compelled to sustain the force of the attack for 2 days before reinforcements arrived.

On the 15th of June 1864 the command was removed to Martinsburg where on the 3d day of July 1864, General Early was encoun-

tered at Leetown and successfully resisted for some time.

Among the important battles Company A participated in were Droop Mountain, Kernstown, Harpers Ferry, Openquen River, Cedar Creek, Snickers Ferry, Winchester, and Berryville.

At Fishers Hill on September 22, 1864, the 10th Virginia was the first to plant the Stars and Stripes on the Confederate fortifications.

On the 19th of December 1864, the regiment was ordered to Washington City where it embarked and joined the army before Richmond, going into camp at Chapins Farm, within 7 miles of the Confederate Capitol on Christmas Day, 1864, where it served until the close of the war as part of the XXIV Army Corps.

Then it returned to Wheeling and was mustered out of the U.S. service on August 9, 1865.

Some perished in the struggle, but not one of Company A deserted, and those who returned had a new State "West Virginia" to come back to.

Fort Pickens was burned by bushwhackers in December of 1864, but it had served its purpose well and helped to put West Virginia on the map, and West Virginia is here to stay.—Written by J. Trop Pickens, June 15, 1963.

Address by John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General, 70th Anniversary Celebration of the Union of Poles in America, Cleveland, Ohio, September 20, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 20, Postmaster General John A. Gronouski came to Cleveland to address the 70th anniversary celebration of the Union of Poles in America.

At the convention session in the evening Mr. Gronouski gave a stirring address in response to the factors relating to the so-called white backlash. In Polish he made a magnificent quotation from the last will and testament of Thaddeus Kosciusko, in which General Kosciusko made a bequest of all of his possessions in the United States for the purpose of freeing American Negro slaves. This stirring speech made a unique call for tolerance.

The speech is as follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. GRONOUSKI, POSTMASTER GENERAL, 70TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE UNION OF POLES IN AMERICA, CLEVELAND, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 20, 1964

We meet here in Cleveland in an hour of great national hope.

An hour when the prospects of a just and lasting peace are brighter than they have been in 20 years.

An hour when the atom is becoming man's servant, instead of his master.

An hour when the walls separating us from our brothers in Eastern Europe are beginning to crumble.

An hour of rededication to the rights of all our citizens.

An hour of opportunity for our poor and of hope for our mentally ill.

An hour when our workers have achieved an unprecedented standard of living.

An hour to preserve our wilderness and to mark our slums for extinction.

And this is just the beginning. We stand on the edge of a bright new era.

We stand there because a man dreamed of greatness for his nation—and that man was John F. Kennedy.

We stand there because a great and compassionate President knew how to put that dream to work—and that President is Lyndon B. Johnson.

We stand there because this Congress, now drawing to a close, has demonstrated itself to be one of the most productive sessions in modern times—and because it had among its most devoted Members such outstanding Americans as STEPHEN YOUNG, CHARLES VANIK, and MICHAEL FEIGHAN.

These men, whom you have chosen to lead you, understand the full meaning of the opportunity that now presents itself. They understand that the forces of nature, of science and of humanity have come together in this particular time and place which will allow us—if we are wise enough—to make more progress within the next 20 years than we have made in the past 200.

Man's knowledge has unlocked many of the secrets of nature and has learned to cure many of our oldest diseases.

For the first time in history, we now have the wealth and leisure to pursue our dreams of a better, more meaningful life for everyone.

And we have in President Johnson a man who is capable of bringing together—for a great national purpose—all the factions of America which have too long been split asunder: north and south, east and west; city and farm; business and labor; Negro and white; rich and poor; and Federal and State.

Men of vision and of faith, all over the country know that if we use our knowledge, our wealth, our leisure and our sense of unity, we can indeed build that which the President has called the great society.

We can change our deserts into lush farmlands.

We can rebuild our blighted cities into centers of beauty and culture.

We can bring the miracle of modern medicine to every citizen and cure the last of the killing and crippling diseases.

We can purify our streams and our air.

We can help every child realize his full potential by improving our schools.

We can give every man a chance to provide a decent life for himself and his family, regardless of his race, his color or his creed.

In short, we can build an America "where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor."

Such is the dream of Lyndon B. Johnson. But it is more than just a dream. It is our destiny—our own generation's destiny—if we only have the vision to see it and the will to grasp it.

Our heritage today is a good society for many. Our heritage tomorrow is a great society for all.

But the future has a way of mocking as it comforts; of taunting as it beckons. And so today, even as we stand on the edge of this great new era, we are confronted with a grave national crisis. There are those among us who would settle for the progress we have already made; who dissipate our energy in petty squabbling; who would retrench because they fear what tomorrow will bring; who look longingly to the past, rather than hopefully to the future.

Today, a man who seeks the highest elective office in the world, travels around the country, preaching the gospel of peace, yet advocating the reckless use of atomic weapons.

This man cries out for national survival, yet opposes the test ban treaty.

He talks about freedom, yet votes against the civil rights act.

He speaks of the dignity of the individual, yet turns his back on our aging.

He calls for the perfection of the "whole man," yet opposes the greatest attack on poverty in the history of civilization.

He decries violence in the streets, yet announces for every malcontent to hear that "extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice," and "moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue."

This man's way is the way of national chaos. He seeks to undo every act of enlightened, progressive social legislation of this century. In his own words he tells us: "My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them. It is not to inaugurate new programs, but to cancel old ones. * * *"

He would cancel creative development of public power—power that helped bring this Nation to its present stature of greatness—by selling TVA to private industry.

He would betray every working man and woman in the United States by destroying the fabric of our social security system.

He would drive us back to the dark days of the 19th century—when the rich got richer and the poor got poorer—by doing away with the graduated income tax.

He would set our labor movement back 50 years with the passage of a national "right-to-work" law.

He would desert our poor and needy citizens with the cancellation of our social welfare programs.

He would allow our depressed areas to stagnate through the abandonment of our area redevelopment programs.

And on the international front, his policies are even more irresponsible.

He would drop a low-yield atomic bomb on North Vietnam.

He would support dictators in Latin America.

He would give life-or-death decisionmaking powers to our military field commanders.

He would slam the door of friendship on the people of Poland and other Eastern European nations, thereby destroying their hope of overthrowing Communist tyranny.

And he would carry this Nation to the brink of war, time and time again.

This Nation cannot afford the policies of such a man and I believe the American voters are going to reject him on November 3.

Today, for the first time in more than 100 years, a single political party has become the last hope of all reasonable citizens. Under one roof—the roof of a great President of the United States—have come men and women of many political shades, not for partisan reasons, but for national survival and national unity.

As you know, there are those in the Nation who are predicting that the so-called white backlash is going to be an important voting factor among Americans of Polish origin. What this implies, in plain English, is that Polish-Americans are going to turn to the intellectual bankruptcy of BARRY GOLDWATER because Senator GOLDWATER voted against the Civil Rights Act.

And when people say this to me, I tell them they don't know what they are talking about. This has never been the tradition of the Polish people—either in Poland or here in the United States—and President Johnson and I refuse to believe it is going to start now.

We of Polish descent are no strangers to discrimination ourselves. Our parents fought against it in the Old Country and they fought against it here in America, too. They were the victims of discrimination because their names were difficult to pronounce, or because their ancestors came from one part of Europe instead of another, or because they could not claim lineage back to the Mayflower.

We know from experience that anyone can be discriminated against for any reason, be it the color of his skin, or his religious beliefs, or the accent with which he speaks.

Earlier this month, before a similar group in Milwaukee, a great Polish-American Congressman, CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, voiced much the same sentiment. "We have felt the sting of being rejected by those who considered themselves culturally and socially superior," he said. "We have felt the burning shame of being denied the opportunity to be equal in the home of democracy, the land of the free."

And then, speaking of the age-old Polish tradition of fighting discrimination wherever it exists, he said this:

"* * * let those among us who have not forgotten the bitter taste of second-class rights accorded to third-class citizens, look around and take note of the job that remains to be done.

"Let us remember that so long as discrimination, oppression, and third-class citizenship are allowed to exist, the cause for which (Thaddeus) Kosciuszko fought and died, the cause which the Polish nation championed during the thousand years of its existence, the cause which was the very reason and the inspiration for the founding of our own great Nation—that cause will not be victorious."

Congressman ZABLOCKI's reference to Thaddeus Kosciuszko was particularly appropriate. Kosciuszko was more than the famous professional soldier and engineer who helped this Nation win its freedom. He was also an outstanding humanitarian. And before he returned to Europe in 1798, he drew up a will that placed him at the forefront of the movement to abolish slavery.

It read:

"Ja—Tadeusz Kosciuszko wyjezdzajac z Ameryki na wypadek, gdybym nie zostawil innego testamentu oswiadczam niniejszym, ze upowazniam mego przyjaciela Tomasza Jeffersona do zuzycia calej mej wlasnosci na wykupienie niewolnikow jego wlasnych lub innych osob i obdarzenie ich wolnoscia."

"I, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, being just on my departure from America, do hereby declare that, should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States, I hereby authorize my friend Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own or any other and giving them liberty in my name * * *."

And that is the tradition of the Polish people; not a tradition of hate and bigotry, but a tradition of love for their fellow men and of respect for human dignity. They have never faltered—and I do not believe they are going to falter in 1964.

Brief in Support of Petition for Complete Exoneration for M. Sgt. Carl H. Buck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. K. W. (BILL) STINSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, the case of M. Sgt. Carl H. Buck is one of gross injustice. I am inserting into the RECORD a statement of his case which was given to me by the Disabled American Veterans. It is my hope that Sergeant Buck will be completely cleared of the unjust charges brought against him.

The statement follows:

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR PARDON AND RESTORATION TO SERVICE FOR M. SGT. CARL H. BUCK

In August of 1952, Carl H. Buck, a marine master sergeant with an 18-year exemplary record of military service, was convicted by a court-martial of stealing three cases of chevrons from the U.S. Government. Since that time Sergeant Buck has unceasingly sought relief from that conviction; he has steadfastly and persuasively maintained that it was based upon mistaken identity. Every avenue of relief within the Navy judicial and administrative system has been pursued by and on behalf of Sergeant Buck; weighty representations on his behalf have been made to the Navy Judge Advocate General, the Secretary of the Navy, and to the President of the United States by the Board for Correction of Naval Records, by a committee of the U.S. Senate, and by individual Senators THOMAS HENNINGS, of Missouri, KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, and PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

On August 21, 1957, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS wrote an extensive communication concerning Sergeant Buck's case to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, pointing out various errors in the handling of Sergeant Buck's court-martial case and new and persuasive evidence of Buck's innocence. The present petition for pardon was prompted by the November 6, 1957, reply to that communication from the special counsel to the President, Mr. Gerald D. Morgan, which states:

"Sergeant Buck's situation has been considered with sympathy and understanding * * * several possibilities have been explored with the following results.

"A petition to the President for Executive clemency would not, as we understand it, be opposed by the Department of the Navy and would therefore receive full consideration by the Department of Justice."

Based upon this communication and upon subsequent representations to members of Senator DOUGLAS' staff by Mr. Henry R. McPhee, assistant special counsel to the President of the United States, that a petition for Executive clemency would receive a thorough investigation by the Department of Justice with the full assistance of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Sergeant Buck hereby submits this documented brief in support of this joint request for the exercise of the clemency powers of the President and his restoration authority as Commander in Chief.

I. THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF SERGEANT BUCK'S TRIAL AND CONVICTION

The sequence of events which gave rise to Sergeant Buck's conviction for larceny of chevrons, as it appears from the record of his court-martial trial, constitutes one of the strangest criminal cases in military history. On March 5, 1952, Sgt. Shurland E. Hatley, assigned to the survey warehouse, Marine Corps Supply Depot, at Camp Pendleton, Calif., was approached by an unknown marine with a request that he exchange three half cases of chevrons, having an estimated value of over $400, for $50 and a bottle of whisky. Sergeant Hatley, after instructing the unknown marine to contact him again on March 7, immediately reported the incident to his superior officers. The unknown marine appeared again at noon on March 7, dressed in khakis, wearing horn-rimmed glasses, needing a shave, and sporting a mustache. Within view of M. Sgt. Johnathan C. Layton and of M. Sgt. Walter J. Franz, who had been called in from the Criminal Investigating Division, Sergeant Hatley, at the instruction of his superior officers, gave the unknown marine three cases of chevrons in exchange for $50. The marine placed the cases of chevrons in his yellow Studebaker and drove off.

Immediately thereafter, Sergeant Franz, the investigator assigned to catch the criminal, turned his jeep around in order to apprehend him, but the latter sped away and Franz was unable to keep up with him in his slower military vehicle. Franz thereupon contacted California State police authorities with the request that they apprehend a marine who was just leaving the base in a yellow Studebaker. A few minutes later, in the town of Solana Beach some 21 miles from the scene of the crime, a State highway patrolman, William A. Doran, received the radio message to apprehend a marine driving a yellow Studebaker. At that very moment, Officer Doran was parked within sight of a yellow Studebaker whose driver, M. Sgt. Carl H. Buck, was standing outside in the rain. Just a minute earlier Master Sergeant Buck had stopper his Studebaker within sight of Officer Doran's police car and had started to repair his rear license plate.

Sergeant Buck was immediately arrested by Officer Doran, but no chevrons were found in his car. Moreover, unlike the marine to whom the chevrons had been handed at Camp Pendleton a few minutes earlier, Sergeant Buck at the time of his arrest was not wearing a khaki uniform but greens, was not wearing horn-rimmed glasses, had no mustache and needed no shave but, on the contrary, was clean shaven. In order to have reached Solana Beach where he was arrested no later than 12:20 p.m. according to the subsequent testimony of Officer Doran, it would have been necessary for Buck to have disposed of the chevrons, passed through five populated communities with stoplights on the highway, and changed his appearance in material respects—all while driving at more than 60 miles an hour in a pouring rainstorm—only to stop at the side of the road just 15 miles from Camp Pendleton within sight of a parked State police car, leisurely proceeding to make repairs on his rear license plate. Needless to say, it is improbable that a fleeing felon could negotiate the 21-mile distance from the warehouse at Camp Pendleton to Solana Beach under the prevailing traffic and weather conditions within the few minutes that elapsed in this case; but it is utterly unbelievable that any such felon, having undertaken such a mad race through populated communities on a well-patrolled highway, should suddenly park his car within sight of a State police officer and start to repair his license plate. In the years of controversy since Sergeant Buck's conviction over the question of his guilt or innocence, no one has yet suggested how anyone could and why anyone would have undertaken such an unprecedented stuntdriving flight from the scene of a crime only to park in front of a State police officer and proceed to repair his rear license plate.

Notwithstanding these startling contradictions, in August of 1952 Sergeant Buck was tried by military court-martial for theft of the chevrons surrendered to a marine by Sergeant Hatley on March 7, 1952. The major issue in the case was whether Sergeant Buck was the same marine who had been handed three cases of chevrons in exchange for $50, or whether there had been a mistake in identity. Sergeant Buck was convicted, and although the members of the court-martial which convicted him all recommended clemency, he served a sentence of 11 months' imprisonment and was discharged from the service.

Sergeant Buck is innocent of the crime for which he was convicted. In demonstration of his innocence and the circumstances which explain why, despite his innocence, he was convicted of larceny of chevrons, Sergeant Buck urges the following documented points in this brief:

1. Sergeant Buck's innocence was indicated at his court-martial trial by persuasive evidence of mistaken identity and by the weakness and conflict in the prosecution's testimony;

2. A major reason for Sergeant Buck's court-martial conviction, notwithstanding his innocence, is found in the misconduct of the Government prosecutor at the trial in introducing utterly irrelevant testimony to prejudice the defendant's case;

3. Sergeant Buck was deprived of a fair opportunity for vindication before the Court of Military Appeals because he was denied his constitutional and statutory right before that tribunal to have the effective representation of his chosen counsel;

4. Since his trial, Sergeant Buck has obtained vital proof that his conviction was the result of perjured testimony by a key prosecution witness, and that he is innocent of the crime of which he was convicted.

II. SERGEANT BUCK'S INNOCENCE WAS DEMONSTRATED AT HIS COURT-MARTIAL TRIAL BY PERSUASIVE EVIDENCE OF MISTAKEN IDENTITY AND BY THE WEAKNESS AND INCONSISTENCY OF THE PROSECUTION'S TESTIMONY

Sergeant Buck was convicted on the basis of weak and inconsistent testimony against him, despite persuasive evidence that he could not possibly have been the marine who had taken the chevrons in question. Of the three prosecution witnesses who, for a considerable number of minutes on March 7, 1952, had observed the marine to whom the chevrons were given, only two even sought to identify Buck as that man, and all three were in complete contradiction concerning the clothing and appearance of the man who had taken the chevrons. Moreover, there was utter and irreconcilable conflict between the description of the offending marine by the three prosecution witnesses with respect to his clothing, his unshaven condition, and his wearing of a mustache, and the testimony of defense witnesses who had observed Sergeant Buck just before and after noon on the same day (one of which witnesses was the California State traffic officer who had apprehended the accused) concerning Sergeant Buck's dress and the fact that he was completely clean shaven and had no mustache. Finally, the evidence of the three prosecution witnesses themselves as to the time of the incident of the taking of chevrons and the time of accused's arrest as fixed by the California State traffic officer who apprehended him made it a physical impossibility for Sergeant Buck to have committed the larceny of which he was convicted.

An excellent summary of the "evidence" identifying the accused as the marine who had been handed the chevrons, as well as the evidence showing the impossibility of Sergeant Buck having been that marine, is contained in a letter of May 2, 1955, from Senator KARL E. MUNDT to the Secretary of the Navy:

"(1) The evidence bearing upon the identification of the accused.

"The evidence adduced at the trial established that at the time of the delivery of the chevrons, there were three individuals present; namely, Sgt. Shurlan Eugene Hatley, S. Sgt. Jonathan Layton, U.S. Marine Corps, and M. Sgt. Walter J. Franz, U.S. Marine Corps. Their testimony concerning the identification of the accused is quite interesting and will be discussed in detail.

"Hatley, in describing the person to whom the chevrons were delivered, said that the suspect was a large man wearing "greens," ribbons, and had four hash marks, and he had a shawl or a sweater thrown over his shoulders—that is all that he remembers. He did not remember whether he wore a hat; he did not remember whether he had a mustache, although he admitted at the pretrial investigation that the man that took the chevrors was wearing a mustache; that he believed to the best of his recollection that he was wearing glasses; that the shawl which he was wearing was a bright color; that it was either red or green, or blue.

"Layton could not identify the accused as the man who received the chevrons: he described the man as a big man, larger than Hatley, who he believed wore dark glasses and had a shawl or sweater thrown over his head. He could not recall even the color of the sweater or shawl, in fact, could not say whether it was a light or dark color: he believed that he had a small mustache, and he believed that he was in uniform, although he was not sure of that, and he was not wearing a hat but did not know the color of his hair. He admitted at the pretrial investigation that he stated then that the man had a mustache.

"M. Sgt. Walter J. Franz identified the man receiving the chevrons as being dressed in the uniform of the day with some kind of a little jacket which he was trying to hold around his shoulders and wearing thick, horn-rimmed glasses. He subsequently stated that the uniform was khaki, he did not know whether or not he had a blouse, that the glasses were not sunglasses; that they were not dark glasses; that the small jacket he was wearing was a real light tan and that he did not think that he had a mustache, but he needed a shave.

"T. Sgt. Hillard Frie testified for the defense that he had seen the accused at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot Bakery on March 7 at about 11 and at that time he was clean shaven and was wearing the green uniform of the day. The only glasses he had ever seen the accused wear was a pair of tinted sunglasses.

"William A. Duran, another witness for the defense, was the State traffic officer who apprehended the accused on March 7 and he testified that he was clean-shaven and he believed he was wearing a green uniform, although he was not positive about it.

"John P. Freed, another witness for the defense, testified that he saw the accused at about 11:30 on March 7 at which time he was in full green uniform wearing a green wool field jacket; that he was clean shaven and that he was wearing tinted rimless glasses.

"It is difficult to understand how any group of witnesses for the prosecution could be any more uncertain about the description of the persons to be identified as the man to whom the chevrons were delivered than were these witnesses, and they were setting a trap for a man. By the numerous discrepancies in the testimony of these Government witnesses, the identification of the accused has failed completely. In contrast thereto, the witnesses for the defendant were all in substantial accord as to the appearance and dress of the accused on the day in question. While it is recognized that witnesses often disagree in some details about an individual, it is difficult to understand how there could be as much confusion as existed among these witnesses. Certainly, it would seem that the prosecution witnesses should agree on the type of uniform which the man was wearing and whether or not he was wearing a hat and if he was not wearing a hat, to know the color of his hair. Also, if he was wearing a sweater or a shawl it would seem that the prosecution witnesses would have some recollection of its color and not have the color range from red, green, blue, or light tan. Finally, and perhaps most important, it is difficult to understand how, if the accused was clean-shaven at about 11 or 11:30 a.m. and at 12:30 p.m. on March 7, as positively testified to by accused's witnesses, he could possibly be the same man who took the cases and who needed a shave or who was wearing a mustache at 12. I submit that the identification of the accused as the person who received the cartons simply is not established by the evidence adduced at the trial. To me it should be axiomatic that the prosecution must prove the identity of the accused beyond a reasonable doubt, along with all the other elements of the offense charged.

"(2) The evidence relating to the time of the commission of the alleged offenses and the apprehension of the accused.

"The evidence relating to the time of the alleged offenses and the whereabouts of the accused at the time of the commission of the alleged offense is just as confusing as is the testimony by which the prosecution seeks to establish the identity of the accused.

"The witnesses Hatley, Layton and Franz established the fact that the chevrons were delivered to someone about 12 noon on March 7, Hatley is very positive about the time, stating that he checked the time by the clock and that the person taking the cartons left at 12:10. Layton fixes the time 'right around noon.' Franz fixes the time as about 12:10 or 12:15 when the person receiving the carton left the building.

"William A. Duran, the officer who stopped the accused, testified that he stopped his car at Solona Beach, a distance about 15 miles from the main gate at Camp Pendleton at approximately 12:15. The distance from Building 22–S–4 was established as being 6 miles from the main gate of Camp Pendleton. Thus, we have the situation where, according to the evidence adduced at the trial, this person identified as the accused left the building from which the chevrons were taken at about the same approximate time (certainly, not more than 15 minutes later). When it is considered that there was a driving rain at the time, that the accused, if he were the guilty party, would have had to drive through about four or five towns in order to reach Solona Beach, that he necessarily would have to stop somewhere assuming the prosecution theory is correct, to transfer the chevrons to another car, as well as at the main gate, it would have been manifestly impossible for him to have performed the travel in the time shown by the evidence. It is impossible for a reasonable man to believe that the accused could have been the person taking the boxes supposed to contain chevrons."

Clearly, the prosecution's evidence identifying the accused as the marine who had been given the chevrons was hopelessly conflicting and confused and, unless the California State policeman who arrested the accused was untruthful in his testimony concerning the time of Buck's arrest, Sergeant Buck could not possibly have been the marine who was handed chevrons at Camp Pendleton between noon and 12:10 on March 7, 1952. The question, therefore, immediately arises why Sergeant Buck was convicted by the court-martial in the light of the most unreliable evidence against him and notwithstanding the proof of innocence, established by the testimony of three prosecution witnesses and a California State highway policeman, concerning the times of the taking of the chevrons and the accused's arrest 21 miles away. Much of the answer to the question why petitioner was ever convicted may doubtless be found in the willful misconduct of the prosecution in introducing irrelevant and highly prejudicial evidence at the trial.

III. A MAJOR REASON FOR SERGEANT BUCK'S COURT-MARTIAL CONVICTION NOTWITHSTANDING HIS INNOCENCE, IS FOUND IN THE MISCONDUCT OF THE PROSECUTOR AT THE TRIAL IN INTRODUCING UTTERLY IRRELEVANT AND PREJUDICIAL TESTIMONY

Shortly after his arrest on March 7, 1952, Sergeant Buck retained Mr. William H. Daubney as his counsel. Mr. Daubney had been a former legal officer at Camp Pendleton, a major in the U.S. Marine Corps who had a flourishing practice of military cases in the area. At the trial, prosecution witness Sergeant Franz testified that on the 19th of March 1952, accused's counsel Daubney called him to say that he had some chevrons

to turn over to the Government and that these chevrons were turned over by Mr. Daubney to a Mr. Scanlon of the FBI and ultimately received by Sergeant Franz. Thereafter the prosecution called to the stand as a witness for the prosecution, Sergeant Buck's defense counsel at the trial, Mr. Daubney, who testified:

"I received a telephone call—I think I can safely say it was not from Sergeant Buck because I would recognize his ovice. A person asked me what they should do if they had some Government property. So I said, 'Turn it into the Government.' As I recall, he then asked me if I would do it for them. I said, 'Certainly, bring 'em up.' I don't recall whether the person told me he had chevrons or not, or whether they just had Government property. I honestly don't remember. That evening, I think I received a telephone call in the afternoon, as I recall, * * * that evening the chevrons were found by me either in my outer office or in the hall. I can't figure out whether I picked them up in the hallway or whether I found them in the outer office and I can't remember. So I looked in the blanket, saw what they were, hauled them down to the library, dumped them in the library, and either called the military police or tried to get Mr. Scanlon. I couldn't get him. I talked to Sergeant-Major Franz" (R. 70).[1]

The evidence concerning the receipt of chevrons by Sergeant Franz from the accused's defense counsel was totally irrelevant and immaterial and introduced only to prejudice the accused. Nothing was adduced to show that the chevrons left at Mr. Daubney's door in an Army blanket on March 19 were in any way related to the chevrons that had been taken on March 7; indeed, unlike the chevrons taken on March 7, the chevrons turned over to Sergeant Franz by accused's defense counsel included private first-class chevrons. Moreover, there was no evidence or even any attempt to relate these chevrons to the accused. Mr. Daubney testified that he could state with certainty from his knowledge of the accused's voice that the person calling him on the telephone inquiring about how to return Government property was not the accused. Indeed, although this was not made known to the members of the court-martial, Sergeant Buck was hospitalized for treatment of a serious disabling condition on March 19, 1952, the day when chevrons were left at Daubney's door.[2]

That the testimony introduced by the prosecution through Sergeant Franz and the accused's own defense counsel concerning the turning over of chevrons to Sergeant Franz by Mr. Daubney was utterly irrelevant, has been fully conceded by Rear Adm. Chester Ward, the Judge Advocate General of the Navy. In a letter of July 22, 1957, to the chief counsel of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Admiral Ward states as follows:

"* * * these particular chevrons were never identified at the trial as part of the stolen loot. In fact, according to the testimony of Franz, there were among the chevrons which Daubney returned, some private first clas chevrons. This particular type of chevron was not described in the evidence as being among the type of chevrons handed over at the time of the larceny. Nor was an inventory of missing chevrons put in evidence to establish as a fact the inference already aroused by Franz's testimony that the chevrons returned by Daubney were probably part of the loot. As matters stand, then, these chevrons could have come from most anywhere."

Not only was the evidence concerning the chevrons irrelevant, but it was highly prejudicial and introduced for the particular purposes of prejudicing the accused. Members of the court-martial would not only obviously have drawn the inference from that evidence that Sergeant Buck may have used through his own defense counsel, but the prosecutor in his closing argument made the following highly prejudicial comment inviting the court-martial to draw that improper inference: "* * * it's circumstantial and circumstantial beyond a reasonable doubt that a huge quantity of chevrons were turned over by Mr. Daubney to Marine Corps officials at, or shortly after, the time he was retained by Buck" (R. 101).

Although the prosecutor knew full well that the Franz and Daubney testimony concerning the chevrons given Franz by Daubney was wholly incompetent and prejudicial, in violation of his obligation as an officer of the court and of the Marine Corps, the prosecutor not only offered this incompetent evidence to the court but deliberately used it in his closing argument in the most prejudicial way possible. It is by resort to irrelevant and highly prejudical testimony that the prosecutor achieved his purpose of reinforcing the unpersuasive and totally conflicting evidence concerning the identity of the accused as the man who had taken three cases of chevrons on the 7th of March 1952.

IV. SERGEANT BUCK WAS DEPRIVED OF A FAIR OPPORTUNITY FOR VINDICATION BEFORE THE COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS BECAUSE HE WAS DENIED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY RIGHT BEFORE THAT TRIBUNAL TO HAVE THE EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION OF HIS CHOSEN COUNSEL

Sergeant Buck was not only convicted on the most conflicting and improable evidence of identity and on the basis of a trial in which the prosecutor knowingly introduced highly irrelevant and prejudicial testimony, but Sergeant Buck was also subsequently denied his constitutional and statutory right to representation in the appellate process by eminent civilian attorneys he had retained for that purpose, and was thus denied fair opportunity for vindication in the military judicial appeal system.

The sixth amendment to the Constitution of the United States assures an accused the right to be represented at any stage of criminal proceedings against him, including the appellate process, by the counsel of his choice. *Adams* v. *United States*, 317 U.S. 269, 279. The same right is assured every member of the military services by the act of 5 May 1950, 64 Stat. 130; 10 U.S.C. § 870, which is article 70(d) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice:

"The accused has the right to be represented before the Court of Military Appeals or the board of review by civilian counsel if provided by him."

Due to a series of unprecedented mistakes by military personnel in the handling of his case before the Court of Military Appeals, Sergeant Buck was denied the valuable right to effective representation before that court by the civilian attorneys of his choice. Indeed, in violation of article 71 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (Act of 5 May 1950, 64 Stat. 131; 10 U.S.C. § 871),[3] Sergeant Buck was even discharged from the service before his full appellate rights had ever been afforded him.

On February 24, 1954, the Naval Board of Review in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy affirmed Sergeant Buck's court-martial conviction. Sergeant Buck immediately gave the required notice that he desired a review of his conviction before the Court of Military Appeals. On May 14, 1954, Lt. Cdr. John J. Nelson, USNR, informed Sergeant Buck by letter that he had been appointed Buck's Appellate Defense Counsel.[4] By letter of May 21, 1954,[5] Sergeant Buck advised Commander Nelson that a brief on his behalf was being prepared by a civilian friend of his (Judge Martin Pence, who had for the past 25 years practiced law in Hawaii and served as the U.S. Circuit Judge, Third Circuit, Territory of Hawaii). Mr. Pence also promptly wrote Commander Nelson on May 29, 1954,[6] to inform him of his presence in the case.

a. Failure to file brief by Judge Pence

Thereafter, without consulting with Sergeant Buck's Counsel Pence, on July 30, 1954, Commander Nelson filed a cursory 5-page brief[7] in support of the petition for review of Sergeant Buck's court-martial conviction. On August 5, 1954, Mr. Pence, who had not been informed of the existence of that brief,[8] wrote Commander Nelson to say that he was "practically abandoning all other work in order to concentrate" on Buck's case,[9] and by letter of August 12, 1954,[10] Mr. Pence forwarded to Commander Nelson a "rough draft" of an extensive and excellent brief he had prepared in support of the petition for the Court of Military Appeals to review Buck's case. Thereafter Commander Nelson acknowledged the receipt of that draft and informed Mr. Pence and Sergeant Buck[11] that he would file an amended petition incorporating such new matters as were appropriate from Mr. Pence's brief. Both Buck and Pence wrote Commander Nelson[12] urging that the material in the Pence brief be brought to the attention of the court by an amended petition. On September 7, 1954, Commander Nelson filed a petition[13] before the Court of Military Appeals for enlargement of time to file additional briefs, reciting the receipt of the Pence brief and Buck's request that the appointed military counsel put the Pence brief "in proper form for submission to the court." Thereupon, additional time for filing of new material was granted until September 27, 1954.[14] Nevertheless, for some inexplicable reason, although both Buck and Counsel Pence had frequently and emphatically urged the filing of the extensive material prepared by Pence, and had been advised that such material would be filed, the Court of Military Appeals was informed by Commander Nelson that no further brief would be filed in the case.[15] Since the Pence brief was not presented to the court due to Commander Nelson's oversight, mistake, or indifference, the Court of Military Appeals proceeded to review the matter, and on October 4, 1954, on the basis of nothing but the cursory 5-page document filed by appointed military counsel, denied Buck's petition for review.[16]

Immediately thereafter, on October 7, 1954, Maj. Charles J. McCaffrey, a new military appellate defense counsel who, in the interim, had been appointed to represent Buck, filed a motion for reconsideration, stating that the five-page Nelson "brief" previously filed "omitted certain assighments of error urged for this honorable court's consideration and that this omission has resulted in substantial prejudice to the accused".[17] Major McCaffrey specifically informed the court of Comdr. Nelson's error in the following terms:

"The matters thus omitted were developed by civilian counsel employed by the accused and but for the inadvertent omission thereof by appointed defense counsel would have come to the attention of this honorable court and may well have influenced its judgment in the disposition of the aforementioned case. Appointed appellate defense counsel who submitted the brief is in the process of being separated from the service."

b. Failure to inform accused of Court of Military Appeals decisions against him

At this point, however, again for some inexplicable reason, Major McCaffrey not only omitted to inform Sergeant Buck that the Court of Military Appeals had denied him review on October 4, but over a 2-month period, in a series of communications to Buck and counsel Pence, McCaffrey discussed the case in great detail without even intimating that the Court had already refused to review it. See exhibits 18, 21, 24, 25, 26, and 30.

Examination of the correspondence indicates that apparently Major McCaffrey him-

Footnotes at end of speech.

self had overlooked or had forgotten the fact that the court had refused to review the case; indeed, in McCaffrey's first letter to Pence on October 7,[18] in discussing the case, McCaffrey failed to mention either the court's denial of review 3 days earlier or the motion for reconsideration he himself filed on that very day. Buck himself received no word from Major McCaffrey or anyone else in the appellate division from August 20 until October 28; and, although in a November 7, 1954, letter to Major McCaffrey[19] Buck stated that "In your letter there seems to be some doubt that the Court of Military Appeals will grant the petition for review," Major McCaffrey never informed him that the court had actually refused just that petition on October 4. It was not until December 20 that petitioner learned of this fact,[20] although he had personally written on October 19 to the Judge Advocate General requesting information concerning the status of his appeal.[21] On November 15, 1954, Major McCaffrey finally filed the 32-page brief prepared by Mr. Martin Pence,[22] which should have been submitted to the court in August or September, before the court's initial decision. On December 10, 1954, the Court of Military Appeals denied the petition for reconsideration.[23]

c. Because Sergeant Buck was not informed of the Court of Military Appeals decisions, General Snedeker's brief was submitted 2½ months too late

Meanwhile, Sergeant Buck, who spoke as late as December 10 by telephone with Major McCaffrey still without learning that the court had taken any action on his original petition,[24] had obtained Brig. Gen. James Snedeker, a former judge advocate general and leading expert on military law, to write a brief on his behalf to be submitted to the Court of Military Appeals on a petition for reconsideration if one were to become necessary.[25] Major McCaffrey was so advised by the accused by letter of December 16, 1954, and was also advised that the brief would be submitted "no later than Monday, December 20, 1954."[26] On December 20, 1954, the Snedeker brief was mailed to Major McCaffrey by Buck, airmail special delivery, and received at the Pentagon on December 21.[27] It was not, however, until December 28, 1954, that a second motion for reconsideration and the Snedeker brief were filed with the court by Major McCaffrey.[28] On December 30, 1954, that motion was opposed by the Government, in a written reply filed with the Court of Military Appeals,[29] solely on the grounds that it had not been timely filed.

d. Sergeant Buck was illegally discharged before the completion of appellate review

The Snedeker brief was received in the office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy at the Pentagon on December 21, 1954.[30] The judge advocate general had been informed, apparently by Major McCaffrey,[31] that the brief was arriving. But again, due to some inexplicable mixup in the office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy,[32] on December 28 a teletype was sent [33] from that office out to the field after the Snedeker brief had arrived in the judge advocate general's office, stating:

"New petition not received by defense counsel in GCM case Carl H. Buck 236477 MDXT USMC. Sentence may be executed at this time without prejudice to further appellate review. Whether new petition will be considered is within province of USCMA."

On January 7, 1955, General Snedeker wrote to the clerk of the Court of Military Appeals,[34] pointing out that the October 4, 1954, Court of Military Appeals order denying review had not been promulgated by the Judge Advocate General of the Navy until December 20, 1954,[35] which was the first date that the accused had ever learned of that action. General Snedeker pointed out that, contrary to the December 28 teletype, postal authorities checked and confirmed the December 21, 1954, receipt of his brief by the Judge Advocate General of the Navy. Nevertheless, on January 14, 1955, Sergeant Buck was discharged from the service pursuant to a supplementary court-martial order dated December 29, 1954,[36] over his strenuous objections, verbal and in writing,[37] while the Court of Military Appeals was still considering his motion for reconsideration, and before it had ever taken action upon that motion and the Snedeker brief. On January 17, 1955, after Sergeant Buck's discharge from the Marine Corps, the Court of Military Appeals denied his motion for reconsideration.[38]

All of the foregoing facts are fully documented in the correspondence of the parties involved, the legal papers filed with the Court of Military Appeals and the formal actions of that court. Photostatic or certified copies of these appear in the appendix; because of the voluminous nature of that documentation and for ease of reference, there is set out below a chronological table thereof:

Date, description, and exhibit number

May 4, 1954: Letter from Commander Nelson to Buck 2
May 21, 1954: Letter from Buck to Commander Nelson 3
June 8, 1954: Letter from Commander Nelson to Judge Pence 4
June 29, 1954: Letter from Lieutenant Hoag to Buck 5
July 28, 1954: "Brief in Support of Petition for Grant of Review" for Buck by Commander Nelson 6
Aug. 5, 1954: Letter from Judge Pence to Commander Nelson 7
Aug. 12, 1954: Letter from Judge Pence to Commander Nelson 8
Aug. 20, 1954: Letter from Commander Nelson to Judge Pence 9
Aug. 21, 1954: Extract of letter from Buck to Commander Nelson 10
Aug. 24, 1954: Letter from Judge Pence to Commander Nelson 11
Aug. 29, 1954: Letter from Commander Nelson to Buck 12
Sept. 7, 1954: "Petition for Enlargement of Time" for Buck by Commander Nelson 13
Sept. 27, 1954: Order by Court of Military Appeals granting Buck's motion for enlargement of time to file additional pleadings 14
Oct. 4, 1954: Memorandum in Court of Military Appeals file 15
Oct. 4, 1954: Order by Court of Military Appeals denying Buck's Petition for Grant of Review of decision of Board of Review 16
Oct. 7, 1954: "Motion for Reconsideration and Request for Extension to File Brief in Support Thereof" for Buck by Major McCaffrey 17
Oct. 7, 1954: Letter from Major McCaffrey to Judge Pence 18
Oct. 7, 1954: Excerpt from letter from Judge Pence to Mr. Ziegler 19
Oct. 8, 1954: Order by Court of Military Appeals granting Buck's motion for extension of time to file brief 20
Oct. 19, 1954: Letter from Buck to Judge Advocate General of the Navy 21
Oct. 20, 1954: "Request for Extension of Time Within Which To File Brief in Support of Petition" for Buck by Major McCaffrey 22
Oct. 22, 1954: Order granting Buck's motion for further extension of time to file brief, by Court of Military Appeals 23
Oct. 22, 1954: Letter from Major McCaffrey to Judge Pence 24
Oct. 28, 1954: Letter from Major McCaffrey to Buck 25

Date, description, and exhibit number—Con.

Nov. 7, 1954: Letter from Buck to Major McCaffrey 26
Nov. 12, 1954: Excerpt from "Brief on the Behalf of Appellant" for Buck by Judge Pence 27
Nov. 30, 1954: "Government Reply to Motion for Reconsideration and Supporting Brief" 28
Dec. 10, 1954: Order by Court of Military Appeals denying Petition for Reconsideration 29
Dec. 16, 1954: Letter from Buck to Major McCaffrey 30
Dec. 17, 1954: Letter from General Snedeker to Buck 31
Dec. 20, 1954: Memorandum from Judge Advocate General of Navy to Commandant, 12th Naval District 32
Dec. 23, 1954: Letter from General Snedeker to Buck 33
Dec. 28, 1954: Teletype from Judge Advocate General to Commandant, 12th Naval District 34
Dec. 28, 1954: "Motion for Reconsideration" and "Brief on Behalf of Accused" by General Snedeker 35
Dec. 29, 1954: "Goevrnment Reply to Motion for Reconsideration" 36
Jan. 3, 1955: Letter from General Snedeker to Buck 37
Jan. 7, 1955: Letter from General Snedeker to Clerk of Court of Military Appeals 38
Jan. 7, 1955: Letter from Post Office Inspector Spencer to Buck 39
Jan. 10, 1955: Letter from clerk of Court of Military Appeals to General Snedeker 40
Jan. 13, 1955: Letter from General Snedeker to Buck 41
Jan. 13, 1955: Letter from Major McCaffrey to Buck 42
Jan. 14, 1955: Statement of Buck, refusing to accept discharge 43
Jan. 17, 1955: Order by Court of Military Appeals denying Petition for Reconsideration 44
Jan. 25, 1955: Letter from Major McCaffrey to General Snedeker 45
Jan. 26, 1955: Letter from Clerk of Court of Military Appeals to Mr. Roy C. Hall 46
——— Extract from Clerk's Docket, Court of Military Appeals 47

In approving Sergeant Buck's court-martial conviction and sentence, the convening authority had ordered that "the execution of that portion thereof adjudging bad conduct discharge is suspended until the accused's release from confinement or upon completion of appellate review, whichever is the later date." [39] It cannot be doubted that Sergeant Buck's premature discharge was in violation of his statutory right to a prior full appellate review. Both his appointed defense counsel, Major McCaffrey, and General Snedeker, concurred in that view at the time.[40] Moreover, Buck's constitutional and statutory right to effective representation by the expert civilian attorneys he had chosen, was denied him by the incredible mistakes of two successive appointed military defense counsel. The first of these, Commander Nelson, neglected to file the brief prepared for Sergeant Buck by Judge Pence; the second, Major McCaffrey, communicated with Buck and his attorney for over 2 months after the court had denied Buck's petition, without advising them of that significant fact. As a consequence, the excellent brief prepared by Buck's counsel, General Snedecker, was not timely filed; it is not clear whether the court ever considered that brief, although it is clear that Buck was unlawfully discharged from the service prior to the court's action upon it.

In sum, Sergeant Buck was denied a fair military judicial review; by virtue of the inexcusable mistakes of appointed military counsel, the excellent briefs on his behalf

Footnotes at end of speech.

prepared by his chosen attorneys were submitted to the Court of Military Appeals piecemeal and out of time and only "after the fact." Sergeant Buck was thus denied a fair and equal opportunity for review before that highest military court.[41]

Sergeant Buck, however, has not ceased in his effort to obtain redress. In the period since his conviction he has obtained a persuasive body of evidentiary documentation to buttress his consistent assertions of innocence; this evidence demonstrates that key testimony against Sergeant Buck at his court-martial was perjurious in various respects and that he is in fact innocent of the only transgression with which he has ever been charged in a lifetime of good conduct and faithful military service.

V. SINCE HIS TRIAL, SERGEANT BUCK HAS OBTAINED VITAL PROOF THAT HIS CONVICTION WAS THE RESULT OF PERJURED TESTIMONY BY A KEY PROSECUTION WITNESS, AND THAT HE IS INNOCENT OF THE CRIME FOR WHICH HE WAS CONVICTED

When Sergeant Buck was convicted by his court-martial, notwithstanding the contradictions in the evidence against him and the proof that he could not have been the offending Marine, he immediately began to gather all available evidence to show that he had been unjustly convicted of a crime he did not commit. The documentary material obtained since the trial gives the strongest possible indication of Sergeant Buck's innocence, and of the perjurious nature of the evidence against him by the chief prosecution witness, Sgt. Walter J. Franz:

a. New evidence of Franz perjury

The most vital issue at the trial was, of course, whether Sergeant Buck was the man who had requested and been given three cases of chevrons. Sergeant Buck has obtained extensive documentary evidence that Sergeant Franz's testimony on this key "identity" aspect of the case was perjurious.

Doubtless the most damaging testimony identifying Sergeant Buck was that by Franz, who testified that even before the boxes of chevrons were handed to an anonymous Marine, he had already obtained Sergeant Buck's name as that of the guilty party. Sergeant Franz testified that after he was called into the case (R. 47):

"I proceeded down there and talked to Major Gallagher and Major Moore and they sent for a man named Staff Sergeant Hatley and they explained to me that there was a master sergeant by the name of Carl H. Buck, from Marine Corps Recruit Depot, who had tried to purchase some Government property. They had a contract that morning that this Master Sergeant Buck was to be at 22–S–4 at noon." [42]

And Sergeant Franz further testified that he himself had used the name "Master Sergeant Buck" before Buck's actual arrest:

"I called the main gate, and as I called the main gate I could hear them hollering as the car was going out the gate. I heard them hollering and whistling, but they told me afterward that Buck had the green light * * * or the car had the green light, that I wanted stopped, and it went right straight through. I then called the town patrol and asked them to go up on 101 and see if they could stop this car with Master Sergeant Buck driving it which I had or which I was told was his name by Major Gallagher.

Question. What else did you do after you notified the town patrol, if anything?

Answer. I then got back in my vehicle and proceeded to the Oceanside Police Department. There I contacted the highway patrol—the highway patrol, it seemed within a matter of 5 or 10 minutes I heard this call going back and forth that they had Buck in Solano Beach" (R. 49).

Evidence obtained since the trial shows that Sergeant Franz' key testimony identifying Buck by name before his arrest on the highway was utterly perjurious in that Franz did not know Sergeant Buck's name before his arrest and that in calling the gate and police authorities to apprehend a marine, Sergeant Franz never identified and could not identify the suspect by the name "Buck." In an affidavit [43] Warrant Officer Young S. Knight, from whose home Sergeant Franz had made the telephone calls to the main gate and the town patrol for the apprehension of a marine, states that in making the telephone calls from his house:

"I do not recall Sergeant Franz mentioning the name of Sgt. Carl Buck and as Sergeant Buck is a friend of mine, I feel quite sure that had his name been mentioned by Sergeant Franz, I would recall it."

Further, California State Highway Patrolman Walter Woods has stated in an affidavit [44] that:

"While I was on duty as a California State highway patrolman in Oceanside, Calif., on the 7th day of March 1952, shortly after the noon hour, I was approached by M. Sgt. Walter Franz from the provost marshal's office, Camp J. H. Pendleton, and requested to put out a call on the police radio to stop and hold a marine driving a yellow Studebaker. I was not given any name of the marine wanted stopped nor the license number of the car. In fact, Sergeant Franz stated that he did not know the name of the person he was looking for."

Finally, the evidence provided by Officer Doran, who arrested Sergeant Buck, and the radio logs of the Oceanside, Calif., police department, show that Sergeant Franz did not have Sergeant Buck's name. Officer Doran has made an affidavit [45] stating as follows:

"When I approached this car to question the driver, in order to determine if he was a marine, I noticed he had stepped out of his car and was attempting to fix his rear license plate which was swinging loosely. In answer to my question, the driver stated he was a marine from Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego.

"He then handed me his identification card showing that he was M. Sgt. Carl H. Buck. I placed him under apprehension and held him in my patrol car for approximately 30 minutes during which time I sent his full name and rank by radio to the Oceanside Police Department. At about 10 minutes to 1 the MP's arrived from Oceanside and asked Sergeant Buck his name and thoroughly searched his car. There was two of them, one of them got into the patrol car with Sergeant Buck and I and he asked me to again radio in to Sergeant Franz at the Oceanside Police Department for the name of the marine wanted. We were informed by radio that Sergeant Franz did not have the name of the marine he was looking for. But we did receive a request for a marine named 'Blackman.'

"At approximately 15 minutes later a call came from the Oceanside Police Department that the marine they wanted was named Carl Buck; this was the first time that Sergeant Buck's name was sent over the air except when I sent Sergeant Buck's name in to identify him as the marine I was holding."

The radio logs of the Oceanside, Calif., Police Department also conclusively demonstrate the falsity of Sergeant Franz' testimony that he knew Sergeant Buck's name before Sergeant Buck's arrest. The recorded 1:03 p.m. radio message [46] states:

"(Contact Sergeant Franz at Camp Pendleton ascertain the correct name of the party being held by CHP Officers) 10–4 Sergeant Franz is at this office has apparently lost all papers with names will check further and call you (10–4) KMA 857."

The prearrest identification of Sergeant Buck's name by Sergeant Franz may have been the most important single piece of evidence relied upon by members of the court in finding that Sergeant Buck was the person who had solicited and been given three boxes of chevrons on March 7, 1952. That prearrest identification of Buck's name has now been proved perjurious by the affidavits of the warrant officer from whose house Sergeant Franz made the telephone calls to apprehend, by the California State highway patrolman whom Sergeant Franz requested to put out a call of apprehension, by the State police officer who apprehended Buck, and by the radio log message recorded by the Oceanside police at the time of Sergeant Buck's arrest. There can be no question that had this evidence of the perjurious nature of this testimony been present to the court, Sergeant Buck would not have been convicted, and that he stands wrongfully convicted on the basis of Sergeant Franz' perjurious prearrest identification of his name. Coming as it does from unimpeachable police sources, this new evidence provides most important corroboration that Sergeant Franz shamelessly gave false testimony identifying the accused by his name in order to cover his own inexcusable negligence in permitting the actual offender to escape from the scene of the crime.

b. The lie detector test

While lie detector tests are not accepted as evidence in criminal courts, they have become generally accepted as a nonjudicial basis of evaluating guilt or innocence. In 1956 at the request of his attorney, Sergeant Buck was subjected to an extensive 3-day lie detector examination conducted at Fordham University by Dr. Joseph F. Kubis, professor of psychology.[47] Critical questions were asked on every phase of the events relating to the taking of chevrons and Sergeant Buck's trial. It was the conclusion of Professor Kubis, an eminent expert in pathometer examination, that:

"It can be asserted that the records of Mr. Buck indicate that he believes his denials of stealing, taking, or receiving the missing chevrons; and, he believes his denials of making a deal to get them."

Indeed, Professor Kubis went further than merely characterizing Sergeant Buck's subjective consciousness of guilt or innocence, to state that "the general picture is that of a person who did not take the objects."

In contrast to Sergeant Buck, who took and passed a lie detector examination, Sergeant Franz, the chief witness against him, and whose testimony Sergeant Buck has repeatedly characterized as false, has refused to undergo a lie detector test. On June 9, 1959, counsel for Sergeant Buck addressed the following communication [48] to Sergeant Franz:

"I am writing to you as attorney for former M. Sgt. Carl H. Buck. You will recall that in August of 1952 you were the chief witness at Sergeant Buck's court-martial for larceny of Government chevrons and that the basic question presented in the case was whether Sergeant Buck was the person who had taken the chevrons or whether the case involved mistaken identity.

"Ever since his trial Sergeant Buck has attempted by various means to obtain redress, asserting his complete innocence and that your testimony against him was false in various important respects. Among other steps that Sergeant Buck has taken to prove his innocence he submitted himself to an extensive lie detector examination at Fordham University in May of 1956 which covered in detail every aspect of the case against him and which Sergeant Buck passed 100 percent.

"I am sure you will understand how important this matter is to Sergeant Buck and to his family. For that reason and because I know that as a member of the Navy criminal investigation branch you would not want to shirk your full responsibilities in such a matter, I make the request of you

Footnotes at end of speech.

that you consent as did Sergeant Buck to a lie detector examination to be given by some independent and acknowledged expert.

"If you consent to undergo a polygraph examination, we will, of course, make all necessary arrangements and pay all the expenses that you might incur.

"Since we are submitting for Sergeant Buck before the end of June a petition to the President for a pardon on the grounds of Sergeant Buck's innocence, I would appreciate your very prompt answer to this communication."

By a letter of June 12, 1959, Sergeant Franz refused that request in the following vitriolic terms: [49]

"Your letter which slyly attacks my character for truth and veracity is hardly the type I expected from a firm of such sound reputation. However, in this day and age nothing is unusual. It appears to me that the real reason for your letter was to offend me into not answering and thus give you an opportunity to capitalize on my silence. If this was your plan, Mr. Silard, let this letter be notice that it failed.

"Your request that I submit to a lie detector test and your statement that I would not want to 'shirk my full responsibilities in this matter' is completely unbelievable. First, Mr. Silard, my testimony was truthfully given under oath and recorded for the world to review. It has never been questioned by the U.S. Marine Corps, nor the courts. Secondly, my responsibilities in connection with the 'Buck case' were completely fulfilled when I gave my testimony in court in 1952.

"It is no great surprise that the convicted Mr. Buck would assert my testimony to be false. He has made assertions for quite some time without success. As far as I am concerned and apparently as far as the courts are concerned, the case is closed. If it were otherwise, you would not need to petition the President for a pardon.

"Very truly yours,

"WALTER J. FRANZ,
"Master Sergeant, U.S. Marine Corps."

The Navy has been just as solicitous to shield Sergeant Franz from the kind of examination or interrogation which might lead to his confession of perjury as has Sergeant Franz himself. On April 3, 1959, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS wrote the Judge Advocate General of the Navy requesting that Sergeant Franz be temporarily brought to Washington. In that letter Senator DOUGLAS pointed out that "the best and most direct way for Sergeant Buck to obtain evidence that a miscarriage of justice has resulted is of course through the chief witness against him, Sergeant Franz" and went on to request that Sergeant Franz be brought to Washington for interrogation, pointing out that—

"In order to present a record upon which he might base his plea for clemency, it therefore seems to me absolutely necessary for Sergeant Buck and his attorneys to be given an opportunity to confront and interrogate Sergeant Franz in the hope that he will retract his testimony or otherwise clarify what appears to be a grievous miscarriage of justice. It seems to me that an informal interrogation of Sergeant Franz at which a representative of himself and of my staff and possibly of Senator Hennings' staff, as well as Seregant Buck and his attorneys, would likely be productive. At the very least it would give Seregant Buck the fair chance to which he is clearly entitled as indicated by the White House letter to me, to demonstrate his innocence and obtain a full reprieve."

In communications of April 21, 1959, from the Judge Advocate General of the Navy and May 4, 1959, from the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Senator DOUGLAS' request was flatly refused, assertedly because of the expense of bringing Sergeant Franz from California to Washington. Notwithstanding that the future life and reputation of an American citizen is at stake and that there is overwhelming cause to believe that Sergeant Franz gave perjurious testimony at his trial, the Judge Advocate General of the Navy wrote Senator DOUGLAS that—

"The proposed examination of Sergeant Franz can have no other purpose except to attempt to weaken and discredit his previous testimony. Full opportunity to do this was accorded in the judicial proceedings now terminated."

c. Police radio logs unquestionably establish Buck's innocence

Finally and most importantly, Sergeant Buck has obtained irrefutable documentary evidence that he could not have been the man to whom the chevrons were turned over by Sergeant Hatley shortly after noon on March 7, 1962.

At the trial itself, the time of the turning over to the chevrons to an unknown marine was established by the prosecution's three witnesses, and the time of Buck's arrest, 21 miles away, was established by Officer Doran of the California Highway Police. The following is the pertinent testimony of these witnesses showing that the anonymous marine was handed the chevrons at 12:07 or 12:10 on March 7, 1952, and that Sergeant Buck was arrested 21 miles away just a few minutes later:

Testimony of Sergeant Hatley, a Government Witness

"Question. After you had this telephone conversation on the morning of the 7th, did you see him?

"Answer. Yes, sir. I saw him at 12 o'clock that day" (R. 12).

* * * * *

"Question. Now you say a chap came in on the 7th of March. Can you fix the time definitely?

"Answer. Who came in?

"Question. Some person to pick up the chevrons.

"Answer. Yes. 12 o'clock.

"Question. How do you fix the time positively at 12 o'clock?

"Answer. There was a clock in the office and I was expecting someone to pick up the chevrons, and during the telephone conversation that morning the person calling said he would be there approximately at 12 o'clock.

"Question. Then you are quite certain that it was 12.

"Answer. It could have been 2 or 3 minutes either way.

"Question. How long was the person there?

"Answer. Approximately 7 or 8 minutes * * * maybe 10.

"Question. What time did you say the person left?

"Answer. Approximately 10 after * * *.

"Question. Now, Mr. Hatley, is it then a fair statement that your testimony indicates that the individual who picked up the chevrons came in at 12 noon and left to the best of your estimation at 10 minutes after 12?

"Answer. Yes, sir, that is correct" (R. 22).

Testimony of M. Sgt. Johnathan C. Layton, a Government Witness

"Question. Do you recall the approximate time on the date in question that this money changed hands?

"Answer. Right around 12 o'clock noon" (R. 34).

Testimony of M. Sgt. Walter J. Franz, a Government Witness

"Question. What happened after they placed the boxes out there?

"Answer. * * * just about 12 o'clock right on the head, maybe a few minutes before 12, a yellow car drove up in front of 22–S–4 and Hatley said, 'it's him' " (R. 48).

* * * * *

"Question. Do you remember distinctly that it was 12 sharp when he arrived?

"Answer. As I said before, it could have been 1 minute to, or 1 minute after. The hands were almost at 12 or they were at 12. I wasn't specifying no different except a minute.

"Question. We can say safely, then, 5 minutes either way?

"Answer. Say 5 minutes either way.

"Question. How long did he stay there?

"Answer. I would say between 7 and 10 minutes.

"Question. Shall we safely assume, then, that according to the correct time he left there at 10 minutes after noon—5 minutes either way?

"Answer. Yes" (R. 59).

The record of trial contains the following testimony concerning the time of apprehension of Buck in Solana Beach, 21 miles from the scene of the crime.

Testimony of William A. Doran, State Traffic Officer, a Defense Witness

"Question. Were you on duty on the 7th of March?

"Answer. Yes, sir.

"Question. At approximately the noon hour, did anything unusual occur?

"Answer. Shortly after the noon hour, I received a call from the Oceanside Police Department to attempt to stop a yellow Studebaker, southbound on Highway 101 with a marine sergeant driving it.

"Question. Did you stop such an automobile?

"Answer. Yes, sir.

"Question. Where?

"Answer. At Solana Beach.

"Question. That's in the county of San Diego?

"Answer. Yes, sir.

"Question. At what time did you make the stop?

"Answer. Approximately 12:15" (R. 86).

* * * * *

"Question. Mr. Duran, how do you fix the time, 12:15?

"Answer. Well, I just approximate it. I don't recall looking at my watch. However, I know it was my lunch hour—starts at 12 and I was just thinking about going to get something to eat, and this—I know it was at least 10 after 12 or so when I started thinking about going for my lunch.

"Question. In other words, it could have been 12:30?

"Answer. No, sir.

"Question. You're absolutely sure of that?

"Answer. I'm positive it was approximately 12:15—12:20, in that area.

"Question. It could have been 12:20 or little——

"Answer. It could have been 12:20, but it could not have been 12:30.

"Question. What time did you first get the call?

"Answer. Just about 1 minute before Sergeant Buck pulled up to the signal" (R. 87–88).[50]

This persuasive evidence of mistaken identity was, however, rejected on the following grounds by the Navy Board of Review in its decision of February 24, 1954, affirming Sergeant Buck's conviction:

"If this was the only testimony in the record of trial reconciling the determination as to whether the person who left Building 22–S–4 was the same person who was apprehended at Solana Beach, this board would admit that a grave possibility of erroneous identification of the accused existed. It speaks for itself that it would be highly im-

Footnotes at end of speech.

probable, if not physically impossible, to drive 21 miles, part of such distance through populated areas involving traffic impediments, in approximately 16 minutes. But the record of trial contains considerable additional evidence which was properly within the court's discretion for consideration. While the testimony of Officer Duran was emphatic and positive it is apparent his deductions as to the time were not predicated upon a factual basis. His testimony discloses he approximated the time—that he did not look at his watch—he knew it was his lunch hour—and he was thinking about going to get something to eat. This testimony is refuted by that portion of Franz' uncontradicted accounting that he had arrived at the Oceanside Police Department—highway patrol—at '* * * approximately 12:30. It was between 12:30 and 1' and that 'it seemed within a matter of 5 or 10 minutes I heard this call going back and forth that they had Buck in Solana Beach.' (R. 49.) It is considered that the court was well within its prerogatives in rejecting that portion of the testimony purporting to be a definite establishment of the time of apprehension bottomed upon such uncertainty."

In short, the primary basis for the Board's rejection of the persuasive evidence of mistaken identity (based upon the time factor) was that Officer Doran's recollection of the time of arrest was "not predicated upon a factual basis." Since his trial, however, Sergeant Buck has obtained the irrefutable documentary "factual basis" for the time of his arrest—recorded radio messages at the San Diego, Calif., Police Department show the latest possible time that Sergeant Buck could possibly have been arrested.

Officer Doran has sworn repeatedly that it was just after Sergeant Buck pulled up to fix his rear license plate that he received a radio call to arrest a Marine in a cream-colored Studebaker. The radio log entry [51] shows the following radio call logged in at 12:33 p.m. by San Diego police: "Have 2473 pick up marine sergeant for CID Camp Pen cream colored Stude 1950 or 1951 south from Encinitas." [52] As further shown on the radio log, by 12:40 Officer Doran (2473), after stopping Sergeant Buck, examining his identification and placing him under arrest, had radioed these facts back to his headquarters.

Under these circumstances the time of Sergeant Buck's arrest is no longer based upon the uncertainty of Sergeant Doran's calculation of the time of the arrest. It is now established through radio logs and the prosecution's own witnesses that whereas the guilty party had left with chevrons at 12:07 or 12:10, Master Sergeant Buck could not have been picked up, 21 miles away, any later than 12:32 and that Officer Doran's unequivocal testimony concerning the time of Sergeant Buck's arrest was thus substantially correct.

It would, of course, have been totally impossible for Sergeant Buck in 21 minutes to traverse 21 miles in a driving rainstorm, through five populated communities with stop lights, also stopping at the main gate of Camp Pendleton and stopping to dispose of chevrons along the way. As emphasized in the communication of August 21, 1957, from Senator PAUL DOUGLAS to the President of the United States:

"According to the definite testimony at the court-martial, the unknown 'Chuck' left the Camp Pendleton warehouse at 12:10 p.m. or within minutes of that time. Buck was apprehended at Solana Beach some 22 miles away. The California State Police officer who apprehended him testified that he did so at 12:15 and certainly no later than 12:20 p.m. The police radio logs show that the calls for the apprehension of the person involved went out at 12:30 or 1232, or no more than 21 or 22 minutes from the time the unknown 'Chuck' left the Camp Pendleton warehouse. The police officer testified that he saw Buck just shortly before the first call came through. These calls were entered on the logs later than they actually occurred, but even then Buck could have been apprehended no later than 22 minutes from the time the so-called 'larceny' occurred and actually only 5 to 10 minutes later.

"From the police radio logs at San Diego and at Oceanside, Calif., it appears that for Buck to have been the person involved, he would have had to drive some 22 miles, at high noon, through a driving rain, through five towns most of them with stoplights, and meanwhile have gotten rid of the stolen goods, all in some 21 minutes. This appears to have been impossible."

Adding the documentary evidence discovered since the trial to the other contradictions in identification—that unlike the offending marine, Sergeant Buck had no mustache, was clean-shaven, wearing different clothing, no horn-rimmed glasses and had no chevrons in his car—it becomes perfectly clear that through an unfortunate coincidence in vehicles, Master Sergeant Buck, with a lifetime record of excellent military service, has been unjustly convicted and dismissed from his military career for an offense committed by someone else.

It is rare indeed that a person convicted of a crime can establish his innocence by the testimony of the prosecution's own witnesses and that of a state highway policeman. It is even more rare that documentary evidence by means of recorded police radio logs is found to substantiate the impossibility of the accused's commission of the offense. In this case, however, such evidence has been produced. Certainly, a convicted American citizen who can prove his innocence through the radio logs of a state police department, is entitled to a full reprieve from a mistaken criminal conviction.

VI. CONCLUSION—SERGEANT BUCK, UNJUSTLY CONVICTED OF A CRIME HE DID NOT COMMIT, DESERVES FULL PARDON AND RESTORATION TO THE SERVICE

Sergeant Buck seeks a pardon because of his innocence and for no other reason. In that connection, Sergeant Buck urges that the fullest investigation be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of every detail of his trial and the testimony there introduced on his behalf and against him, as well as all the circumstances relied upon in this brief. Sergeant Buck will willingly undergo a second lie detector test or any other examination aimed at establishing the truth. He is confident that a full investigation will remove him and his family from the cloud of the degrading accusation that he has committed a crime against the Government he sought to serve; by finally proving his innocence, it will make possible the rebuilding of a ruined life.

There are only a few instances in which a President of the United States has granted a pardon because of innocence. But Sergeant Buck's case is certainly one of those rare cases which cries out for clemency for an innocent citizen wrongfully branded a criminal, imprisoned, and dismissed, after 18 years, from his career in the U.S. Marines.

Buck was convicted on the slimmest and most contradictory evidence against him in the face of persuasive proof that he could not have been the guilty party. Totally irrelevant and highly prejudicial testimony introduced by the prosecution at his trial through his own defense counsel denied him a fair trial. A series of incredible mistakes before the U.S. Court of Military Appeals by appointed military counsel denied Sergeant Buck his constitutional and statutory right to a fair defense in the appellate process by the expert attorneys of his choice. Finally, and most importantly, Sergeant Buck has obtained vital new evidence since his trial to demonstrate what has been clear to three Senators of the United States and every other impartial reviewer, that his conviction was the result of mistaken identity.

As an innocent man mistakenly convicted, Sergeant Buck fully deserves a pardon; such a pardon should be accompanied by his restoration to the service, which is within the power of the Chief Executive as Commander in Chief. Certainly, now that Sergeant Buck can demonstrate his innocence, nothing could justify the withholding of full redress by restoring him to his service career.

But all apart from Sergeant Buck's innocence of the crime for which he was convicted, there is a separate and additional ground for his restoration to the Marine Corps. On November 8, 1956, after an official hearing and investigation by the Board for Correction of Naval Records, that statutory agency made a determination that Sergeant Buck should never have been discharged from the Marine Corps.[53] The Board found, on the basis of Buck's "many years of faithful and meritorious service," [54] that the Clemency Board which had rejected his appeal to remain in the Marine Corps should have retained him in the service. The specific finding of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, concurred in by the Secretary of the Navy on November 29, 1956,[55] was as follows:

"* * * after a most conscientious and careful consideration of petitioner's naval record, the evidence presented by him, or in his behalf, and particularly in view of his many years of faithful and meritorious service, the Board finds that the ends of justice would have been better served had petitioner been restored to duty and afforded an opportunity to complete his enlistment under honorable conditions by serving a probationary period. In this connection the Board is mindful of the general policy of the Department not to restore to duty a person convicted of theft, but believes that exceptions should be made in certain cases and that in view of all the circumstances attending the instant case, an exception to the general policy should have been made."

Thus, although a statutory agency of the United States, as well as the Secretary of the Navy, have ruled that Sergeant Buck was unjustly discharged from the Marine Corps, he has yet to receive the only appropriate relief against that injustice—restoration to the corps.

Sergeant Buck, innocent of the crime of which he was convicted, has been unfairly and unjustly labeled a criminal and deprived of his military career. He hereby respectfully requests an exoneration, in exercise of the clemency and restoration powers vested in the President as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief.

Respectfully submitted.

STANLEY C. VORACHEK,
Commander, East Lake Washington, Chapter 43 of the Disabled American Veterans, Representative for Petitioner.

BELLEVUE, WASH., *September 1964.*

---

[1] All "R." references herein are to pages of the official transcript of Sergeant Buck's court-martial trial.

[2] See appendix, exhibit 1, attesting Buck's hospitalization for acute spinal myositis from Mar. 11 to Apr. 10, 1952.

[3] See *United States* v. *Doherty*, decided by the U.S. Court of Military Appeals on June 12, 1959.

[4] See exhibit 2.

[5] See exhibit 3.

[6] See exhibits 4 and 5.

[7] See exhibit 6.

[8] See exhibit 11.

[9] See exhibit 7.

[10] See exhibit 8.

[11] See exhibits 9 and 12.

[12] See exhibits 10, 11 and 19.

[13] See exhibit 13.

[14] See exhibit 14.

[15] See exhibit 15.
[16] See exhibit 16.
[17] See exhibit 17.
[18] See exhibit 18.
[19] See exhibit 26.
[20] See exhibits 33 and 38.
[21] See exhibit 21.
[22] See exhibits 20, 22, 23, 27 and 28.
[23] See exhibit 29.
[24] See exhibit 30.
[25] See exhibit 31.
[26] See exhibit 30.
[27] See exhibits 38 and 39.
[28] See exhibits 35 and 37.
[29] See exhibit 36.
[30] See exhibits 38 and 39.
[31] See exhibit 33.
[32] See exhibit 42.
[33] See exhibit 34.
[34] See exhibits 38 and 40.
[35] See exhibit 32.
[36] See exhibit 49.
[37] See exhibit 43.
[38] See exhibit 44.
[39] See exhibit 48.
[40] See exhibits 31, 42, and 45.
[41] While the Court of Military Appeals subsequently had before it a motion to reopen the case, upon which it rendered a lengthy "Memorandum Opinion" on June 6, 1958, that proceeding was obviously not an adequate substitute for the fair and orderly submission of Sergeant Buck's regular appeal to the Court of Military Appeals with participation of his chosen counsel therein. Indeed, although the Court of Military Appeals' 1958 "opinion" purported to deal with the merits of some of Sergeant Buck's contentions, the court's decision also expressly recognized that at that late date the court no longer had jurisdiction to entertain Sergeant Buck's appeal. Certainly under these circumstances Sergeant Buck never had the benefit of the regular appeal of his conviction to the Court of Military Appeals with the benefit of full participation by his chosen civilian counsel, which was his statutory and constitutional right.
[42] As even the Board of Review decision of Feb. 24, 1954, conceded, "The circumstances were that Major Gallagher did not, and could not, have known that Sergeant Buck was involved."
[43] See exhibit 50.
[44] See exhibits 51 and 52.
[45] See exhibits 53 and 54.
[46] See exhibit 55.
[47] See exhibit 56.
[48] See exhibit 57.
[49] See exhibit 58.
[50] Officer Doran made a slip of the tongue here for he has repeatedly stated and verified in affidavits that Sergeant Buck pulled up to the signal a minute before the radio message, not vice versa. See exhibit 53.
[51] See exhibit 59.
[52] The radio logs actually show that at the very latest, Buck had already pulled up in Solana Beach by 12:30. The time could have been no later and was possibly much earlier for the San Diego log 12:33 excerpt was recorded only after the call had originally been broadcast from Oceanside, rebroadcast from San Diego, and finally logged into the log book at San Diego.
[53] See exhibit 60. While the Board for Correction of Naval Records did not recommend restoration to service for Sergeant Buck, it should be noted that it is the consistent practice of that Board either as a matter of jurisdiction or policy not to recommend such restoration. See exhibits 62 and 63.
[54] Marine Corps fitness report ratings range from "unsatisfactory" to "outstanding." The fitness reports contained in Sergeant Buck's personnel file, covering the period of his service, have been reviewed. Sergeant Buck's ratings include none in the "unsatisfactory" column, 2 ratings of "fair," 52 ratings of "good," 107 ratings of "very good," 115 ratings of "excellent," and 21 ratings of "outstanding."
[55] See exhibit 61.

Remarks of the Honorable Thomas N. Downing, Representative, First Virginia District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, Virginia's important role in the establishment, the development, and the continuing strength of our great country is written indelibly in our history. The first permanent English settlement in what was then known as "the New World" was at Jamestown. Virginians led the fight for our independence and played the most significant roles in drawing up the principles upon which our Government is operated and upon which our freedoms are based.

My colleague from the First Congressional District of Virginia, THOMAS N. DOWNING, knows of that history and he lets its lessons guide his own valuable service here in the House of Representatives. His district includes Jamestown and Yorktown and Williamsburg—an area steeped in the early history of our land. The footprints in history that were noted there still provide paths our Nation can follow with success.

Earlier this month, at the unveiling of a plaque at Jamestown Church in memory of one of our early settlers and heroes, the Reverend Richard Bucke, Congressman DOWNING took a look at our heritage in a talk that deserves the consideration of every Member of the Congress. Under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include his address at this point and commend it to your attention:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS N. DOWNING, REPRESENTATIVE, FIRST VIRGINIA DISTRICT, AT THE UNVEILING OF A PLAQUE IN MEMORY OF THE REVEREND RICHARD BUCKE

The events which took place here in Jamestown 357 years ago mean far more to us than the historians could ever convey.

Our Nation, the mightest nation on earth, the most prosperous nation on earth, the Nation to whom all other freedom loving nations look for support had its beginning here. The settlement of Virginia by a group of colonists whose endurance can hardly be described in words, was more than the beginning of the United States of America. Jamestown was the beginning of a promise—a promise that a free people who govern themselves can create a greater degree of human dignity and a fuller measure of material prosperity and cultural attainment than any other governing philosophy conceived by the mind of man.

Jamestown opened up a new era—an era in which uncommon men responded to uncommon challenges to reach uncommon heights, the colonists at Jamestown undertook to master a harsh environment and the durability of character, developed more than 350 years ago, still can be seen in a people whose astronauts have virtually conquered the universe.

Jamestown was a tiny colony but there were no small men here. It is perhaps too easy to attribute giant stature to a man after his death, too difficult to praise a giant of a man while he is still alive, but many generations in our land have been blessed because men like the Reverend Richard Bucke had the courage to strive for giant stature during his lifetime. It is a stirring and humbling experience for me to stand here as a people's representative, knowing that the first legislators, the first representatives, ever to assemble in this New World had God's blessing and guidance requested by the man being honored today.

Reverend Bucke knew, as our first Representative knew, that a nation was being founded here on this soil. They knew too that the Nation they were founding had to be founded on a belief in God. The men who came here, came to the new world, in part, to worship God. Religious liberty was deeply meaningful to them and the first documents prepared here were religious documents. The colonists here acknowledged their dependence on God for survival. The second rector of the Jamestown Church, Rev. Richard Bucke, may justifiably be credited with initiating a new type of society here in Virginia—a free Nation under God. I believe deeply, that our Nation has become the great nation that it is because we have recognized the dignity of the individual and the individual's dependence upon God. I cannot believe that the tiny colony here at Jamestown, could ever have grown into the most powerful nation on earth without recognizing that our steps were being taken with His help. We have been blessed with vast resources. But I believe that our greatest resource has been the greatness of our people—primarily people like Reverend Bucke and the others who came here to say that an individual can be free under a system of government with God's help.

We must be true and faithful to this heritage. We must be true and faithful to the traditions which have been, on so many occasions, the saving grace of our society. They are being threatened now, perhaps to a greater extent than they have ever been threatened before. For the past 20 years, two ideologies have been struggling for the minds and the souls of men. Our ideology, call it if you will—our American way of life—recognizes our dependence on God, as the colonists here at Jamestown acknowledged it. The other ideology, communism, has no faith in the dignity of the individual and no recognition of God. Karl Marx framed the Communist philosophy because he failed to recognize that religious faith, a belief in God, can add conscience to capitalism. Capitalism in the United States functions with a sense of community obligation that stems from a religious sense. The tradition of business in America has been a conscientious tradition.

Capitalism could easily have become ruthlessly exploitive had it not been for faith, conscience, and a belief in God. After all, capitalism, in this great Nation, was established by the same colonists who established a nation under God. The people who came here to Jamestown hoped to make money. The people back in England who sent the colonists here hoped to make money. Our early settlers hoped to better their economic condition as well as find religious freedom. There were exceptions, of course, but the largest majority of men who we now call our Founding Fathers were men looking for a living and unashamed of capitalism.

Capitalism, or the seeking of a profit, did have a brief, dark time in our history, a time that undoubtedly arouses shame in all of

us, but the conscience that has always existed in capitalism, welled up, and business without a religious sense was very short-lived in our history. Karl Marx misinterpreted this dark time and set a large number of people off the religious path. The religious conscience was clearly the victor in our society, but it came too late to stop Karl Marx, who decided that no faith could be placed in God, and no faith in the individual. It is a source of great disappointment that one of the briefest periods in our history, when capitalism seemed to forget its conscience, spawned an ideology that now threatens our Christian-centered way of life.

Today, in honoring Rev. Richard Bucke and the Jamestown colonists, we also honor our positive traditions. Reverend Bucke was a positive leader who once led a group of passengers in thanks to God for their safe deliverance after the ship on which they were traveling was wrecked on the reefs of what is now Bermuda. His positive leadership inspired that group of passengers to set sail again, only 9 months later, for Virginia and Jamestown. The same strain of positive leadership has been carried forward throughout our history. It is a golden thread—Washington kneeling in the snow at Valley Forge—Lincoln's Gettysburg Address—Woodrow Wilson urging a world to forget hate—and John Glenn coming back to earth after traveling in outer space to say "The Heavens declare the glory of God."

We live in a good land, an inspired land, a land where positive men with vision and courage sat down to create an entirely new political philosophy. Because of them, no American has lived under any type of despotism. Few people have been so fortunate. Few people have been able to preserve for themselves mastery of their own destinies, as we have. Men have had the vision and the courage to put their faith in man. This is really what Reverend Bucke said to his people and this is what Jamestown has always been about—faith in man and in God. This must be what Lincoln meant when he placed his full confidence in America's future by referring to a young, insecure Republic as "the last, best hope on earth." It may even be that today we see with a greater clarity and purpose the same vision that Reverend Bucke saw and each succeeding generation has seen.

We call this vision the American dream and there have never, in the history of the world, been so many millions of people desperately longing to share the dream with us. It is a dream that lures men. Looking back to those men who first saw this dream, we marvel at the power of a vision that could draw men out to sea in a ship about the size of one of our lifeboats. A man must have had a full view of a rich promise to brave Jamestown in 1607 to 1610. The Reverend Mr. Bucke and others helped channel the American dream throughout the terrible early days on this soil, the American dream he channeled has survived and been illuminated and the light from it is now visible on parts of this earth unknown to Jamestown's colonists. Freedom loving people are said to stand side by side in a long phalanx before godless communism. It seems to me today that this phalanx is longer and deeper than we sometimes acknowledge. We have never faced a challenge alone in our Nation. We have never had a dark day or hour without the shield of Jamestown's promise and America's "last, best hope." As we face the masters of Moscow and Peiping, we are formed in a line that threads through the courageous men of our own time back through Wilson and Washington—Madison and Jefferson—Nathaniel Bacon and Richard Bucke. We share their faith and they truly share our challenge.

We can, it seems to me, pay no higher honor to our forefathers than to let them stand with us—unforgotten—as men who have longed for freedom together, dreamed of prosperity together, planned for greatness together, as a people and a Nation always under God.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Mark C. Honeywell, a Great Builder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the September 14, 1964, issue of the Wabash Plain Dealer, Wabash, Ind. It is a well-deserved tribute to a man who contributed much to this Nation's well-being and whose generosity to his home community was boundless. We are saddened by Mr. Honeywell's passing but we take great pride in his achievements. He was a great man who loved his country, his State and mankind.

The article follows:

MARK C. HONEYWELL, A GREAT BUILDER

Wherever he lived Mark C. Honeywell created beauty, industry, recreation, and the highest respect for craftsmanship.

Whether the need was for a golf course and country club at Wabash or Tippecanoe—or eliminating crabgrass in his backyard—he devoted the same energy to the task.

An amateur magician of skill, a violin player, a hypnotist, moviemaker, superlative host, Mark Honeywell brought pleasure to his friends and to citizens of Wabash.

He installed the heating system still in use in the old Bradley Building. He built the chimney for the Lutheran Church in Peru to show how to overcome draft problems. He was the proud owner of one of the first automobiles in Wabash County.

Surrounding each house he lived in, he built gardens. The most elaborate culminated in a garden festival at his lodge, enjoyed by thousands from all over Indiana. He was a student and devotee of outdoor beauty as well as a pioneer in indoor comfort.

Devoted to art, he was vice president of the Hoosier Art Salon for many years. He was a loyal patron of Indiana artists, and a discriminating collector of treasured antiques.

Spending part of his boyhood in Deland, Fla., he was one of the first to foresee the potential of Florida. His oranges were so well prepared for market that they brought a higher price.

He was a leader among leaders. He was president for many years of the Committee of 100 in Miami Beach, an organization of hundreds of industrial leaders from all over the country.

In 1944 he received an honorary degree of humanities from the University of Miami.

He was a director of Miami Beach's famed Surf Club for 25 years, also the Indian Creek Country Club.

His yachts have taken memorable fishing parties on the blue waterways of Florida to his private island, Boca Chita. He built a cottage there, a harbor, bridge, and lighthouse, as charming as they were sturdy.

He was a stanch friend of both Boy and Girl Scouts. He built a rustic cabin for their camping trips. He provided quarters for them when he built the Honeywell Memorial Community Center. The Scouts awarded him their highest award, the Silver Beaver.

He was a member of many local clubs including the Elks and Masons. Last July J. E. Ferrier, worshipful master of Hanna Lodge No. 61 presented Mr. Honeywell's 50-year membership pin.

In 1947 Mr. Honeywell was named one of Wabash's distinguished citizens and man of the year by Wabash's Chamber of Commerce. He and W. C. Mills shared this honor in 1947 and 1948. The two men were great friends and their joint planning resulted in development of the Honeywell Community Center.

Wabash was without a bank in the depression. He helped finance and organize our First National Bank and served many years as chairman of the board.

He and Horace Launder made buckwheat flour and cider at their North Cass Street plant. Later he became interested in heating problems and he developed the generator for hot water heating systems. This made possible more extensive use of hot water heating plants.

This grew into a great industrial company making the name Honeywell known around the world.

The corporate name has now been changed. The company has abandoned "Minneapolis" in its name. It is now known as Honeywell all over the world. Honeywell, Inc. is now the official name.

The company progressed from its early concern for human comfort to the manufacture of controls for safety, defense, and exploration of the future. It employs more than 47,000 people and makes countless homes, including the White House, more comfortable.

A genial, gallant gentleman, Mr. Honeywell never looked back, always ahead. His industry is a lesson to all who knew him.

The Honeywell Memorial Community Center was his crowning achievement for the citizens of Wabash. It is an adornment and joy to the entire Wabash Valley and State of Indiana.

The community center provides year around service to the area. Recreation naturally moves outdoors during summer months so the need was long apparent for a Wabash swimming pool. The Mark C. Honeywell pool was provided in 1961 by the Honeywell Foundation, established by Mr. Honeywell.

Whether it was pruning a tree, planting a climbing rose, greeting his favorite dog, finding a skilled workman, or flagstone for a favorite building project, Mr. Honeywell gave the occasion his best attention.

Everything he did he did well. And he did everything.

Nasser's "Peaceful" Intentions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the latest issue of Prevent World War III, No. 64, summer 1964, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., 24 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., contains a most timely analysis of Egyptian foreign policy and its threat to peace in the Middle East and elsewhere. The article explodes the illusion, harbored by some of our State Department policymakers, that Nasser has turned a new leaf, and no longer is intent on subverting or destroying the independence of neighboring Middle Eastern states.

Actually, Nasser's ambitions have grown to a point where countries in north Africa, and even countries in Latin America, are experiencing the sinister activities of his agents and propagandists. Security minded Americans are entitled to more than wishful thinking by State Department policymakers who try to assure us that Nasser poses no threat to our national interests.

This article makes very clear that a realistic and strong stand against Nasser's imperialism is essential, in order to protect American interests and security. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

"NASSER HAS PEACEFUL INTENTIONS"—U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT

It has become a standard argument among some U.S. policymakers that the springtimes of President Nasser's aggressive activities is past. The Egyptian leader and his cohorts, according to this theory, are mellowing; they are turning inward, so the theory continues, to the great task of internal construction and are leaving behind the youthful romantic dreams of conquest.

These policymakers will cite some "statistics" and some "moderate" statements by Mr. Nasser to support their contention that he is a "new" man. This is one of the main argument put forth year after year by those in the State Department who continue to maintain that the American taxpayers are doing the right thing when they permit our wishful-thinking policymakers to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into Nasser's coffers annually.

HAS NASSER CHANGED?

Is it really true that Nasser has turned the corner? Is he really setting down to give the wretched masses of Egypt an opportunity to improve their lives? Is he prepared now to pursue a policy of "live and let live" with his neighbors? These are questions to which the American people are entitled to have unambiguous concrete replies.

The society has done a little investigation on its own since we must confess that we have not succeeded up to now in obtaining from the State Department any concrete evidence which would support this glorified picture of the "new" Nasser. We shall leave it up to our readers to judge whether the evidence presented herewith supports or refutes the new image of Egypt's strong man.

On February 22, 1964, President Nasser delivered an address commemorating the "unity anniversary" which brought Syria and Egypt into one political setup as the United Arab Republic. Of course, Syria is no longer a

member of the United Arab Republic because its people found out that Cairo's definition of unity was more akin to the relation between the wolf and the lamb. Nevertheless, Nasser decided to go ahead to talk about the unity on the grounds that "the secession of Syria was not implemented by the will of the people," but rather by subversive elements cooperating with "imperialism." So apparently, Nasser looks upon the Syrian state as a sort of imperialistic instrument, and since Nasser is the self-proclaimed leader against "imperialism," it follows that the Syrian Government cannot enjoy Cairo's respect and must be regarded as an enemy of "Arabdom." We shall discuss a little later the implications of this attitude toward Syria. What struck our attention, however, in President Nasser's speech was his affirmation that "we never try to export our revolution. I believe that revolutions cannot be engineered from outside."

PLAIN TALK

We presume that it is precisely this kind of statement which some of our policymakers like to quote when they seek to assure the American people that President Nasser has given up his troublemaking activities. The society is a little more fortunate than most people in this respect because we have preserved a number of President Nasser's statements on the question of "exporting revolution." For example, we can point to Nasser's "victory" speech at Port Said, December 23, 1962, where he launched a vicious attack against the Governments of Saudi Arabia and Jordan alleging that the people of those countries did not support their Governments. He then shouted to the audience that it was "our duty to fight for our principles and for the revolution. We have to fight for the political systems which we want. Life is for the fittest. Death is for reaction." This was Nasser's way of telling Saudi Arabia and Jordan that they were on his list of governments destined to be destroyed.

In that same speech he also condemned the Syrian Government which by that time had broken with Cairo. Nasser promised that the Syrian regime too would be crushed. As for Egypt's intervention in Yemen, Nasser did not deny that he was spending E£1 million hard currency daily. "I wish we had the money to support all revolutions," he exclaimed. But even with the little money available to finance revolutions, Egypt makes no bones about its successes in this field. Thus, radio Cairo, broadcasting to the Arab world on April 8, boasted that since 1952 Egypt had "triggered more than 10 liberation revolutions in the Middle East and has ignited a number of liberation movements throughout Africa." Quite a record for a regime which now pretends that it no longer plays with matches.

It should be made clear that Nasser-style revolutions have no connection whatsoever with movements which are designed to truly improve the living conditions of the people who are the supposed beneficiaries. Certainly, the Syrians and Yemenites who were part of the United Arab Republic at one time, did not find their lives improved by Nasser's "revolutions." Indeed, the same medieval conditions which obtained in Yemen prior to its joining the United Arab Republic, continued to exist under the "enlightened" and "beneficent" rule of Cairo. As for the Syrians, one of the basic reasons for their decision to break with Egypt was precisely because their economic situation was turning from bad to worse thanks to the ruthless exploitation by their Egyptian "brothers."

Nasser's brand of revolution is nothing less than a ruthless overthrow of the independence of other countries with the expressed aim of absorbing the resources of those countries to further the ambitions of the Cairo regime. Whatever political and economic measures for regeneration may be incorporated in these "revolutionary" movements, they really serve as window dressing to fool the outside world. Indeed, one can say the same for Nasser's own "revolution" in Egypt where despite all the fanfare, the people are still on the borderline of starvation. The fact is that Nasser really has no time for his own people, he is so busy trying to bully other people. Let us cite cases:

INTERVENTION IN YEMEN

Since September 1962, President Nasser's armed forces, equipped with the latest Soviet-made aircraft and tanks, have been intervening in Yemen's civil war. It is now estimated that there are approximately 40,000 Egyptian troops in that country who are supporting the Yemenite political faction with headquarters located in the Yemen capital of Sanaa. Theoretically, the Yemenite troops operating out of Sanaa, are controlled by Yemenite officers under their leader, Marshal Abdullah Sallal. In reality, the real ruler of Yemen is Nasser's proconsul, General Abdel Mohsin Moutagi, the commander in chief of Egypt armed forces. Moreover, the so-called republican Government of Yemen is firmly under the thumb of Egyptians advisers. The Yemen civil service "is virtually an Egyptian affair" (London Observer, Apr. 5, 1964). As a matter of fact, every aspect of Yemenite life, official and unofficial, is heavily infiltrated by Egyptian agents posing as advisers, technicians, teachers, doctors, etc.

Time and again, the Egyptian Government has intimated that it would pull out its troops but these promises, as United Nations observers have revealed in official reports, have proved to be worthless. Nasser himself has publicly declared that "We shall support the Yemeni revolution till a strong nationalist Yemeni army is established * * *" (February 22, 1964). This means, of course, that President Nasser has no intention whatsoever to abide by the disingagement agreement worked out in 1963 by Ellsworth Bunker, retired U.S. Ambassador. Our own policymakers—those who come to Congress every year for aid to Nasser—hailed this agreement as proof that suspicions with regard to Egypt's intentions in Yemen, were unfounded. The British, who have a little more experience in the Middle East than we, have been extremely skeptical. Their skepticism seems justified by the facts. As Britain's Prime Minister, Sir Alex Douglas-Home told Parliament: "Everyone's objective has been to create conditions" under which Nasser could withdraw his troops from Yemen "within a reasonable time." But what is the present situation? According to Sir Alex: "The only result has been that, whereas there were 28,000 a year ago, there are now something like 40,000."

Yet, such State Department experts as Phillips Talbot, Assistant Secretary of State, have assured Members of Congress that there was every reason to believe that Nasser would carry out his pledges. But Yemen, in Nasser's book, is but a steppingstone to greater adventures. Only recently he declared that "Yemen is not the last; we have Palestine before us." He then promised that the training which the Egyptian troops received in Yemen, would not be wasted, for Yemen was not the "last battle * * *" (April 20, 1964). So much for Nasser's "new look" in Yemen.

SYRIA AND SOUTH ARABIA

Nasser's hand will also be found in another part of the Arabian peninsula; i.e., the newly established "Federation of South Arabia" which was formed from a number of areas that were previously under the direct control of the British. Sir Patrick Dean, Britain's Ambassador to the United Nations, told the Security Council during a recent debate that "the United Arab Republic must take their full share of the blame for the deterioration of relations between the Federation of South Arabia and Yemen." (New York Times, April 8, 1964).

Sir Patrick knew whereof he was speaking for it is public knowledge that a so-called revolutionary command operates out of Cairo with a view toward undermining the independence of the Federation of South Arabia under the guise of fighting "imperialism." Egyptian propaganda against the Federation is vicious and incessant. Nasser himself has publicly boasted: "We support revolutions of every liberation movement in the occupied South * * *" (February 22, 1964). And yet, President Nasser assures the world and seems to have convinced State Department policymakers that he does not "export revolution."

It is not only on the Arabian Peninsula that Nasser's forces work around the clock. These same forces will also be found in Syria, for Nasser has never reconciled himself to the decision of the Syrian people that they intend to live their own lives without the benefit of Cairo's "helping hand." His very speech of February 22, 1964, commemorating the unity of Syria and Egypt, when this unity no longer exists in fact, is a brazen attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of another country.

But Nasser does not confine his interference to speechmaking. Egyptian agents are very busy in Syria. In fact, the very day after Nasser delivered his "unity" speech, rioting broke out in a number of Syrian towns. Lives were lost and many were wounded. The rioting and killings compelled the Syrian Government to round up the Nasserites in Damascus and other points. It is interesting to note in this connection that among those who were rounded up for subversive activities on behalf of Nasser, was one Dr. Adnan Zein, "a local adviser to the German Embassy in Damascus" (New York Times, Feb. 24, 1964).

Rioting again broke out in April. Once more, many people were killed and the Syrian Government was compelled to take stern measures to restore order. Syria's Premier, General Amin Hafez, did not conceal the instigators of this challenge to the government. Speaking to a delegation of merchants and businessmen in the Syrian town of Homs, he declared: "The plot was hatched abroad and great amounts of money were put up to carry it out. The plotters have received the money from Abdel Salam Aref and the Egyptian Embassy" (Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1964). Meanwhile, Nasser has been trying to bypass Syria on the "Palestine question." Thus, Nasser's stooge Ahmad Al-Shukairy, noted for his slanderous attacks against the United States, decided to build up a "Palestine Liberation Front" whose ultimate goal is the "liberation" of the "Arab homeland" (UPI, Feb. 26, 1964).

This gangster-like organization is a pure Nasser concoction and Shukairy's job is to present the other Arab States with a ready-made organization which they will be obliged to join and so carry out Nasser's plans. It has been roundly condemned by the Syrians who sense that the Shukairy organizations is designed to inveigle them into pulling Nasser's chestnuts out of the fire. Thus, one of Syria's leading newspapers, Al-Bath, charged that Shukairy "not only exceeded the limits of his mission, but also took a wrong and serious course and submitted a plan which aroused the suspicious of the refugees and the fears of the Arab masses" (Feb. 15, 1964).

Thus, it is no wonder that despite the sweetness and light which allegedly colored the atmosphere of the Arab Summit Conference in early January, there was little love between Nasser and Syrian Premier Hafez who attended the meeting. How can there be sweetness and light between these two men when up to the very last moment before the meeting took place, the Cairo Radio was trying to incite Syrians against their Premier by describing him as a "bloody butcher."

MOVES IN IRAQ

A word should be said about the situation in Iraq. There, it will be recalled, the President of Iraq seized power in November 1963, following two previous coups d'etat which

resulted, among other things, in the murder of the Iraqi leader, General Kassim. The new Iraqi regime, established after Kassim's overthrow, combined a number of Nasserites and leaders of the Baath Party. The Baath Party is Nasser's chief political foe in the Middle East. It aspires to many of the same things which Nasser himself avows but it refuses to accept Nasser as the infallible leader of the Arab world. This, of course, is intolerable to the Egyptian strong man and so, Baathists and Nasserites are at sword's point.

Nasser blamed the Baathists in Syria for engineering the breakup of the United Arab Republic. He was afraid that the Baathist influence would upset his speculations in Iraq too. Hence, President Arif, an obedient tool of President Nasser and a thoroughly ruthless man, moved quickly, ousted the Baathists in the Iraqi regime and placed himself at the head of the state. What was Nasser's role in this affair? Was he minding his own business and tending to the needs of his own people? Let us quote from a report by the London Financial Times' own correspondent in the Middle East (Nov. 20, 1963):

"* * * There is mounting evidence that he had a hand in the tangled events of the past week. Nasser's policy objectives may at this stage be summed up as follows:

"1. To destroy the Baath, who emerged this year as his chief rival.

"2. To prevent at all costs, the union of Syria and Iraq. This is a constant of Egyptian policy, which since the Middle Ages has opposed the rise of a power in Asia strong enough to outweigh her influence in the Eastern Mediterranean.

"3. To recover control of Syria—the linchpin of the Middle East power system."

This correspondent further pointed out that, to consolidate his gains, Nasser's propaganda services "have launched a large-scale campaign appealing to the Iraqui Army, as brothers in Islam, accusing the Baath of atheism, stressing the Christian origin of the Secretary General of the Baath, Michel Aflaq, and hinting that Egypt was ready to intervene militarily in Iraq if Syria moved."

LIBYA UNDER FIRE

So much for Nasser's "export of revolution" in the Arab Middle East. Let us now turn our gaze further to the west. Since January, the State of Libya has been in ferment. Rioting broke out in mid-January after it had become known that 75-year-old King Idris would not attend Nasser's summit conference in Cairo. As an elderly man, the King felt that this trip was too arduous and moreover, suspicious of Nasser's intentions, he sent his nephew, the Crown Prince. But a man like Nasser, whose conceit is one of his chief characteristics, could hardly accept King Idris' decision and so, the usual rioting, violence, and killing broke out in Libyan cities.

Were these acts of violence Egyptian inspired? According to the Sunday Times' (London) correspondent in Cairo, the answer is probably "directly no, indirectly yes" (Feb. 9, 1964). This correspondent reported that for the last 2 years, Cairo had been increasingly spreading Pan-Arab propaganda in Libya which has incited certain elements in the population to defy law and order. Nasser has been even more direct in his intervention in Libya. In his February 22 speech, he declared that U.S. bases in Libya constitute "a threat to us and all Arabs" and he demanded that the Libyan Government eject the United States and Britain from the country. It is of this issue that the Nasserites are resorting to every trick of demagogy so as to conceal their subversive activities against the Libyan Government.

Prior to Nasser's outburst, relations between Libya and the United States had been cordial and correct but now "the words of President Gamal Abdel Nasser have become political gospel transmitted by the Cairo Radio * * *." (New York Times, Mar. 29, 1964.) Nasser's influence in Libya is bolstered by the fact that more than 700 Egyptian teachers and professors staff the Libyan school system and dozens of Egyptians may be found in key posts in the government itself. The Cairo Radio dominates the air waves since the Libyans themselves have no broadcasting system. Under these circumstances it is understandable that the Libyan Government is now threatened by internal disorders. The infection of Nasserism is spreading and has already caused governmental upheavals in Libya. Here is another case how Nasser "does not export revolution."

REACHING FOR NORTH AFRICA

But Nasser has not only whipped up hatred against the United States and Britain in Libya, he is also trying the same in Cyprus. No one has asked him but Nasser took it upon himself to declare that the British bases in Cyprus must be liquidated. Why? On the grounds that they are "directed against the Arab peoples." This has become Nasser's standard slogan. It has become his major excuse for intruding on the internal affairs of other countries. Nasser, of course, has other fish to fry. The Cairo Radio (Feb. 25, 1964) made it clear what Nasser was up to when he said: "The time has come when these bases should be liquidated and the Arab land from the Atlantic to the Gulf should be freed * * *."

Why does Nasser still talk about the freedom of the Arab lands from the Atlantic to the Gulf? Would he deny that Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, and Libya are free? In reality, when Nasser talks about liberating this vast area, he means to subvert the independence of these countries and to undermine the position of the Western democracies so that Cairo can move in.

It has become standing operating procedure for Nasser to probe other soft spots when he is rebuffed elsewhere. His ambitions for a "bigger and better" United Arab Republic have been thwarted. His costly and inconclusive adventure in Yemen has become an embarrassing burden. Instead of drawing the appropriate conclusions by giving up these dreams of empire and devoting the meager resources of his country to internal development, Nasser takes the opposite approach. It appears that each time he is confronted with a stone wall of resistance, he turns to other roads of aggression.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Nasser has been accused by the Turks of wanting to restore the Caliphate, the supreme Moslem titular office which had been abolished by Turkey's national hero Kemal Atatürk in 1924. According to General Rafet Ulgenalp, a senior Turkish army officer, Nasser hopes to set himself up as the Caliph of all Islam. The Turkish general further charged that Nasser was supporting and financing subversive elements to undermine the independence of the Turkish state. (New York Times, June 1, 1964.)

Last winter, he embarked on one such course when Egyptian troops turned up in the border conflict between Algeria and Morocco. As the London Financial Times put it: The clash between Algeria and Morocco gave Egypt "another chance to win friends and influence people by sending military aid into the field against the forces of Monarchy" (November 14, 1963). Actually, Nasser's aid to Algeria against Morocco was not a sudden move. In point of fact, the Algerian army itself has been infiltrated by Egyptians on the highest levels as "advisers and military technicians."

The Egyptians have been training Algerians in desert warfare tactics. They have been teaching the Algerians to use Soviet armor and artillery. During the conflict itself, Egyptian officers led Algerian units against the Moroccans. Furthermore, 1,000 additional Egyptian soldiers were transported to Algeria during the conflict itself. Indeed, the influence of the Egyptians in the Algerian armed forces has become so pronounced that even Colonel Boumedienne, the leading Algerian officer, has been complaining about the presence of Egyptians on his general staff.

That Cairo should have intervened in this battle shocked the Arab world. The Moroccans were particularly bitter. The Moroccan radio denounced Cairo for shedding the innocent blood of the Arab people. "Cairo's rulers," the radio declared, "distort everything noble and sacred in Arab relations: Thus, they mutilate all principles, infest our Arab Maghrab sky with intrigues and treachery, and done by ways and means to which our free people are unused and which belong neither to the nature of the Arab people nor to the ideals of struggle * * *" The Moroccan radio further charged that the Egyptians had committed aggression "under an Algerian flag." It then declared: "We and the entire Arab Maghrab are facing a flagrant Egyptian and foreign conspiracy. This aggression and that conspiracy are settling before our eyes under the banner of socialism, Arab nationalism, and all the slogans in which Gamel Abdel Nasser and his set are trading."

The blatant interference of Egypt in the Moroccan conflict upset many Africans who were led to believe by Cairo propagandists that Nasser was a man of peace. A leading Nigerian newspaper wrote the following acid commentary which undoubtedly reflects the sentiment of many Africans: "This is shameful * * * Instead of playing the role of peacemaker, the Egyptian President found it necessary to take sides openly by threatening to break off diplomatic relations with Morocco. * * * Nasser has not dropped his pet ambition to making Cairo the throne from which he will rule an Arab empire which will include Algeria, Syria, Iraq, Jordan, the Yemen, Saudi Arabia, and Aden."

IN LATIN AMERICA TOO

Nasser's ambitions are by no means confined to the Middle East and the Mediterranean. Most Americans are unaware of the fact that Cairo agents have been busily at work in South American countries where they tried to incite the people against the United States. In previous issues of Prevent World War III, the society has exposed Cairo's anti-U.S. activities in cooperation with Castro Cuba. We have also revealed how Cairo's propagandists try to stir up Panamanians against the United States several years ago. It is now clear that Egypt's efforts in Panama continue. A leading authority on South American problems, Mr. John D. Harbron, recently reported in the Montreal Star that the United Arab Republic's Embassy in Panama City is playing an aggressive role in inciting the Panamanians against the United States on the issue of the Panama Canal. These activities which include propaganda, Mr. Harbron writes, "suggest that Nasser's influence on Panamanian leaders * * * has been more important than the ill-defined role of the anti-American Castroite elements in Panama."

When the Panamanian conflict was at its height in January 1964, one of the leading Government-controlled newspapers in Cairo, Al Ahram, applauded the anti-U.S. attacks of Panamanian crowds "against American aggression." Cairo's vicious activities in Panama against U.S. interests were reflected in the recent meeting of the Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Conference. This organization is heavily influenced by Moscow and Peiping and its day-to-day operations are administered by a staff which is predominantly Egyptian. Thus, it was not unexpected that the Conference should denounce the United States and call for the "expulsion of U.S. imperialists from Panama."

More recently, information has come to light that the Egyptians are also active in Brazil. According to these reports, Arabs located in Brazil, are kept in close touch

with the Egyptian Government through various agencies. The numbers of these Arabs has grown to a point where local Brazilian networks broadcast in Arabic. The Arabs are also playing a role among antidemocratic elements in that country. The Arab League too, which for all intents and purposes is an instrument of the Cairo regime, is busily at work spreading Cairo's gospel.

WORLDWIDE NETWORK

Thus, the Nasser network stretches from the remotest areas of the Arabian Peninsula to the not so remote lands of South America. The trails of his agents are strewn with the evidence of subversion and violence. It is not the picture of a leader who has finally made his peace with the rest of the world. Nevertheless, his apologists continue to maintain that he is bending all of his energies to satisfy the needs of the Egyptian masses. But the image and the real Nasser are entirely different. For example, in his speech of February 22, 1964, which ran over 3,700 words, only approximately 350 words were devoted to problems concerning the economic situation in Egypt itself. The rest of his talk spanned virtually the whole Middle East and the Mediterranean Basin. Yes, indeed, he had plenty of words to say about other people's business but he had little to offer to his own people. This is the true measure of the weight which Nasser gives to the welfare of his people.

What is remarkable in all of this is that his posturing and aggressive adventurism would be impossible, were it not for the fact that his government is the recipient of an annual largess from the United States which runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars. Those in our State Department who defend these handouts, claim they are necessary because this is the only way to influence Nasser and to keep him satisfied. It is the same argument which statesmen in the 1930's made to justify the appeasement of another predatory dictatorship. The world now knows that this submission to blackmail opened the door to the carnage of World War II. Security-minded Americans have the right to expect that our State Department policymakers will not lead them down that same road to disaster.

How Big Is a Tactical Nuclear Bomb?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial from the September 22, 1964, issue of the Peoria Journal Star which is self-explanatory:

HOW BIG IS A TACTICAL NUCLEAR BOMB?

If a newspaper editorialist has any obligations from the nature of his daily work and information, it must be to try to clear up the gamesmanship of words as used in a political campaign.

There is a lovely example in the attempts to work Mr. GOLDWATER's comment about the question of NATO tactical weapons into a political smear, instead of a genuine discussion of the issues and merits involved.

Hatchetman HUBERT HUMPHREY is trumpeting it across the Nation these days that GOLDWATER in talking about "tactical weapons" "means bombs that would destroy whole cities."

The new approach to the same old smear was made possible by Secretary of Defense McNamara who had publicly stated that the "average nuclear tactical weapon in Europe" would have "at least" the force of one Hiroshima explosion.

Those remarks in toto are a masterpiece. They speak much of huge and horrible weapons of mass destruction which make the average in this statement. And in the course of all this death and destruction, the Secretary kept his skirts clean, or assuaged his conscience, with just a one-line reference to smaller weapons.

He said that our "smallest nuclear weapon in Europe has tens of times the force of the conventional 1,000-pound bomb of the last war." And he let it go with that.

He didn't come right out and say that the smaller bomb was the Davy Crockett, a 2-man weapon with an explosive force of about 40 tons of TNT. But he picked the 1,000-pound conventional bomb for a fuzzy comparison of "tens of times." Why? The 1,000-pound bomb wasn't a big bomb.

It was used in salvos. We had many bombs a lot bigger than that. Did he mean to give the impression that the nuclear tactical weapon, the smallest, was fantastically greater than the biggest thing we used in World War II?

Now, war is horrible enough without exaggeration. The first requirement of war is to try to live with the reality and if you try to live with your imagination, you are on your way to the "talking doctor" and the psych ward. You have to stick to reality, which is bad enough.

If you haven't experienced some big ones, it is hard enough to imagine these ratios of force without having them glossed up with "tens of times" something that sounds big, and averages compared to one that killed 100,000 civilians in a paper and wood city.

When we got hit with even 1,000-pound bombs in World War II, we got hit with at least four at a time, and that multiplied by the number of planes, usually, "patterning" us. When we hit the enemy we often used much bigger ones, and went as high as 1,000 planes in a raid.

My "CP" was dead center on one occasion of a salvo of four of those bombs. It jars things. Protected by a crib of coconut logs, and dirt, however, it didn't interrupt either my pipe smoking or any communications. If it had been about 12 feet off center, instead of dead center, it would have disintegrated me. Simple fact.

A Davey Crockett dead center would have been four times the blast and would have done the job on me and a couple of others in my command post. It would not have wiped out my outfit, nor harmed any other installation, and certainly no cities or civilians.

This weapon, as one example, is, in fact, two-tenths of 1 percent of the Hiroshima bomb Mr. HUMPHREY refers to in charging GOLDWATER is talking about weapons "to destroy whole cities." He only stretched it by a multiplier of 500 times over.

The simple fact is that Senator GOLDWATER has raised publicly a serious question raised by a NATO staff including some of the most dedicated, responsible, and skilled experts of our country and of allied countries. But they raised it in private and were suppressed, being subordinates to the President.

That question is whether it would not be better to anticipate possible situations in advance, and give advance instructions to commanders in Europe as to the conditions when they might use certain types of battlefield nuclear weapons—without having to wait for the word from the President no matter what.

"It is a good question. It requires a healthy discussion of what potential circumstances do they anticipate in which the orders could just as well be cut in advance, and what possible problems do they fear under the present arrangements. That and what weapons do they have specifically in mind are the nub of the question.

Instead of dealing with this very serious functional question, publicly or privately, our Government is rushing clear out to the end of the limb in future commitment to a wait-and-see policy when under attack—and doing so in order to grossly exaggerate the issue, deceive the American people as to the problem and its real nature, and thus be able to use the subject for purposes of political smear campaign.

Such is the play of words—and hence on facts—by which we reach the "GOLDWATER will blow up the world" campaign pitch.

If it were just a bit of political cheating, it would not be so bad. Unhappily, it also plays fast and loose with our position as the champion of freedom and peace, in that it greatly reduces the "deterrent" which keeps the Communist power from getting too grabby * * * and makes us look as faltering, uncertain, and fearful as they hope we are.

It is a dangerous game, indeed.

C. L. DANCEY.

"A Look at America"—Address by Alan R. Willis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed with an address on the subject of "A Look at America," recently delivered by Alan R. Willis before the Rotary Club of Gaffney, S.C. The address, which was made on August 18, 1964, eloquently points up some very important American principles which need to be discussed and considered throughout America if we are to protect our great political and spiritual heritage and retain our freedom in this Nation under God.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

A LOOK AT AMERICA

(A speech delivered before the Rotary Club, Gaffney, S.C., Aug. 18, 1964, by Alan R. Willis, executive secretary, Spartanburg Development Association)

It is incumbent upon every American businessman * * * in fact, every American citizen * * * to read, and to read a lot. In my work, perhaps 50 percent of my working day is spent reading * * * reading information which I evaluate, condense, digest, and pass along to others * * * Government information, labor information, management information, etc.

A short time ago I came across a paragraph which caught my eye and which forms the basis of what I would like to discuss with you today.

This paragraph began an article by Mae Craig. Now, you all know Mae Craig—she's the Washington correspondent for a Seattle newspaper—a little old lady who wears funny hats, and who has the proclivity for asking questions of Presidents.

This article was entitled "A Look At America." Now, I'm interested in looking at America, because it's not the same America

I used to look at a few short years ago. It is ever changing, but changing so gradually that few of us notice the changes taking place. Here is how that article began:

"Unless there is a change, deep down, in the American people, a genuine crusade against self-indulgence, immorality, public and private, then we are witnesses to the decline and fall of the American Republic."

Imagine that. The decline and fall of the American Republic. That's my country, and yours Mrs. Craig is talking about. So this warning, this prediction, if you will, should be of more than passing interest to us all.

When Thomas Jefferson and his compatriots framed the Constitution, this document which is still acclaimed as the most perfect governmental document ever conceived, was designed to prevent such a thing as the decline and fall of the American Republic. I am very convinced that, if we had hewed to the principles outlined in Thomas Jefferson's Constitution such a thing would be possible. But have you looked at your copy of the Constitution lately?

It is a document designed to insure the fact that the Government is and will remain, in the hands of the people, not the people in the hands of the Government. It is a document designed to hold good for all time. Now, times change, of course, but the Constitution is so written that its principles will take care of those changes fairly and adequately.

I wonder what Mr. Jefferson would say if he could see his Constitution today and note its usage in this Nation he fought so hard to create?

Now, I am the first to admit that I am not a student of the Constitution. (I share this condition with the nine members of the U.S. Supreme Court.) But even a cursory glance will show how far we have strayed * * * and how much further we are likely to stray.

One outstanding feature of our Constitution is the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights. Certainly, we are all familiar with the Bill of Rights, but have you stopped lately to realize what has already happened to the rights guaranteed therein?

The first 10 amendments, as we all know, guarantee such precious things as freedom of speech, religion, assembly, trial by jury and redress to the government of grievances, among others. Let us take just a moment to see what has happened to these rights.

There is no need to dwell upon the right of prayer in our public schools. As we know, Bible reading in assembly in our schools is now a violation of our Constitution, not a right—and this, in a Nation whose pledge to the flag includes the phrase "One nation under God," and whose coins are inscribed, "In God we trust." We can thank that same God that many schools do not adhere to this abridgement of the right of freedom of religion.

Let us look at freedom of speech and assembly and let me cite an example. A union organizer comes to your plant for the purpose of cajoling your workers into paying dues for the privilege of holding their jobs. He is given, by the way, carte blanche to tell just about all the lies he wishes in the process. The moment he makes contact your right of free speech has flown right out your office window. There are now things you cannot say even though they may be true.

Freedom of assembly? Under these same circumstances, let's see you assemble two or three workers in your office and explain to them how you feel about the organization efforts. Oh, no. You can't unless you wish to incur the wrath of the National Labor Relations Board; one of the countless bureaus which have taken over almost completely the rights guaranteed to you and to me by our Bill of Rights.

Do you enjoy trial by jury and are you presumed innocent until proved guilty? Then you haven't tangled with that fine bureau known as the Bureau of Internal Revenue * * * nor have you met the recently passed Equal Pay Act, the director of which said only a short time ago that the burden of proof of innocence lies with the employer and that the employer does not have the right to face his accuser.

Oh, but we must have some rights under the first 10 amendments. The right to own property, for instance, that right which is the real key to freedom. All right, you're a farmer. You decide that this would be a good year to plant cotton. With this in mind, you apply the old-fashioned principle of free enterprise and take a chance. But don't try planting any more cotton than the Department of Agriculture says you can. A perfectly ridiculous example of this took place a few years ago down on Route 301. A filling station operator, in an effort to attract tourists en route to Florida, decided to plant a few cotton plants around his filling station so the tourists could see cotton growing. He was fined by the Department of Agriculture because he didn't have a cotton allotment.

But don't give up, this is a free country. You own a plant, or a store. You decide that there are certain qualifications necessary to do a job in your establishment and * * * not so fast. We are now the proud possessors of another bureau, recently created under the Civil Rights Act. The Bureau of Equal Employment and Opportunity * * * and I'm sadly afraid that, when this bureau begins to affect your business in July of next year, qualifications will have very little to do with your hiring practices.

My point, my friends, is this: You and I are now governed, not by and for the people, but by and for a series of bureaucrats which grows in unbelievable leaps and bounds with every passing year. These bureaus, where the work of Government is really done, where decisions are really made, where budgets are really framed, and where your money is really spent, are leading us right down that road suggested by Mae Craig, the little lady with the funny hat.

Can you remember when the United States was the leading nation of the world? You probably can, because it was just 20 short years ago, at the end of World War II. Today, we talk of leadership, but as Mrs. Craig asks in her article, are we capable of giving it? Would Charles de Gaulle have flaunted U.S. policy 20 years ago? Would Britain have sold buses 20 years ago to a little pipsqueak in Cuba, if the United States had suggested she not?

When leadership falters, my friends, it is challenged. And it is being challenged today as never before in history.

Around the world our money is taken with one hand while we are slapped in the face with the other. And a perfect example of this was released just this week by Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota. He released a report which showed that, through 1963, we have spent $78 billion, $56 million in foreign aid to 21 nations. On key issues in the United Nations, these countries have voted 91 times for the United States, and 157 times with Russia.

We officially decide that Russia is not so bad because Red China is worse, and anyway, our Presidential advisers assure us that Russia is moving slowly to the right and we are moving slowly to the left, so eventually we will meet in one world. So, we sell wheat (subsidized, of course, with your money) to our most important enemy. We sign test ban treaties with the one nation which has a perfect record for throwing treaties down the nearest drain when they no longer meet her needs.

We fiddle-faddle in southeast Asia. We fight a "secret war" in Vietnam * * * our soldiers are killed daily by the Communists but it isn't really war. And we may well be ignominously thrown out.

We did nothing in Cuba, so she is now the home of subversion for all of Latin America and Africa.

The United Nations was founded in this country and now it is nothing more than a messy combination of nations grappling for our dollars while ignoring our arguments. We are paying the bills while countless other nations ride free and fight us at the same time.

At home, I am sorry to say, we are little better off.

We are fostering a society in which a Bobby Baker can turn a Government salary into a multimillion-dollar empire through influence peddling, and the minute the investigation of the hanky-panky touches people in high places, the whole mess is swept under the rug * * * even to the extent that our own President seems never to have heard of Mr. Baker before.

We were told in June by the nine wise men that our State legislatures, many of which are patterned after the very legislature prescribed for the Federal Government, are now unconstitutional and that, contrary to the Constitution, the affairs of the States are no longer in the hands of those States. (I see that Congress is attempting to do something about this decision * * * because it hits them right where they live * * * right in the job. You see, many astute observers see this decision as the forerunner of a Supreme Court decision to reapportion the U.S. Senate, too.)

Financial integrity is now a thing of the past. "Spend yourself rich," we are told, and charge the whole thing to your children and your children's children. Just raise the national debt limit, print paper money not backed by real money and don't worry, we're having a ball. (I suggest you check with your banker and see how long he'll let you operate this way.)

We are going to fight poverty by taking away man's right to be a man and stand on his own feet and earn his own way. We are going to defeat poverty by giving and giving and giving to the poor, to the young, to the old, to the successful and the unsuccessful, to the minority groups, and on and on and on. (I see where Sargent Shriver just gave Cherokee a little something she didn't want in the form of a work camp at Kings Mountain, and I salute Mayor Queen for his outspoken stand.)

What is the outcome of all this vote-buying giveaway of your money and mine? (The Government doesn't have any money, remember, except that which we give it in taxes.)

The tragic outcome, my friends, is socialism. The complete welfare state where every facet of your daily lives is in the hands of a benevolent government. During the last 30 years, we have seen a slow and deadly creeping toward this form of government. It has come during your lifetime and mine and it has come so gradually that all but the most brilliant among us have failed to notice.

Well, would socialism be so bad? "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs?" Everybody equal? That's not what the framers of the Constitution meant when they said: All men are created equal, and you know it. They referred to equality of opportunity, opportunity to take a chance, and to succeed or to fail. Not leveling all men off at a point of average. And civil rights demonstrators notwithstanding, the American Negro has that same opportunity—many have done it. That's the equality guaranteed in our Constitution.

But, I asked a question, I'd better answer it. Is socialism so bad? To begin with, arguments against it are very difficult to frame, because it carries that aura of "helping one's fellow man," so let me answer

the question by quoting a very brilliant man, Nicolai Lenin. Lenin said, in effect, "Feed a nation a little socialism at a time and it is soon ripe for communism." If this sounds like "it can't happen here," let me quote from column written by Elizabeth Curley Flynn, in the Communist newspaper, the Worker, "June was a month of victories in the people's struggle for democratic rights. Leading, of course, was the civil rights bill. Then came the reapportionment decision. On June 8, a body blow was delivered to the McCarran Act by U.S. Supreme Court decision upholding the fifth amendment protection of Communists in refusing to register the party. A Federal court in San Francisco reversed the conviction of Archie Brown for holding office in the Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union while an admitted member of the Communist Party. Flash! Yesterday, Dr. Herbert Apthecker and I won our passport case. Whoopee!"

Now do you see where socialism leads?

For myself, I'd rather not see my country became a Communist nation. Nor, I think, would you.

So what can we do about it?

Three things:

1. Know the system under which the United States is supposed to operate. The free enterprise system, which entails free markets, regulated by supply and demand, not government decree. Read about it, study it, and shout its praises from the housetop.

2. If the Constitution is outmoded as the experts tell us, then call upon Congress to amend it. Don't circumvent it by Executive order and Supreme Court judicial trickery.

3. Take an active part in politics. Let your chosen representatives know how you feel about issues. They do care. When a Congressman doesn't hear from his constituents on a given issue, he takes that to mean tacit approval and votes accordingly.

And remember, a politician's first duty is to be reelected; he will do what is necessary and take the appropriate steps to accomplish this, be he Democrat, Republican, or what have you. Therefore, let him know how you feel on every issue that comes before him.

The action is ours. We are the ones who can get this country back on the road to constitutional government.

So, if you feel this country is not on the road to socialism through its multiple vote-getting giveaway programs, if you feel there is no apparent danger in the welfare state where there is something for everybody with no work and no cost involved, then I respectfully suggest you do the same thing so many of us have been doing for so many years—nothing.

If, on the other hand, you think our Constitution is worth protecting; if you think America is, as our National Anthem proclaims, "* * * the land of the free," then I suggest you write your Congresman and let him know how you feel.

Two great civilizations, to which we owe much of our heritage: Greece, from whom we got the concept of our democracy; Rome, from whom we took the principle of government by civil law * * * both these great nations, when the responsible, informed citizenry no longer took an active interest in work and in the affairs of government, fell from the pages of history.

Let us then heed the philosopher, Santayana, who reminded us, "The man who does not recognize and understand history will be forced to relive it."

So let us accept the challenge offered by Mae Craig, the little lady with the funny hats. Let us bring about a change, deep down, in the American people. A genuine crusade against self-indulgence, immorality, public and private, so that we may not witness the decline and fall of the American Republic.

On Warmongering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a number of Members joined me in discussing Senator GOLDWATER's record on foreign and military policy. In an analysis of Senator GOLDWATER's position, Walter Lippmann in his column appearing in this morning's Washington Post, has put the matter in succinct and articulate terms. Mr. Lippmann's column is as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 24, 1964]

TODAY AND TOMORROW—ON WARMONGERING

(By Walter Lippmann)

General Eisenhower says it is "tommyrot" to think that Senator GOLDWATER is a "warmonger"—that is to say, a man who wants to start a war. But does anybody say that BARRY GOLDWATER wants a war? I know of no one who says it, or thinks it. What is being said is that he is the kind of man who would be much more likely than President Johnson to get us into a big war.

This charge, which is affecting the campaign profoundly, is that Senator GOLDWATER's admiration of brinkmanship, his impulsive willingness to threaten nuclear war, could put this country in the position where the only choice left was between surrender and nuclear war. It is not that BARRY GOLDWATER wants to have a war; it is that he denounces every alternative to war as surrender, appeasement, or cowardice.

The crucial fallacy of his military thinking and of his ideas about foreign policy is the assumption that the United States must be and will be obeyed by all the rest of the world, by its adversaries, its rivals, its allies. Here again is that unreason of the dreamer: the illusion of superman that all opponents can be commanded to disappear. Of course, the Senator does not want a war. But he is suffering from that most dangerous of all the illusions of a statesman, the illusion of omnipotence.

Thus, if one studies his remarks on foreign policy, one finds that his idea of diplomacy is to deliver an ultimatum. If what he means is what he says, he would solve all our difficult problems by issuing an ultimatum to somebody. He would solve the Vietnamese conflict by an ultimatum to Hanoi and an ultimatum to Peiping. He would get rid of the nuisance in Cuba by an ultimatum to Castro. He would remove the Berlin wall by an ultimatum to the Soviet Government.

He is at pains to deny that he is trigger-happy, and General Eisenhower is now testifying that no one who has seen a war could want a war. But BARRY GOLDWATER is undeniably ultimatum-happy. And this makes him a very dangerous man. For there are powerful, brave, and proud nations which oppose us on various issues. A President who would conduct foreign policy by ultimatum is failing to realize that other people are like Americans in that, driven to it, they will fight rather than surrender.

This is the specific danger of Goldwaterism in foreign affairs: an instinctive and impulsive preference for the ultimatum rather than for negotiation. That is why, without intending to have a war, he would prove to be a precipitator of warlike crises and perhaps of the ultimate crisis of a war of annihilation. For him the outer world does not really exist: the foreigners who live beyond the seas are not other men with whom we must live on this planet but abstractions who will vanish if the President barks at them.

There has been no serious discussion about foregin affairs in this campaign. There is not likely to be. For the President lives in the daylight world and there he deals with Russians and Chinese and Germans and South Americans and Vietnamese and Cypriots, all of whom are very different and most of whom are very ornery. They all have certain things in common. In the daylight world the President knows that he did not create them. He knows that he does not own them. And he knows that he cannot command them.

But BARRY GOLDWATER does not live in the daylight world and he does not deal with real people, only with the good guys and the bad guys of superman's imagining.

Citation Awarded to Senator Long of Louisiana at the Conference on Dual Distribution Honors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the American small businessman has no better friend in this body than the Senator from Louisiana, our esteemed colleague RUSSELL B. LONG. As chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I have had the privilege and pleasure of working closely with Senator LONG in the labors of that committee throughout the now almost 15 years it has had permanent standing. Hence, I know from personal observation the devotion he has given and the effectiveness of his work.

Senator LONG is chairman of the Subcommittee on Monopoly. In that post, he has grappled for several years with the problems that are facing small business as a result of growing trends of vertical integration and dual distribution. He is the author of two bills, S. 1107 and S. 1108, that are gaining increasing attention as possible means for alleviating these problems.

This past Tuesday, our colleague's efforts were recognized in a citation awarded to him by the Conference on Dual Distribution, a new organization of independent businesses representing a number of industries and all segments of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the citation to Senator LONG, his remarks on acceptance, and a news release about the Conference on Dual Distribution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation, remarks, and news release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION—CONFERENCE ON DUAL DISTRIBUTION

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Monopoly, Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, the Honorable RUSSELL B.

LONG, has demonstrated keen awareness of the problems created for American independent enterprise by dual distribution. His energetic efforts and constuctive proposals have contributed importantly to the development of solutions of these problems. This certificate acknowledges with grateful appreciation Senator LONG'S dedication to the goal of strengthening small business as a continuing vital force in our national economy.

[SEAL]

G. F. BEALL,
National Cochairman.
LAWRENCE SCHACHT,
National Cochairman.

Given at Washington September 22, 1964.

REMARKS OF SENATOR RUSSELL B. LONG, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON MONOPOLY, SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, AT THE CONFERENCE ON DUAL DISTRIBUTION, INTERNATIONAL INN, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 22, 1964

Mr. Schacht, Mr. Beall, and members of the Conference on Dual Distribution, you do me great honor with this award, and I thank you for it most gratefully. I guess no one really dislikes a word of commendation for his efforts, now and then, and it is especially pleasant when the word comes from so significant and promising a group as this one—and in a document suitable for framing. So I thank you again—for your warm hospitality, for the very generous words contained in this citation, and—most of all—for being here.

Let me explain what I mean by that last—why I thank you for being here. The presence of all of you in this room, for the purpose you have assembled, makes an accurate prophet of me. It is now 5 years, at least, since I first began to think and predict that someday there would be a national multiple-industry organization concerned exclusively with the problems of dual distribution. I mean no disrespect to Lawrence Schacht, Franklin Beall, "Eric" Erickson, Morris Rosoff, and Max Rogel, your organizing committee, when I say that if they had not invented this Conference, someone else would have had to. I know that others have thought about it. It is to the great credit of your Founding Fathers that they have done it.

Among the general public, I suspect that 99 people out of 100 have not yet so much as heard the term "dual distribution." Even in the ranks of commerce and industry, 8 out of 10 small businessmen might be at a loss to define it. But I think virtually 10 out of 10 small businessmen today would know immediately what you were talking about when you defined "dual distribution" to them as the situation in which your supplier becomes your competitor. Perhaps as many as 3 to 5 out of 10 small businesses have experienced it personally by now, in some form or other, at some level or other.

My own first close look at dual distribution came about in 1958. At that time I was approached, in my capacity as chairman of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee, by small business dealers and distributors in the flat glass industry. That industry was then experiencing a rather rapid growth in dual distribution, from various sources and of various types. Even earlier, the Senate Small Business Committee had been active in studying dual distribution in the tire industry.

After hearings, my subcommittee issued a report on its study of the glass industry, which was adopted by the full committee and filed as Senate Report 1015 of the 86th Congress. It is interesting—and an indication, perhaps, of the hazards inherent in recommending in this field—that the two dual distribution bills I finally introduced more than a year and a half after our glass report came out bore no resemblance to any of the 10 recommendations in the report. As in so many other areas of our complex society, in the field of dual distribution it is easier to describe an ailment than to prescribe for its cure.

At the time I originally introduced the two dual distribution bills, back in September of 1961, I admitted that I wasn't positive they would provide the final, workable answer; I had myself rejected many other ideas before writing up these two in legal language. It is possible that these, in turn, may have to give way to still others before we reach something that will represent a broad enough consensus of Congress and business to secure passage. But somewhere a beginning must be made, and I am glad that my bills have served that purpose.

Your Chairman has admonished me to be brief, and it is at least as welcome advice to me as to you, for the pressures of legislative business back at the Capitol are intense today. Therefore, I am going to assume that you understand—or from other speakers today will get understanding of—the provisions of S. 1107, the Antitrust Vertical Integration Amendments, and S. 1108, the Dual Distribution Reporting Act. I know that some other good ideas are going to be forthcoming from the House Small Business subcommittee work that our able friend, Congressman ROOSEVELT, has been leading with such vigor for so long.

But I want to close by reminding you how tremendously important a part you—all of you—have to play in this effort to find fair, workable solutions to the problems of dual distribution. Those problems are very severe. You would not have taken the time and spent the money to be here today if they weren't hurting your own business right where you live. But the remedies proposed by my bills, which Mr. ROOSEVELT has also sponsored, must be recognized to be drastic ones. After long thought, it is my judgment that nothing less drastic would do any good; but you must all recognize that the Congress will never pass these bills without the most widespread kind of interest and support from the business community.

In its 12th, 13th, and 14th annual reports, the Senate Small Business Committee has earnestly recommended and urged the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate to hold hearings on these bills of mine and Congressman ROOSEVELT'S. But no hearings have yet been scheduled by either legislative committee. Neither my Senate Small Business subcommittee nor Mr. ROOSEVELT'S House Small Business subcommittee can get these bills out on the floor for debate and a vote. That can only be accomplished by the Judiciary Committees, and they will only do it after they are persuaded to hold and have held hearings.

At such legislative hearings, the Senate Small Business Committee said in its 12th annual report, it will be—and I quote—"incumbent upon the small business supporters of this legislation to produce evidence that the problem is, indeed, as severe as they have averred, and that these bills will help to solve it, not only in their own but in the national interest."

An organization such as the one being born here today can produce that evidence, marshal it, and present it where it matters—at hearings of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittees of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees. Even before that, you can produce the kind of broad-based business support that must be present before those subcommittees will even hold hearings.

I welcome, therefore, the formation of a national Conference on Dual Distribution; I congratulate all of you on the part you are taking in a great and necessary effort; and I wish you the best of luck in your work—"not only in your own but in the national interest."

Thank you.

[News Release]

DUAL DISTRIBUTION PROBLEM EMPHASIZED

WASHINGTON, D.C., September 22.—Nearly 100 representatives of independent business and industry—meeting in Washington today (Tuesday) at the official organization gathering of the new national Conference on Dual Distribution—emphasized the growing importance of the dual distribution problem by stating that it has now become necessary for them to import materials from abroad in order to keep from being squeezed out of business.

Today's national meeting was called by Lawrence Schacht, president of the Schacht Steel Corp., New York, cochairman with G. F. Beall, Portland, Oreg., of the original organizing committee of the conference. Beall is vice president of the Beall Pipe & Tank Corp.

Principal speakers at today's daylong meeting at the International Inn were Senator Russell B. Long of Louisiana, Irving Maness, Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and Gregg Potvin, counsel to the House Small Business Committee.

Awards were presented by the conference group to Senator LONG and to Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, for their efforts in attempting to solve the dual distribution problem which is plaguing American industry.

Representative ROOSEVELT was unable to be present and his award was accepted by Mr. Potvin.

In calling the meeting, Mr. Schacht said in his letters to Senator LONG and other leaders:

"You are no doubt aware of the great adverse impact of dual distribution upon the independent business sector of the business community. Competition of the distribution and fabricating arms of vertically integrated complexes with the independents, in the same functional area whom they supply, merits, we believe, the ever increasing attention of the Government at both administrative and legislative levels.

"The bills already introduced by Senator LONG and Congressman ROOSEVELT, and the hearings already conducted by Congressman ROOSEVELT as Chairman of Subcommittee No. 4, are indispensably important steps which we believe must be implemented and brought to fruition through the efforts of the independent businessmen affected. They cannot do this without your active interest and support."

Indicative of the widespread current influence on American business of the dual distribution problem was the fact that today's meeting was attended by representatives of the following independent businesses and industries:

Aluminum, steel, business machines, culvert pipe, construction, warehousing, paint and wallpaper, glass, and electrical construction, among others.

It was announced at the meeting that: "The Conference on Dual Distribution will actively seek a solution to the problems posed by the practice of dual distribution. The Conference will, in future, include all trade associations and individual small businessmen who honestly and sincerely desire to help find the way to prevent the abuses and inequities involved with the problem of dual distribution."

The following were appointed as members of an interim organizational committee to help in the organization of the growing membership of the Conference: Max Rogel and Morris Rosoff.

Headquarters for the Conference on Dual Distribution have been established at Suite 229, Shoreham Building, 15th and H Streets, NW., Washington, D.C.

Race Is the Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days a most enlightening article appeared in the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C. The statements of Mr. Dixon, a nationally known news columnist, author of the article, serve to prove the deplorable depths to which racial relations have been lowered here in the District of Columbia. I wish to have Ken Dixon's material reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to fully illustrate that the riots and unrest reported recently in Philadelphia, New York, and other major northern cities are not just the work of hoodlums. Contrary to what several news reports would have people believe—they indicate that groups causing trouble have no tie-in with racial questions—these outbursts of violence are very much the product of a loss of respect between the races. The arrogance and disrespect shown by the young Negroes in Mr. Dixon's case, under the shadow of the Capitol, are perfect examples of the initial steps toward the violent hostilities and wanton destruction of property which naturally follow.

The article follows:

DEPRESSING CHANGES IN RACE RELATIONS

(By Kenneth L. Dixon)

WASHINGTON.—It probably was inevitable that with the whole world torn by racial turmoil, this so-called capital of the world would have to suffer along with the rest.

But if you have lived here in happier days, and return for a brief visit, the drastic change in race relations is a depressing thing to see.

When my wife and I first moved here at the start of World War II, the District of Columbia was checkerboarded with sectors where black and white lived, either side by side or just across the street from one another. And they were neighbors—friendly neighbors.

Our home was in such a sector during part of the time I was overseas, and my wife was attending night school. But she never had a qualm about catching the bus or streetcar when necessary (cabs were hard to come by then, you may recall), and walking from the corner up the dark street to the house late at night.

JUST NEIGHBORS

Had she ever been threatened, one scream would have brought the whole neighborhood out in her defense—the whites from one side of the street and the Negroes from the other. We know because it happened to a friend of ours. This female friend let out one mighty yell and the guy who was threatening her suddenly saw men pouring out of the doors on both sides of the street and he fled in terror.

And this wasn't a rich-white-man, poor-black-man relationship. A lot of the guys across the street made more money than I did. It was simply that we were neighbors.

But it isn't that way any more.

In that particular sector the physical appearance has changed drastically. Most of the old houses have been razed to make way for new apartment buildings. But that physical progress cannot begin to compensate for the deterioration in racial peace and harmony.

I would not dream of allowing my wife to walk those streets alone, even in daylight—and I myself would not walk them alone after dark.

In that and other sections even armed policemen do not walk their beats alone. They either patrol in pairs or accompanied by a trained fighting dog on a leash.

THE SIN OF COLOR

In fact, right out here on the well-lighted hill the other night—within a stone's throw of the Capitol—I saw policemen walking with big trained dogs at heel.

Walking from my hotel the three blocks or so to the Capitol just after dark one night when there was a late session, I was cursed out audibly twice by small groups of young Negro men. Since I'd never seen them and they'd never seen me before, my only sin was being white.

And right in front of the Old Senate Office Building I saw a white taxi driver deliberately swerve his cab to frighten—if not actually to hit—a well-dressed Negro who stepped off the curb to hail him.

This tragic transformation in race relationship has to be seen to be believed, and it makes you weep internally.

The only possible good that could come of it is that Congress, dealing with racial strife at home and abroad cannot possibly ignore the powder keg right here.

It might make them a little more careful about lighting legislative matches.

Campaign Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on campaign tactics, written by William F. Buckley, Jr., and published on September 22 in the Washington Daily News.

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

ON FIGHTING DIRTY

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Writing in an English journal, Murray Kempton predicted last July after the nomination of Senator GOLDWATER that this surely would be the vilest campaign in recent history. It appears to be so.

Consider now some of the statements of Senator GOLDWATER'S opponents. Within a 48-hour period last week, three men drew a parallel of one sort or other between Senator GOLDWATER and Hitler. Specifically:

George Meany, head of the AFL–CIO;

Martin Luther King, head of the nonviolent Negro movement; and

EMANUEL CELLER, head of the Judiciary Committee.

It may be objected that the three gentlemen were provoked into objurgatory extremes, which cannot be blamed on the national leadership. Indeed?

But the national leadership was directly involved in the little 1-minute spot that is going the rounds of our television screens, featuring a pretty little girl licking an ice cream cone, with audio commentary to the effect that Senator GOLDWATER wants to resume nuclear tests, which would contaminate the milk, which would contaminate the ice cream, which would contaminate the pretty little girl. Poor little girl.

She doesn't know, and John Bailey won't tell her, that Edward Teller announced last week that the United States has developed hydrogen bombs that are 100 percent free of fallout: and presumably the little girl is not to be reminded that President Truman and President Eisenhower, whom we know as moderates, conducted nuclear tests of a very, very dirty kind during their administrations, on the grounds that to do so was necessary to the maintenance of the kind of freedom that permits little girls to eat ice cream cones, and big boys to lie about the dangers of doing so.

Or consider the lead editorial in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post. Senator GOLDWATER is—"a wild man, a stray, an unprincipled and ruthless political jujitsu artist."

Strange; the Saturday Evening Post's principal political writer is Stewart Alsop, who wrote as recently as last fall that Senator GOLDWATER was a man of principle and of total sincerity.

The English are having an election at this moment, and the strictly enforced rules of English politics require an interesting act of political discipline.

No one may issue a piece of political propaganda against one or another political candidate without the express consent of the opposing political candidate or his agent.

Thus, George Meany would not be allowed to "draw a parallel" between Senator Goldwater and Hitler without the consent of Lyndon Johnson.

Thus the publisher of an obscene little magazine in New York could not publicly question Senator GOLDWATER'S sanity in full-page ads without L.B.J.'s consent to do so.

I do not know whether such rules could be applied in the United States under the first amendment, and I am not altogether sure that I would welcome their institution. But the British, who have had such a long experience with democracy, recognize that vile campaigns are the enemy of thoughtful political discourse. We do not seem to know that at all.

Gardner Withrow—Eulogy

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I have just listened to the announcement of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON] of the passing of my great friend Gardner Withrow. Like the majority leader who has spoken so ably and so well here, and so fluently, may I say that Gardner Withrow was one of the most respected Members of this body to serve here in my time. He was a broadminded person and was always interested in the welfare of the people who sent him down here. Likewise, he was also interested in the affairs of our great Nation and of his great State of Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions I had an opportunity to be with Gardner Withrow in his home district in Wiscon-

sin. My wife had an uncle who was head of the History Department at La Crosse State Teachers College. While we were up there to see him I frequently saw Gardner, and on other occasions I was there from time to time in joint political efforts with him. I have spoken of the high esteem in which he was held here by his colleagues in the House of Representatives. I can testify firsthand that he was held in the same high regard and esteem by the people of his area in Wisconsin.

So, Mr. Speaker, I mourn his passing. I am truly sorry that he is gone. Certainly, he left here a great imprint and a great example of conduct and statesmanship that many of us could well emulate.

Itchy Political Fingers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Washington Post for September 23 includes an interesting article, written by John Chamberlain, which puts into perspective some of the allegations being made today. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 23, 1964]

THESE DAYS—ITCHY POLITICAL FINGERS

(By John Chamberlain)

The question of itchy fingers is a major preoccupation with the politicians this autumn. Senator GOLDWATER is accused of having an irresponsible trigger finger because he advocates giving the NATO commander authority to use tactical atomic weapons without consulting the President in the event that the Russians pull a surprise nuclear infantry and tank attack on West Germany.

Senator GOLDWATER is, of course, merely supporting what military men insist is a necessity if they hope to save their troops from almost instant obliteration. The military men—Generals LeMay, Lemnitzer, Thomas S. Power—could speak out on this, but they would first have to be unmuzzled.

Commonsense—which, I suppose, is as rare a commodity as there is—should tell the American voter that Senator GOLDWATER is a responsible spokesman for trained military men when it comes to advocating that the NATO commander have the authority to reply instantly in kind to a tactical nuclear attack.

A soldier deprived for a critical period of the right of self-defense with the same weapon the enemy is using cannot possibly sustain his morale if, by chance, he is left alive to fire back after an inevitable time-consuming call by his commander to Washington or Texas.

So much, then, for one imputation of itchy fingers. If this allegation is a phony, however, there is another charge of itchy fingers that can be sustained. And that is the charge of itchy fingers on the monetary spigot.

Suddenly, in the effort to attract votes, the cry in the higher echelons of the "in" party is to call for turning on every spigot possible. Representative JOHN D. DINGELL returns to Washington after a close victory in a Michigan Democratic primary with the news that a few old-age pensioners saved him from the so-called backlash. So the orders have gone out to whip up enthusiasm for medicare.

It does not matter that young married couples in their twenties, living on $5,000 a year, cannot possibly maintain private insurance if the social security bite is upped to pay for the Federal hospitalization of anybody and everybody in the 65-year-old brackets.

The cry is out, too, to vote for partisans of the theory that the Federal Government must provide mass transit for our big cities, to pump in money for education, and to clear more downtown areas for resale at a favored price to redevelopers.

Now, if one thing is plain, it is that when tax money is pumped from the States to Washintgon and then back again via Federal bureaus, the bureaucrats take a hefty "living expense" cut from it. How much simpler it would be to let the States collect their own excise taxes. Or how much simpler it would be to accept BARRY GOLDWATER'S proposal for a Federal remission of a fair proportion of taxes to the States to use as local citizens see fit.

The States are quite capable of taking care of their own needs if they have funds and local incentive to do it. One currently popular Federal idea is that Washington should supply money to erase scars caused by strip mining. But in Indiana, for example, where taxes are levied on nominally worthless stripped-out coal areas, the owners of the land, to put value back into their taxed real estate, have reclaimed all save 3,621 acres out of a total of 80,000.

Every coal State could do what Indiana has done. But not if election-hungry politicians get their itchy fingers on the Federal spigot.

Our Decline in Morality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial reprinted in the Dixon Evening Telegraph which is self-explanatory:

OUR DECLINE IN MORALITY

Ray Page, State superintendent of public instruction, in a recent speech, called attention to a disturbing trend in American society which distresses those who want to see a strong and healthy Nation passed on to a generation yet unborn.

Mr. Page discussed the apathy with which so many Americans now accept the steady decline of morality in our society. An educator with broad experience in the high school classroom as well as in the administrative area, Mr. Page cited distressing evidence of how deeply this dry rot of adult indifference is eating into the core of our youth.

He mentioned an August report of the National Education Association which reported that 62 percent of American teachers, who have had 20 or more years of teaching experience, agree that students' behavior in the classroom has grown considerably more unruly in the last 20 years.

A major reason, Mr. Page believes, why students are becoming increasingly contemptuous of authority is because "they have examples at the highest level of government of dishonesty and immorality."

He notes that "big crime is big business and big criminals are the subject of glamor and considerable publicity."

He cites the alarming degree of government immorality at the highest level as illustrated by the Bobby Baker and Billy Sol Estes cases.

Mr. Page speaks for uncounted thousands of Americans when he deplores the casual acceptance of these glaring examples of high level wrongdoing and the complacency with which the spread of the moral blight throughout our society is viewed.

This concern is a major reason why Mr. Page and so many like him are devoting their individual efforts on behalf of the presidential campaign of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

They see in the no-nonsense attitude of Senator GOLDWATER, his refusal to compromise with those elements of society which shrug off the growing dangers to our basic fabric of democracy as unimportant, a renewed devotion to preservation of the virtues and principles which have made this country great.

Mr. Page in his own words offers an inspiring evaluation of a man who has captured the imagination of those Americans more concerned with the kind of America we leave for the future than for the national comforts we might enjoy today.

"A man with the courage to look at our history and point out what is good and important in it; and a man with the vision to fight for the prestige of those historical principles and precepts for America's future. That man, BARRY GOLDWATER, has captured the imagination of vast numbers of the American people."

These are indeed words that all should heed.

Judge Sarah T. Hughes Writes of the Crisis in the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, of all the many domestic problems created by the movement of this Nation into an ever more industrial age, perhaps the most basic is the problem of the cities. Is the city of the future to be a place characterized by inadequate housing, overcrowded conditions, polluted air, and a pervasive urban ugliness? If the answer to this question is to be a resounding "No," which it must be, our cities must begin now to face up to these problems before they reach unmanageable proportions.

I am gratified that many cities in Texas are showing awareness of the need to plan for the future. Dallas and Houston, two of the fastest growing cities in the country, have been singularly imaginative in this regard, as an article in the September issue of Nation's Business points out. Especially noteworthy is the fact that these two cities have been making substantial progress without Federal aid. I commend the forward-looking leaders of Dallas and Houston for the initiative and skill they have exhibited in demonstrating what can be done at the local level.

In many of our communities, especially our older ones, the obstacles to be overcome may be so great, and the resources so slim, that outside help is needed. In these cases, the Federal Government stands ready to offer its assistance. Activity at both the local and the Federal level must be stepped up if urban blight is not to descend upon our great cities and pervade the landscape of the future.

Mr. President, a provocative and enlightening article on our urban crisis appears in the current issue of the Texas Observer, under the title "The Crisis in the Cities." The author is the Honorable Sarah T. Hughes, the U.S. District judge for the northern district of Texas. Judge Hughes was recently presented the outstanding woman jurist award of the Federal Bar Association; and she is the only woman ever to administer the Presidential oath of office to a President of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article to which I have referred, which was published on September 18 in the Texas Observer.

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

THE CRISIS IN THE CITIES

(By Sarah T. Hughes)

DALLAS.—According to a recent estimate, metropolitan Dallas will double its present population by 1985. President Johnson, in a speech delivered at the University of Michigan on May 22, 1964, said to the students, "Many of you will live to see the day, perhaps 50 years from now, when there will be 400 million Americans; fourth-fifths in urban areas. In the remainder of the century urban population will double, city land will double." A recent report of the World Health Organization declared, "After the question of keeping world peace, metropolitan planning is probably the most serious single problem faced by man in the second half of the 20th century."

These statements are a striking summary of the urban crisis and the urgent need for action. In this century there has occurred the most massive population movement from rural to urban areas history has ever seen. These people come from a limited environment, bringing with them their traditions and living habits. Many have lived on the margin of existence, and their education was of minor importance. But despite the limitations, life on the farm has been relatively self-sufficient and free from restrictions. A living was made by physical effort and endurance. Rural communities have been fairly stable, with close family and neighborhood ties and with much of the social life centered around the church. Politically the people were of some significance. County officials were personally known to them.

The shift to the city has meant more than a change in physical location. The immigrants entered the city with little orientation for urban living and have found themselves compelled to live in deteriorated homes, separated from friends and without community ties. Farmwork has given them no training for the skilled jobs in industry or experience with the restrictions on their freedom imposed by the routine work of the assembly lines in factories. They are unfamiliar with urban problems, and politically they feel frustrated.

They must alter almost all their living habits, their family and community relations, and adjust to the manifold difficulties of obtaining jobs and providing necessities for living. They need help, but few city administrations, welfare agencies, or churches have recognized their problems or done anything to alleviate them. There has been a failure to provide the means of inducting them into the requirements of urban living, and the development of pockets of untrained and unadjusted groups has concerned only a few.

The people from the rural areas not only present a problem themselves, but they contribute to other conditions which, according to the World Health Organization report, may reach catastrophic dimensions in the next 20 years. President Johnson in his May 22 speech declared that in the remainder of the century "we will have to build homes, highways, and facilities equal to all those since this country was first settled."

The New York Times, in an editorial commenting on the report of the World Health Organization, said, "No one need look to the United States for precedent-setting policies in handling the world's No. 2 problem. America is the country of nonplan. Cars continue to invade the cities at a multiplication rate shared only by rabbits, trees are defoliated, smog is a health menace, and urban immobility is a daily threat. * * * The United States has a Department of Agriculture but no Department of Urban Affairs, though in 15 years 80 percent of the population will be concentrated in cities. * * * A city like New York still has no master plan. Resources are wasted, the stigma of formless sprawl is on the land.

"Control is a wicked word, even for the greater democratic good, and freedom apparently includes the right to consign cities to chaos for private speculative profit. The warnings are shouted by congested streets and shoddy buildings. The price is being paid physically, in health hazards and cities that don't work; emotionally, in frustration and neuroses, and esthetically, in sheer, solid ugliness."

But the urban crisis created by the vast influx of population is not solely physical. Aristotel has said of the city, "Men come together in cities in order to live, but they remain together in order to live the good life." But to live the good life in American cities today is increasingly difficult. Along with the tremendous increase in population there has been the movement to suburbia, resulting in lessened interest in the old city and a consequent loss of the services that can strengthen those qualities of life, character development, and culture which only the urban center can provide. The city must be more than a place to care for physical wants. It should also be the civilizer of men and the builder of character.

To solve the problems of the city occasioned by the tremendous immigration from the rural areas will not be easy, but it can be done. The New York Times said in its editorial on "The Urban Crisis," "It is inconceivable that the immense resources of brains, money, science, and art that mark our time as clearly as does the urban crisis cannot be harnessed to solve it."

Some people who can do something about it are aware of the crisis in our cities. At a recent urban affairs seminar in Newark, N.J., leaders of the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., said they believed religious organizations must join in physical, social, and industrial planning. According to these leaders questions of traffic, building, parking, housing discrimination, and jobs challenge the church to do something about them.

President Kennedy recommended to Congress the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs. At the insistence of President Johnson, Congress recently enacted the antipoverty bill, which will be a beginning in providing job training for underprivileged young people and heads of families on relief and in stimulating the planning of antipoverty programs by urban and rural communities.

An unusual local program, envisioned by New York's Mobilization for Youth, recognized the need of community and political awareness by young slum dwellers. It tries to sharpen their awareness of problems in education, employment, and housing and to help them participate in community efforts.

"The solution to these problems," President Johnson has said, "does not rest on a massive program in Washington, nor can it rely solely on the strained resources of local authority. They require us to create new concepts of cooperation, a creative federalism, between the National Capital and the leaders of local communities." A realization that this is a job bigger than any one community was evidenced by a declaration of the Municipal Association of New Hampshire that "many of the towns in New Hampshire are not effective instruments of self-government" because "they simply do not have the fiscal resources nor the talents to support services." It urged regional planning and greater responsibility on the part of the State for welfare programs.

These are simply examples of the growing awareness of the urban crisis and of the existence of plans to cope with it. In every community there are probably individuals who recognize the dangers that face the city and faltering steps are being taken to solve the problems. But too often plans are dictated by expediency and seldom is a plan made in terms of the whole need. Piecemeal measures are not enough. To be effective plans require the cooperation of all groups in the community. Leadership is necessary, but the entire city must be made aware of the problems and must understand the need for action and the various alternatives and be capable of intelligent decision.

It is truly later than we think. The time for action is now. As Carlisle has said, "Nothing ever happens in this world but once. What I do now I do for all time. It is over and gone with all its eternity of solemn meaning."

Can an Employer Close His Plant?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial by Holmes Alexander which appeared in his recent syndicated column in papers throughout the Nation:

CAN AN EMPLOYER CLOSE HIS PLANT?

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Private enterprise will literally stand before the bar of justice in this same year that conservatism goes in judgment before the people.

The Supreme Court, which returns in October, has agreed to take up the celebrated Darlington case, which involves the right of an employer to go out of business and thereby cause unemployment.

Attorneys for the business interests and for the National Labor Relations Board are in for some hot weather skull sessions because this could be a landmark decision for the American economy. Having talked with persons on both sides, I am pierced with the arrows of their controversy. The NLRB says it is protecting workers' jobs from anti-union bias." The businessmen's lawyers contend that a firm should be allowed to

close its doors for any reason, including that of bias.

What's plain is that once the Federal Government can force one man to maintain a job for another man, we are coming very close to what Senator GOLDWATER has called a "controlled state." GOLDWATER is cosponsor of a Republican bill (S. 2744) that would legalize an industrialist's right to do what the NLRB says he cannot do. But the bill will undoubtedly languish in committee until after the November election, and the whole matter probably lies at the mercy of the Supreme Court, in which conservatives have little faith these days.

PLANT CLOSES

The Darlington Co. was a textile plant in South Carolina that was already losing money in 1956 when it also lost an election. The Textile Workers' Union won the right to organize the plant by an eight-vote margin (256 to 248), whereupon the stockholders by a much larger margin (134,911 shares to 3,774) decided to close the plant. They put up the machinery and other physical assets at public auction, and the firm ceased to exist.

The NLRB leaped into action with a complaint of "unfair labor practices." But from whom or what could the Labor Board extract "remedies" with which to pay the continuing wages of the disemployed workers or guarantee them new jobs? What corporation or person could be punished for this unfair practice?

Having decided that remedies were due and that punishment was required, the labor board set out to find culprits. It put the finger on Roger Milliken, who was president of both Darlington and the Deering-Milliken Co., the latter firm being a sales agent and stockholder of Darlington.

The concept of "single employer" emerged. Mr. Milliken and Deering-Milliken, as well as several other "affiliated" companies and many stockholders, were ordered to resume responsibility for paying wages and finding jobs for those who had lost them in the closure. After much litigation, the Circuit Court of Appeals ruled against the Labor Board. But the Supreme Court agreed to hear the case, and the GOP platform for 1964 came out in favor of a company's right-to-quit. These issues are at stake:

How far can the Labor Board, or any Government agency, venture into "mind-reading" an employer's motives? Few employers are without some "bias" against unions. Does previous prejudice cause a man to forfeit his right to make a future business decision?

In the Darlington case, as in ever-widening areas, citizens and corporations are leery of the long, strong arm of federalia.

Legislative Reapportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, two very incisive editorials on the matter of legislative reapportionment were published in the Evening Herald, of Rock Hill, S.C., on September 21, 1964. The editorials were written by the very able president and chief editor of that newspaper, Patrick Talbot. These two editorials, entitled, "Vital to Our Nation" and "A Threat to U.S. Senators," should be given careful study by all who are concerned with this far-reaching issue. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VITAL TO OUR NATION

Six weeks from tomorrow is the national election.

The result of that election may be less important for the future of the United States than what Congress does in the next several weeks. More particularly, what the U.S. Senate does.

Surprised?

We meant to catch your attention. And here are what we consider good reasons for the statements of the second paragraph above:

Regardless of whom the voters pick for the White House occupant—we hope for 4 years—a majority in each House of Congress is almost certain to remain Democratic. For the Republicans to gain control of the Senate, they would have to hold in the election 34 seats they have and take 17 out of 26 Democratic seats at stake. And to control the House of Representatives the Republicans would have to add 40 seats to the 178 they now have.

If GOLDWATER were elected President, the Congress thereafter would prevent him from doing many things he might like to do. If Johnson were elected President, a Congress whose Members have seen display of unexpected conservative strength across the Nation might well be more of a restraint on him than it was during his year as successor to President Kennedy.

Whoever is elected President, the Congress is going to continue much the same courses it has been following since it faced Republican President Eisenhower with Democratic majorities in both House and Senate. The courses of Congress after November 3, 1964, will be affected by the administration only to a degree; the Congress also can have strong effects on the administration's courses.

What's of even greater concern to us is what Congress will do in the next several weeks about membership in the legislature of the 50 States of our Nation.

The U.S. Supreme Court has ordered that all membership in a State legislature be solely on basis of equal representation of population. In accord with that decision, a U.S. Court of Appeals last week ordered Virginia to reapportion (and hold a new election) so that next January all members of both State house and senate be from districts to be new-formed later this year.

The decision of the U.S. Supreme Court was to right a wrong: the control in many States of the State senate by senators from low-population rural areas. But carrying out the Supreme Court order in the 50 States would bring another wrong: control of both houses of the legislature in many States by one big city or by a combination of several bigger cities, to the detriment of statewide considerations.

One State already has had proof through the years of need to consider state geography, problems of small-population areas, etc., in the legislature's composition. This State has had only one house, instead of two. The technical term is that it is unicameral, meaning it has had only one chamber.

When Nebraska went to one chamber, membership was set up strictly on population representation. And Nebraska redistricted after each 10-year national census. But, recently, experience led the legislature's membership and leaders of both political parties in the State to agree that legislative membership should be modified, so as to give more representation to low-population areas of the State.

By the U.S. Supreme Court rule, Nebraska will have to go back to what experience had already proved unsatisfactory: representation strictly on a population basis. Unless—unless Congress takes action within the next several weeks;

The U.S. House of Representatives has already passed and sent to the U.S. Senate a bill which would stop all Federal courts from enforcing the U.S. Supreme Court ruling. But in the Senate sentiment is more divided, less strongly expressed.

Senator DIRKSEN, the Republican leader, has worked out a wishy-washy compromise. We call it wishy-washy because it would only "express the sentiment of Congress" in a rider on the foreign aid bill that courts allow a year or two for adjustments to the Supreme Court order. The Dirksen plan would not allow a bill for limitation of the Court order.

The Senate should pass a bill with real guts.

A THREAT TO U.S. SENATORS

Even yet, some U.S. Senators fail to see far enough ahead to realize that the U.S. Supreme Court decision about State legislatures carries danger of eventual change of the U.S. Senate.

They count on two parts of the U.S. Constitution. In one place membership in the U.S. Senate is established as equal for each State. In another, there is statement that no State can be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate without its consent.

Hah, and also hunh.

The U.S. Constitution already has been changed repeatedly by amendments, through acts of Congress passed by at least two-thirds vote in each House followed by agreement of three-fourths of the States. Some folks add that U.S. Supreme Court decisions have also changed the Constitution.

So, suppose the legislatures are changed, as the Supreme Court has ordered. Then we'll see most of the States with biggest populations controlled by the biggest population groups, that is to say in each State by one big city or by a combination of several big cities.

These States controlled by big cities thereafter will control each political party. The national administration and the U.S. House of Representatives will represent the big city controls. Over a period of time, appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court will reflect that same big city control.

Does any realistic U.S. Senator deny that in time this would bring an end to the U.S. Senate as it is now made up? The States of big populations, controlled by big cities, would force an eventual U.S. Senate membership based solely on population.

That would be mighty bad for this Nation of ours, and for the people living in it.

Remarks of Hon. Walter F. Mondale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in a speech yesterday, the attorney general of my State of Minnesota, Walter F. Mondale, pointed to another one of the examples of how difficult it is to understand the position of the Republican nominee for President.

The following excerpt from Attorney General Mondale's speech clearly shows how BARRY GOLDWATER has either

changed his position on farm policy or is engaging in some very confusing campaign rhetoric:

EXTRACT OF REMARKS OF HON. WALTER F. MONDALE, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MINNESOTA, SIGMA DELTA CHI DINNER, ST. PAUL, MINN., SEPTEMBER 23, 1964

I am sure all of our farmers were much relieved that the temporary spokesman for the Republican Party clarified his farm program at Plowville by saying that under his administration, "Nothing would be done to bring disaster suddenly upon you."

GOLDWATER'S stated preference for slow, rather than sudden disaster, represents quite a movement from his previously expressed position in "Conscience of a Conservative" where he advocated "prompt and final termination" of all Federal farm programs. This, of course, would necessarily mean prompt and final termination of most farm families.

Now maybe GOLDWATER did not mean slow disaster, at Plowville. Maybe he meant disaster only for some, or disaster for all, but at some future date which will be kept secret until the election.

However, I would think that (unless GOLDWATER'S press secretary tells us in a week or so what he actually meant at Plowville) those farmers who prefer no disaster to slow disaster will vote this November for Lyndon Johnson and HUBERT HUMPHREY.

Editor of "Tactics" Expresses Apprehension and Concern Over Content of Warren Commission Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the President's Commission To Report Upon the Assassination of President Kennedy is about to release its long-awaited findings and conclusions.

It is my firm conviction that the Warren Commission, being a political body, is not in a position to render an independent judgment as to the fundamental causes which brought about the tragic assassination of President Kennedy. The political pressures to which the Commission must pay heed will, I am sure, prevent it from reaching a final decision that will properly and completely disclose the Communist influences and motivations in Lee Harvey Oswald's assassination of President Kennedy.

Mr. Edward Hunter, a highly respected and knowledgeable anti-Communist writer and lecturer, is the editor of "Tactics." I have found "Tactics" to be an unusually well-researched publication, worthy of the attention of anyone who is interested in sharp, concise analyses of the strategies, tactics, operations, and objectives of the world Communist movement.

In the June 20, 1964 edition of "Tactics," Mr. Hunter addresses himself to the forthcoming publication of the Warren Commission report:

Mr. Hunter's article follows:

THE WARREN REPORT—I WON'T BE ABLE TO TRUST IT

(By Edward Hunter)

I am sincerely sorry, but I will be unable to put my faith in the Warren Commission's report on the slaying of President John F. Kennedy. Far too many weighty causes for doubt exist for me to put my trust in it. I cannot erase these points from my mind:

1. Chief Justice Earl Warren of the Supreme Court has practically never during his long tenure there adjudicated a case, in which the Communists had a vital interest, in a manner that conflicted with their stand. I can hardly believe he will be capable of doing so now, or will not use his tremendous influence to prevent it from being done. Whether this is a psychological or a politically opportunistic state of mind is immaterial to the result.

2. Under Chief Justice Warren's guidance, the Supreme Court has placed social studies along with or ahead of legal precedents as the basis for decisions, sometimes making them completely legislative rather than judicial in nature. The attitude cannot give me any confidence that he will be able to suddenly switch and make his findings in accordance to the traditional, legal approach. He permits other elements to enter, and whether he realizes this or not, this is a controlled, Marxism way of passing judgment. Facts are tampered with by selection or omission in such a framework.

WARREN HAS ALREADY PREJUDGED THE CASE

3. Justice Warren prejudged the case at the start on at least two occasions, in effect absolving the Communists and pinning the guilt upon so-called extremists and bigots in doubletalk that shockingly, for a jurist in particular, went counter to the obvious facts and smeared conservatives and old-time liberals as guilty in some mystic, collective manner. This, too, is a Marxist approach, utterly contrary to the philosophy of the dignity of man and his freedom as an individual. A jurist has the responsibility to avoid any such slant.

4. I have never know the Communists to urge something of national importance that they were not sure would rebound to their favor. They had a very special interest in this case because of the Marxist, pro-Communist motivation of the killer. They recommended Justice Warren for the post he now holds before he was given it. Knowing the subtle and often crude ramifications by which they are able to exert influence inside the Washington administration, I cannot feel sure that this recommendation was without at least clandestine and indirect impact.

5. The curious selection of a man connected through many years with organizations cited as pro-Communist and Communist, and the stubborn retention of him as a consultant, cannot be explained away. Those on the Warren Commission well understand the facts of life on such matters, and surely did not pick Norman Redlich by mere chance. If they did, and blundered so completely on so simple a matter, how can they expect their judgment to be trusted on so tremendous a case as the assassination of the President? If they picked him knowing his record, the same question arises even more.

COMMISSION IS LOADED WITH ANTI-ANTI-COMMUNISTS

6. The Warren Commission is for the most part a loaded commission, packed with men who are belligerently anti-anti-Communist. This outlook can hardly fail to determine whatever conclusions they reach, and how. Their state of mind, of course, will determine what material they regard as worthy of consideration and even inclusion. The anti-anti-Communist propaganda climate has created a pathological condition in false "liberal" circles, so much so that if the killer had been linked in any manner to so-called rightists, television would have been successful in signaling a virtual pogrom or purge of leading conservatives. Such "liberals" dominate the Warren Commission.

7. The manner in which the Commission was named, and its composition, neatly conform to the supposed need in our relations and negotiations with Moscow. Immediately upon learning of the attack, the State Department exerted pressure upon the press not to involve communism, thus leaving the propaganda field open by default to accusations basely made against anti-Communists and the right or conservative segment in American life.

8. At once upon receiving news of the assault, the State Department file on Lee Harvey Oswald was removed by an official there, and knowledgeable informants declare it has not been put back. The State Department's involvement by providing the money with which to bring Oswald back to the United States has been virtually ignored.

9. Considering Oswald's renunciation of his allegiance to the United States and his treasonable actions in the U.S.S.R., and his probable link to the Red network, the CIA and later the FBI would have been remiss if they had not contacted him in one way or another, for their own purposes, in order to discredit him with the enemy, and to find out all they could. This could easily be exaggerated wholly out of proportion in the present propaganda climate, with only a hint needed, giving an utterly untrue impression, through the one-sided misinterpretation of news fed to the public these days by the prestige press and radio-TV. I obviously have no way of knowing whether any such contact was made, but the type of propaganda being produced by Red and so-called peace organs makes this a matter that cannot be intelligently ignored. The Reds are obviously out to befuddle the issue permanently, if they cannot affix the blame to the rightists, as they sought in the beginning in the United States. They still, incidentally, are taking this line in many areas abroad.

10. Sadly, while "managed news" remains the administration's policy, it is impossible to know what can be believed. How is a Senator or Congressman, much more a citizen, to tell a falsehood from the truth, when Government policy still is the "speaking with one voice" line instituted by the Kennedys? The sooner this situation were cleared up by complete abandonment of this policy that admits falsehood, the better for all Americans. The Warren Commission of course is part of this picture, as it is an executive agency, not a Congressional one, as would have been proper and as was expected.

CONGRESS MAY HAVE TO MAKE ITS OWN INQUIRY

The composition of what is in effect an executive committee of inquiry is unfortunate. The first news I heard of the creation of the Warren Commission was by a television newscast. The commentator seemed to look his viewers in the eye and proclaim in a bland manner that the Commission was so composed that there was no question but that every American citizen would regard it as wholly fair and unbiased, and accept its findings unquetioningly. This was too much like big brother telling me, for one, how I must think, and I frankly knew differently, because of the grave doubts that had been raised for some time regarding Earl Warren's stewardship of the Supreme Court. Surely the commentator had heard about these opposing forces, and for him to say that all the people would automatically accept the appointments made as the best possible and utterly trustworthy, without any political connotation to them, was simply another attempt to manage the news to

manage the people's thinking. The time has come for this approach to cease.

The American public was promised by the new President that the FBI would have a report ready within a very short time, and that this would at once be made public. This promise was not kept. The people have the right to expect that their elected officials—their servants—keep their promises to them. The tendency has been in both political parties too long now to make promises for immediate political purposes, and to ignore them or go completely contrary to them later on. This can only be damaging to a democratic, republican system of free government.

The news media also disclosed that the Congress was prepared to immediately conduct an inquiry into all phases of the Kennedy assassination, by a completely bipartisan committee of Congressmen and Senators. Quickly, to extinguish this effort, the Warren Commission was named.

This editor, for one, anticipates that Congress must prepare to be faced again with the need and responsibility to make this sort of inquiry. Much time has been lost, but I, for one, wish my Congress as the elected representatives of all the people to make up its own mind regarding this, and be sure to act as promptly as possible, once the Warren Commission makes its findings public, or as much of them as it decides to reveal to the people.

Inefficient and Wasteful Practices of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of Senators an interesting—but disturbing—article, by the Associated Press, which summarizes some of the inefficient and wasteful practices of this bureaucratic Government. The article, entitled "General Accounting Office: Taxpayers' Watchdog," which was published in the Columbia Record on August 27, 1964, cites several examples of waste and extravagance which have been found by the General Accounting Office. The General Accounting Office does an excellent job of disclosing these practices, but it is up to Congress to bring an end to them.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE: TAXPAYERS' WATCHDOG

(By Bem Price)

WASHINGTON.—You brag in this town at your own peril.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara held a news conference July 7 to announce his cost reduction program has saved $2.5 billion last year.

Since then there have been 28 reports—little noticed for the most part—by the General Accounting Office pointing out where it said the Defense Department should have saved even more.

The GAO accountants also produced three additional reports pointing out where what they called sloppy supervision on the part of commanders had reduced the combat efficiency of four spot-checked units, including an antiaircraft-missile base.

After examining 66 armored personnel carriers and cargo trucks belonging to the 30th Infantry Regiment in Germany, the GAO found 216 major defects and 2,300 less serious ones.

The GAO checked out the maintenance on the reconnaissance and liaison aircraft of the 1st and 2d Armored Divisions at Fort Hood, Tex., and found it so poor that "the combat readiness of these divisions was impaired."

Poor maintenance, said the GAO, was the primary factor in the crash and total loss of a $200,000 aircraft.

At an unidentified antiaircraft missile base somewhere overseas, the GAO reported the management of spare parts was so inefficient that $30 million worth of missile gear was inoperable.

As for the other GAO reports, they include such findings as these:

The Army wasted $1.3 million buying utility caps which cost $1.08 each and required special laundering, whereas the Marines and Seabees were buying 57-cent utility caps which could be washed under any circumstances.

At the U.S. Army Engineer depot just outside Seoul, Korea, was $376,000 worth of unneeded spare parts and the depot was in the process of ordering $101,000 more stock it didn't need.

Further, the Korean depot had suffered a $12.6-million inventory loss which it hadn't investigated.

The Air Force was in the process of spending $424,000 over a 5-year period by leasing electronic data processing equipment at its Tullahoma, Tenn., development center which could have been saved by buying the equipment.

The Air Force and the Army spent $441,000 in 1962 leasing teletype circuits and equipment they didn't need.

The Navy spent $13.3 million on rocket packs for the Crusader airplane which had a limited capability and could have saved $4 million of additional procurement costs if somebody in the upper echelons had been told in time.

The Army and Navy spent $245,950 for petroleum storage around Los Angeles, storage they either didn't need to meet mobilization requirements or had available on Government property.

The Federal Government was charged more than $2 million in unnecessary travel costs by military and civilian personnel of the Defense Department who were permitted to use private modes of travel.

At five military installations there were 505 commercial-type heavy trucks which were surplus to needs—about one in six—which cost $589,000.

The Navy's failure to terminate orders for excess jet engine parts when it was evident no more were needed, resulted in the loss to the Government of $310,000.

The Navy spent $2,329,000 on 333 receiver-transmitters "although it already had sufficient stocks on hand."

The Defense Department spent $5 million moving the household goods of defense personnel "because of overstated weights used by carriers in billing charges."

At Fort Rucker, Ala., the Army had 220 helicopters, worth $6.5 million, which were grounded "up to 60 percent of the time for lack of serviceable engines."

The Air Force had to dispose of $137,000 worth of photographic supplies at the Atlantic Missile Range because of shelf deterioration.

The Air Force spent $825,000 completing a $4 million rocket propellent plant "which couldn't be used as planned."

The Air Force spent $700,000 repairing airplane spare parts when it would have been cheaper to buy new ones.

The Army spent $269,000 buying unneeded special tooling for utility truck engine spares.

The Navy is spending $191,000 on off-post quarters allowances for personnel at its Oakland, Calif., hospital when on-post housing is available.

And, finally, the GAO reported:

"The Government has incurred unnecessary costs we estimated to be over $7.2 million because the Army rebuilt tracks for tanks instead of procuring new ones.

"When the rebuilt track was installed on tanks, the tanks experienced premature failures, creating safety hazards to personnel and impairing the combat effectiveness of the Army."

The GAO said the Army spent $12.5 million rebuilding tank tracks when new ones would have cost $5.3 million.

Report to the Voters of the 12th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the work of the 88th Congress is drawing to an end. Begun on a note of hope, brought to a standstill by the great tragedy which befell our Nation, it ends on a sense of legislative fulfillment. While the world is still beset by many problems and crises, and while the shadow of conflict still hangs above several areas of the world, particularly southeast Asia, the immediate tasks which faced this Congress have been accomplished. The legislative program has been enacted. The urgent needs of our Nation, and the requirements of the cause of freedom, are being met.

In every sense the accomplishments of the 88th Congress have already won it a prestige place in our Nation's history.

In retrospect, the achievements of this Congress bear the special imprint of two great men: the late President John F. Kennedy and President Lyndon B. Johnson. The spirit and vision of the former, and the patient, untiring work and ability of the latter, combined to make the record of this Congress truly remarkable.

In his final state of the Union message, delivered to the Congress on January 14, 1963, President Kennedy outlined the tasks to which we, the people's representatives in this great legislative body, have devoted our energies during the past 2 years.

The time has come—

He told us on that memorable day—

to translate the renewal of our national strength into the achievements of our national purpose.

He went on to propose a legislative program to improve the opportunities and the well-being of the American people, and to strengthen our Nation, by investing in our youth, by safeguarding the health of the Nation, by protecting the basic rights of our citizens, by promoting economic growth, and by making the

best and most economical use of our resources and facilities.

We must do these things, he said, "for we cannot lead for long the cause of peace and freedom, if we ever cease to set the pace at home."

President Kennedy's program did not, however, concern itself solely with domestic issues. Pointing to the world beyond our borders, he spoke of the need to maintain the frontiers of freedom, to concert the political and economic policies of the North Atlantic Alliance, to expand world trade, to aid the emergent nation, and to continue steady progress in building a "world of order."

In presenting his legislative program to the Congress, President Kennedy did not promise any easy solutions to the problems confronting the United States at home and on the world scene. He pledged—and asked—only toil and dedication. And these the Congress has given in good measure.

The record of the 88th Congress bears also the imprint of another great leader—President Lyndon B. Johnson. When the tragic assassination of President Kennedy shifted the burdens of the Executive Office to his shoulders, he pledged himself during the remainder of the current term of office to dedicate his efforts to the attainment of President Kennedy's program. He has directed his tremendous energy to this task. And the record of the 88th Congress serves in large part as a tribute to his dedication, his ability, and the success of his efforts.

The legislation which highlighted the record of the first session of the 88th Congress included appropriations for the defense and national security of the United States. This was for foreign assistance; expansion of the Peace Corps; satisfaction of World War II claims; extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; repair and construction of foreign service buildings; extension of the arms control and disarmament program which has been responsible for the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and the "hot line" between Washington and Moscow; continuation of National Aeronautics and Space Administration research; and extension of the Export-Import Bank.

A trailblazing parade of education bills became law, including the Higher Education Facilities Act; legislation providing vocational education; health professions educational assistance in the form of expanded teaching and research facilities and student loans; maternal and child health services, including crippled children's programs and research projects to prevent mental retardation; and the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act.

The opportunities and well-being of our citizens were improved by the equal pay law providing equal pay for equal work for women; extension of the housing for the elderly program; a law governing air pollution control; extension of the Civil Rights Commission; increase of the library services and construction program; the Manpower Development and Training Act; and veterans' legislation.

Legislation enacted during the second session of the 88th Congress was the most creative passed by any Congress in recent history. I will report briefly on the bills of major importance. Complete information on any law can be obtained by writing to me at my Washington office.

Defense spending was again the largest budgetary item, which includes procurement of military materiel; research and development; cost of military personnel; maintenance and operation of the Military Establishment, the Department of Defense, and money for the Reserve officers; military construction; and military assistance.

Laws enacted for our servicemen and veterans are: Increase of 2.5 percent in basic pay for all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel of the uniformed services with more than 2 years of service—since the pay scale for commissioned and warrant officers with less than 2 years of service had not been increased since 1952, Congress provided them an 8.5 percent increase—educational assistance was extended to children of veterans with total and permanent service-connected disability; extended disability income provisions of National Service Life Insurance policies through age 65 under certain conditions; exempted from draft sole surviving son of family whose father died as result of military service; assistance to States on matching basis for nursing home facilities of State veteran homes; raised authorized strength of Cadet Corps of U.S. Military and Air Force Academies and fixed period of obligative service at 5 years.

The Economic Opportunity Act, the so-called war on poverty bill, establishes a job corps for out-of-school and out-of-work youth, ages 16 through 21, offering opportunities for education, vocational training, recreation and physical training; establishes work-training programs designed to give unemployed young men and women from 16 to 21 training experience not now available, to enable them to acquire new skills and work habits, thereby increasing their employability. Counseling and job placement will be provided. College work-study programs are created, designed to provide basic financial assistance through part-time employment for needy and potential college students. Part-time work opportunities will be provided for more than 140,000 students from low-income families per year. Urban and rural community action programs will be conducted in the fields of employment, job training and counseling, health, vocational rehabilitation, housing, home, management, welfare, and special remedial educational assistance, to provide assistance to all poor people in a community without discrimination.

The Urban Mass Transportation Act provides for more modern mass transit within our communities and low-cost transportation between them. The act establishes a program of Federal loans and partial grants for needed equipment for the extension and improvement of urban mass transportation systems and provides for an adequate relocation program for families displaced by each project, as well as fair and equitable arrangements to protect the interests of affected transit employees.

Certain excise tax rates were extended for 1 year, in order to allow the House Committee on Ways and Means to complete its careful and comprehensive hearings into our entire excise tax structure.

The Interest Equalization Tax Act is a temporary excise tax effective for the period July 19, 1963, through December 31, 1965. The tax is designed to aid our balance-of-payments position by restraining the heavy and accelerated demand on our capital market from other industrialized countries.

Salary increases were given to all Federal employees in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government, ranging from 5 percent to 22½ percent. This is necessary in order to attract young people and to encourage them to seek public office.

The Housing Act was extended for 1 year. It provided $725 million for urban renewal; permits 37,500 new public housing units; raises to $30,000 the mortgage insurance limit on one-family FHA homes; grants broader lending authority to banks; establishes a new $50 million program to induce property owners to rehabilitate slum properties; authorizes 20-year loans at 3 percent interest to owners and tenants of property in urban renewal areas: up to $10,000 for homes and $50,000 for nonresidential property; establishes $150 million for direct farm housing loans; $75 million for direct housing loans for the elderly; $30 million for urban planning assistance in renewal areas; $25 million for grants to help in purchase of park lands and open space areas; $10 million for a new program of low-rent housing for migrant farmworkers; and finally, sets up relocation payments up to $1,500 for each business, and a rent supplement for families paid over a period of 5 months, for residents and businesses displaced by urban renewal.

The Renegotiation Act was extended for 2 years. It permits the Committee on Ways and Means to review the renegotiation process. It extends the application of this act to contracts entered into by the Federal Aviation Agency, and related subcontracts, in order to recover excess profits and continue present review of contracts of defense agencies.

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1964 is the regular 2-year authorization for the so-called A–B–C system, which means primary roads, secondary roads, and extension of these roads to urban areas. It also authorizes funds for roads in national parks and forests, and public lands. Congress authorized $1 billion for fiscal 1966 and 1 billion for fiscal 1967 for the A–B–C system—broken down 45 percent for the primary system, 30 percent for the secondary, and 25 percent for the extension within urban areas.

The Civil Rights Act provides for the enforcement of the inherent rights of all persons by all the States of these United States and its subsidiaries. These rights have too long been denied. It provides for the appointment of a three-judge district court in voting suits and for the ex-

peditious determination of such suits, and also provides against the discriminatory use of literacy tests in Federal elections; prohibits discrimination in enumerated public establishments; authorizes the Attorney General to initiate suits to desegregate public facilities, other than public schools, and to intervene in suits charging deprivation of equal protection of the laws; authorizes the Attorney General to initiate suits to desegregate public schools; makes the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency; prohibits discrimination in any Federal financial assistance program; establishes a Federal Equal Employment Commission designed to eliminate discriminatory employment practices by business, labor unions or employment agencies; provides for the compilation of registration and voting statistics by race, color, and national origin; makes a remand of a civil rights case from a Federal court back to a State court reviewable on appeal.

The Securities Acts Amendments of 1964 amends the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; extends to issuers of securities traded in over-the-counter markets, where the issuers have over $1 million in total assets and 750 stockholders of record—reduced to 500 over 2 years—the same requirements that now apply to issuers of securities which are listed on an exchange; namely, registration, periodic reporting and financial statement must accompany proxy solicitation. Certain classes of securities are exempted from these requirements: building and loan associations; charitable, educational, and religious institutions; securities of stock insurance companies may become exempt if under State law or regulation there are comparable requirements. The bill also strengthens the regulation of over-the-counter broker-dealers, including qualifications standards and disciplinary controls.

The Hospital and Medical Facilities Amendment of 1964 extended the Hill-Burton hospital construction program for 5 years, authorizing appropriations for grants for the construction of public or nonprofit hospitals and public health centers; diagnostic or treatment centers; hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired; rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes. It permits appropriations for construction and modernization of hospitals ranging from $150 million for fiscal year 1965 through $180 million annually for the last 2 years of the program. Of these amounts, $20 million is specifically earmarked for modernization in fiscal 1966, $35 million in 1967, $50 million in 1968, and $55 million in 1969. This law permits the States to transfer sums from the modernization category to new construction, in amounts which, when added to other funds appropriated for new construction, will not exceed in the aggregate $150 million for new construction in any fiscal year. The law consolidates nursing home and chronic disease categories and increases the combined authorization by $30 million (to $70 million) in fiscal 1965. It adds grants for areawide health facility planning in metropolitan and other areas ($2.5 million in fiscal 1965 and $5 million in each of the next 4 years, with 50–50 Federal-State matching). The bill permits States to use 2 percent of their allotments—not to exceed $50,000 a year—for State administration of the construction program, on a 50–50 matching basis. The Hill-Burton program is a milestone in successful Federal, State, and local grant-in-aid programs. Its success can be measured by the network of modern and efficient hospitals which have been built throughout the United States. As of June 30, 1963, these projects had produced 289,489 general, mental, tuberculosis, and long-term care beds, and helped construct 1,522 rehabilitation centers, public health centers, diagnostic and treatment centers, and other health laboratories. It has had a marked effect in raising State licensing standards and in improving the design, maintenance, and operation of health facilities in every State. It has helped attract vitally needed physicians and other health specialists to rural areas.

The Nurses Training Act establishes a 5-year program to combat the shortage of nurses, which includes grants for construction and rebuilding of collegiate and associate degree or diploma schools of nursing; traineeships for advanced training of professional nurses; and a student loan program.

The Graduate Public Health Training Act continues for 5 years programs for traineeships to increase number of professional public health personnel and expand health project grants to schools of medicine, dentistry, engineering, social work, and pharmacy.

The 88th Congress has a notable record in the field of conservation. The Wilderness Act represents a decade of effort to keep part of our country in the primeval state our pioneers saw; the law protects 9,200,000 acres in 13 States and provides for adding another 5,500,000 acres over the next 10 years. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was a companion piece of legislation; this law establishes for the first time a permanent fund of $2 billion in the next decade to finance the acquisition and development of land to be used for recreation and for new wildlife refuges. The fund is derived from the proceeds of the existing tax on motorboat fuels and from admission and user fees to be paid by those who use camping sites and other facilities on Government-owned land. It underscores the interdependence of conservation and recreation—a balance can be had between developing some of our outdoor areas for sports and recreation and still maintaining other areas as wilderness and as game and bird refuges. Congress also passed the Ozark national scenic riverways bill, which saved the beautiful Current River and its tributary, Jacks Fork, in southern Missouri, from exploitation. Another law established the Canyon Lands National Park in the magnificent mountain country of southern Utah. Most important of all was the establishment of the Fire Island National Seashore, the first such park in the State of New York.

Congress initiated two special commissions—one, a National Commission on Automation and Technological Progress which will undertake a study of current and future trends of automation, technology and economic progress. The other, the National Commission on Food Marketing, will make a thorough study of the food industry from the farm to the consumer.

The National Defense Education Act Amendments extend, expand, increase, and revise the program for 3 years; more graduate fellowships are provided, as well as counseling, guidance, and testing services; it will strengthen Federal support of language development and increase training opportunities under a program of grants for training institutes for certain teachers, library personnel, and guidance and counseling personnel. The amendments provide for a considerable expansion of the title 3 program of equipment grants. Presently such grants may only be given for equipment used in the teaching of science, mathematics, and modern foreign language. This will be expanded to include history, geography, English, reading, and civics.

Public Law 480 deals with the vast agricultural surpluses owned by the American people, including you, my constituents. I supported a 3-year extension of this program, but with reluctance, because it needs vast revision. It is so costly to us that the more than $1 billion saved by this administration, including defense moneys, has been wiped out.

Foreign service annuities were adjusted to improve the pensions of the widows of retired Foreign Service officers, and also provided a small annual income to a few widows whose husbands were unable to provide a pension for them.

Two most important bills are presently tied up because of technical difficulties. It is hoped the outcome of this legislation will be solved before Congress adjourns. One, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964, which emerged from the Foreign Affairs Committee after 3 months of intensive study. It is remarkable for at least three reasons: First, the $3.5 billion program it proposed was the tightest, the most modest, and perhaps the most realistic authorization in years. Second, the principle of selectivity—of concentrating our aid in those countries which are showing the will and the determination to help themselves—is strongly reflected in this legislation. And, third, the bulk of the money which this bill provides will go to those countries—from Greece to Korea—which are on the firing line in the great conflict between communism and freedom. These countries need and deserve our help. They are the first to bear the brunt of Communist expansion. I supported this program because I believe that it is necessary for our national and free world security. It will also carry us a step closer to the goal we all seek; the goal of a free and secure world in which all men of good will can have the opportunity to strive to realize their hopes and dreams of a better life. We must continue to seek this goal. We must seek it for ourselves and for our children.

The other is social security amendments to increase benefits to retired workers, widows, and the disabled; raise

the wage base for social security tax; and reduce the age limit for widows' benefits from 62 to 60 years. Medical care for the aged was added to this bill in the Senate. The bill is now in conference.

One of the resolutions passed unanimously by both Houses of Congress bears my name. I admit bipartisan action and support of all Members was needed to make this record. This resolution expressed the sense of Congress that the President should direct the Permanent U.S. Delegate to the United Nations to continue efforts toward securing payment by members of the United Nations of their assessments in arrears. The resolution states it is further the sense of the Congress that if, upon the convening of the 19th General Assembly, the arrears of any member of the United Nations equals or exceeds the amount of the contribution due from it for the preceding 2 full years, the President should direct the Permanent U.S. Delegate to make every effort to assure invocation of the penalty provisions of article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations. The importance of this resolution should not be underestimated. It strengthens the purpose of the United Nations. It strengthens the policy of the United States—through our Ambassador Stevenson at the United Nations—to seek to establish the United Nations on a sound financial basis and ultimately helps in the establishment of "negotiable" differences between nations by peaceful means, not war.

It is an honor and privilege to serve you as your Representative in Congress. I want you to know that personal attention is given to any and all problems sent to me. If I can be of assistance to you at any time on the Federal level, please do not hesitate to write to me at my Washington office.

Resolution at the Sixth Convention of the Byelorussians of North America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolution adopted at the Sixth Convention of the Byelorussians of North America, held under the theme of "Twenty Years in the Free World" in New Brunswick, N.J., on September 6, 1964.

This resolution expresses the thinking of all Americans, and certainly all free men, with regard to the evil Communist policy of economic exploitation and denial of political, religious, and other freedoms within the captive nations.

The need for freedom and self-determination for these peoples is as clearly manifest today as it has been at any time during Communist and Russian imperialist rule of this area, and certainly the United States should continue to work toward freedom and self-determination for these brave people and others behind the Iron Curtain.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE SIXTH CONVENTION OF BYELORUSSIANS OF NORTH AMERICA

1. As a result of World War II and the second occupation of Byelorussia by the Bolsheviks in 1944, great numbers of Byelorussians found themselves in the West. Some of them, fearing an unknown and uncertain future in foreign countries, returned to their homeland after the end of the war. Others were forcibly repatriated. Still others chose the unenviable path of political emigration. This emigration, and particularly its ideological and national leadership, dedicated itself to the task of continuing abroad the activity for national liberation which it was unable to pursue in its enslaved homeland. It undertook to develop, strengthen, and conduct propaganda in the free world for the idea of the act of March 25, 1918—the idea of a free and independent Byelorussia, which had been trampled and dishonored by the Bolshevik occupant.

2. In the free world, the Byelorussian emigration has encountered the sympathetic and friendly response of the democratic nations and people among whom destiny had brought them to live and to work. Throughout the free world, and above all in the United States and Canada, where the largest numbers of Byelorussian emigrees are concentrated, there has been a steady and satisfactory development of Byelorussian organizational life, cultural activities such as schools of Byelorussian studies and the publication of newspapers and books, religious life and political activity. Everyone here enjoys full cultural autonomy, while every trace of such autonomy has been eradicated on Byelorussian territories not included in the B.S.S.R., and also in Siberia and the virgin lands of Kazakhstan, where many thousands of Byelorussians have been deported.

3. In the area of political activity and the popularization among the peoples of the free world of the Byelorussian cause of national liberation, the achievements of the Byelorussian emigration for the past 20 years have been very substantial. The governments and political forces of the West, which had formerly been poorly informed concerning the problem of national liberation of the Byelorussian people, are today—chiefly thanks to the activity of the emigrees—aware of us, sympathetic toward our plight, and support us politically and morally.

4. With every passing year, the emigrees' work for national liberation reaches deeper through various channels across the Iron Curtain into enslaved Byelorussia, and strengthens our people's hopes for liberation. This is why the Soviet Union, which carefully ignored the existence and activities of the Byelorussian political emigration during the early postwar years, has in the last few years been compelled to speak of them openly. The Soviet Union seeks to besmirch the Byelorussian emigration morally and to compromise it politically in the eyes of the Byelorussian people and the Western World, representing it as a clique of unprincipled careerists and venal agents of American intelligence. However, no Soviet provocations or diversions, and none of the slanderous vilifications aimed at the emigree leadership, have accomplished their purpose.

5. While the Byelorussian emigration in the free world has every opportunity to carry on its national activity in all areas of public life, the yoke of slavery continues to strangle our freedom-loving people. Our people continue to suffer from economic exploitation, social injustice and unheard of mockery over the faith of its forebears. It is deprived of basic political rights and opportunities for free national development. Systematic Russification, especially in the field of language, national discrimination, and the resettlement of Byelorussian families and youth on the virgin lands of Kazakhstan and Siberia are aimed, by gradually undermining the Byelorussian national potential, at the eradication of the Byelorussians as a nation.

6. But ruthless oppression, moral, and physical terror and national discrimination cannot break the spirit of freedom alive in the Byelorussian people, or to quench its unshakable striving for liberation and full development as a national entity. The Byelorussian's devotion to, and love of, his national tradition, culture, and native tongue not only have not weakened, but are steadily growing stronger and prompting the most resolute resistance to Russification. This resistance is so great among the people, and particularly among the national intelligentsia—writers, leaders in every cultural area, teachers and student youth—that none of the measures employed by the Bolsheviks have been able, or shall be able, to crush it.

On the basis of all we have outlined above, we, the Byelorussians of North America, assembled at our Sixth Convention on September 5–7, in the city of New Brunswick, N.J.: Proclaim to our people at home and to the free world, that:

1. We condemn the criminal Russian Communist policy in Byelorussia, a policy of economic exploitation, political, national and religious suppression, and Russification.

2. We bow our heads before the glorious memory of the many thousands of sons of the Byelorussian people who have given their lives in the fight against communism, and we voice our admiration for, and gratitude to, all who unflinchingly carry on this fight for liberation in our enslaved, but unvanquished, homeland.

3. We express our deep appreciation to the American and Canadian peoples who, prompted by humanitarian sentiments and fulfilling the principles of democracy, have given our emigration asylum and equal civil rights.

4. As United States and Canadian citizens who loyally fulfill our duties to the United States and Canada, we appeal to the President of the United States, the Governments of the United States and Canada, and the Members of the U.S. Congress and the Canadian Parliament to champion and support the Byelorussian people's struggle for national liberation both in domestic and foreign policies, in full consonance with the traditional observance and active support by both countries of the idea of freedom and independence of all the peoples of the world.

5. Today, on the 20th anniversary of the beginning of our life in the free world, we offer a solemn vow that we shall not cease our struggle for national liberation until the ideas of freedom and independence, proclaimed by the Council of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic in the act of March 25, 1918, are fully achieved and realized.

STANISLAU STANKEVICH,
Chairman of the Convention.

Captive Nations

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I, too, want to commend my colleague from Indiana for the statement he is making. I am in complete sympathy with it. For a long time I have thought we ought to go into this whole matter of the captive nations very thoroughly and exhaustively and do everything we could to hold out the hope they have a right to expect and to help them in that respect.

Again, I congratulate the gentleman and appreciate very much the statement he has made.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman.

U.S. Marshal Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 175th anniversary of the enactment of the Judiciary Act of 1789, which provided for the appointment of U.S. Marshals for each of the 13 newly created Federal judicial districts.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the proclamation issued by the President making today, September 24, 1964, U.S. Marshal Day:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL DAY—BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
A PROCLAMATION

September 24, 1964, marks the 175th anniversary of the enactment of the Judiciary Act of 1789, which provided for the appointment of United States marshals for each of the 13 newly created Federal judicial districts. The contribution of the United States marshals and their staffs to the development of the Federal judicial system is now a legend in the annals of our country. Their role in establishing the rule of law throughout the length and breadth of this Nation, including the new territories where some recognized no authority other than raw courage, is inscribed in history and enshrined in our national folklore. First in establishing the authority of the new Federal Government, and thereafter in performing a central function in Federal law enforcement, the United States marshal has become a foremost symbol and servant of the law.

The marshal's duties have changed with the times. Some of the services once performed by marshals have now been reassigned to specialized agencies. However, the importance of the marshal's position as an indispensable arm of our judicial system remains undiminished. Throughout the changes which have characterized this country's rise from a young republic to the foremost power in this world, the marshal has always performed with steadfast dedication, competency, and inspiration. Over the past century and three-quarters, the marshal's star has symbolized a tradition of service and courage; it has shone with the gleam of constancy and integrity in the performance of duty.

On this the 175th anniversary of the establishment of that service, it is fit and appropriate that a grateful Nation acknowledge and extol the distinguished record of our United States marshals, past and present, and of their deputies, special deputies, and other staff assistants. To them all we owe special recognition and commendation.

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Thursday, September 24, 1964, as "United States Marshal Day," and I call upon the Federal courts, Federal departments and agencies, bar associations, and other civic groups, and members of the bar and other interested individuals to plan and participate in appropriate ceremonies and activities providing public recognition for the 175 years of devoted public service performed by United States marshals and their staffs.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 18th day of August in the year of our Lord 1964, and of the independence of the United States of America the 189th.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

[SEAL]
By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

Goldwater Does the Nation a Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the September 22, 1964, issue of the Christian Science Monitor points out how Senator BARRY GOLDWATER is pointing out the dangers of continuing expansion of Federal power and calls on President Johnson to face up and debate the issue. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial:

CAMPAIGN ISSUES—FEDERAL GOVERNMENT: HOW BIG IS TOO BIG?

In recent decades the role of the Federal Government has grown from that of governing a predominantly rural society to that of presiding over a highly industrialized and exceedingly complex commonwealth. The demands of a blissfully isolated Nation have given way to the immense responsibilities of world leadership and of peacekeeping in an era of great turbulence.

Few would question the need for vastly expanded governmental functions today. Since 1932 the national consensus has gone along with the proliferating of Government. For this very reason Senator GOLDWATER has done the Nation a service in spotlighting the continuing expansion of Federal power. There is a danger of too much power being centralized in Washington. There is danger of too much intrusion by Government into the affairs of the individual. There is need for careful scrutiny of governmental trends.

To some extent the danger is inherent in the nature of political power. Power tends to feed on power. History shows this. The genius of the American political system in controlling this tendency is twofold: (1) the checks, balances, and separation of powers which characterize the system, and which must be preserved; and (2) the recognition that individual rights are more basic in substance and origin than human government itself; that freedom is not a gift to be extended or withheld by government, but that government exists by delegation of power from the people—that is, by consent of the governed.

Traditionally governments have tended to take autocratic or bureaucratic power unto themselves. Nevertheless it is an oversimplification just to blame the present danger on politicians who, according to Senator GOLDWATER, "would monopolize power, centralize power, manipulate power, and grow rich from power." The trend toward concentration in Washington arises mainly from the kind of society and the kind of world we have now. In horse-and-buggy days interstate highways weren't much needed. Neither were space programs or a network of defense bases abroad.

Still another pressure toward concentration of power is the tendency to ask Washington for help. Individuals, communities, States, industries, private interests and special groups—all exert constant pressues for more programs and bigger expenditures. The hue and cry over closing obsolete naval yards illustrates the problem. Such pressures mount when States and cities fail, as they often have, to face their problems and solve them. As the Democratic national platform states: "No government at any level can properly complain of violation of its power, if it fails to meet its responsibilities."

The pressures toward concentrated power cannot be blamed wholly on any one group or any one political party. But the voters are entitled to ask, and should ask, precisely what each of the Presidential candidates proposes to do about them. This will be the subject of a subsequent editorial. The same question might well be asked of State and local candidates, too.

It needs to be stressed that even while facing squarely the dangers of too-powerful government, nobody should assume that government is inherently evil. That, too, is an oversimplification encouraged by campaign oratory.

Government is a necessary instrument to improve the conditions of human living. It can and should be used as a positive instrument. Its power cannot be exercised merely negatively in the modern world. It must be exercised positively to carry out needed programs for the general welfare that cannot be accomplished any other way.

It is easy to say that Federal Government is too big. The test comes in what steps a candidate puts forward to curtail its activities. Where would he save money? What functions would he abolish? Unless sweeping generalities are backed by concrete proposals as to how and where cuts will be made, campaign promises can be empty and disillusioning.

It is easy to say more power should be transferred to the States and cities. But State and local governments too often are incapable of taking over functions lodged with the Federal Government. They are more corrupt and less free from abuse, generally speaking, than the National Government. The burden of proof rests on those who advocate such a transfer of functions. The need is for practical programs rather than campaign rhetoric.

This newspaper believes that as much of the business of government as possible should be done at the community level instead of the State level. Whatever can be done at the State level should be done there instead of by the Federal Government. All that can be left to the individual should be left to him.

And at the Federal level, authority should above all be balanced wisely by constitutional liberty—else freedom itself will decay.

But all this cannot be done merely by returning to the simpler ways of the past. The need is to find better ways of dealing with the problems of our highly developed society. The Founding Fathers devised a magnificent system of government. The American people today face the need to adapt and utilize it so as to cope with the needs of an increasingly complicated and urbanized society—

and at the same time to promote and extend individual freedom.

At least there is the thrill and the challenge of new horizons in that.

International Convention of Amchem Products, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, during the week of September 27, more than 150 top executives from all over the world are expected to attend the International Convention of Amchem Products, Inc., in Ambler, Pa. Amchem is a worldwide organization which last year received the U.S. Department of Commerce "E" Award for "excellence in exporting." I ask unanimous consent that a news release on this important meeting be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

AMBLER, PA.—More than 150 top executives from virtually every country in the world are expected to attend the International Convention of Amchem Products, Inc., here this fall.

Scheduled for the week of September 27, it will be Amchem's largest international gathering and is being planned as part of the firm's observance of its 50th anniversary.

The group, which will include the wives of many of the representatives will represent Amchem's worldwide organization of 125 direct licensees and distributors. Many will be from well-established industrial and agricultural countries while some attending will be from developing nations.

Previous Amchem international meetings have been held in Paris, Copenhagen, Brussels, Windsor, England, and The Hague. The last time the group met at Amchhem's headquarters in Ambler was in 1957. George Washington Motor Lodge, in nearby Willow Grove, will be "headquarters" for the week-long convention. In addition to overall meetings, there will be study groups on metalworking, agricultural, and thermal insulation chemicals. Also, visits are scheduled to Amchem's plant and laboratories, in Ambler; its experimental farm at nearby Springhouse; and to industries and universities in the area. A daily program of entertainment has been arranged for the wives attending.

Amchem has developed and markets many metalworking chemicals and processes for the protection of metals and for a wide variety of scientific applications. Its Agricultural Division produces chemicals for control of weeds in crops, and a third division, Foster Division, makes protective coatings and mastics for thermal insulations.

According to Amchem President, Gerald C. Romig, last year his firm recorded its greatest sales volume in history. This year, International Division direct sales and royalties are continuing the growth trend of the past 10 years, when each year's annual growth in overseas business was significantly greater than the previous year's.

Mr. Romig expects this growth to continue, and has pledged his firm to continue its stepped-up program of research and development.

J. O. J. Shellenberger, Amchem vice president and director of marketing, states that in the last 4 years Amchem's international direct sales have doubled, and licensee sales have jumped by over 70 percent. Licensees use Amchem scientific know-how, basic patents and trademarks, and on-the-spot technical assistance.

Last year the U.S. Department of Commerce gave Amchem the President's "E" Award for "excellence in exporting." It cited the firm for "its intensive program of licensing, for improving service and product knowledge, for conducting technical refresher courses, and for its long-range research."

Some 40 years ago, Amchem began licensing for oversea business. All those early licensees are still part of the Amchem organization while many are substantial companies in their own right. Today, a distributor generally starts with direct sales, and licensing agreements covering local manufacture or formulation are negotiated when justified by market development.

However, sometimes a country will require local manufacture for other reasons. In this event, Amchem may license a local distributor in order to protect a market which may not be profitable for years. Warren E. Weston, manager of the international division, feels that this is an "investment" his firm must make to continue growth of its oversea business.

In its 50 years, Amchem has pioneered many scientific "firsts," including: Deoxidine, the prepaint chemical coating which made the all-metal automobile possible; Alodine, for prepaint treatment and protection of aluminum; Lineguard, the first automated electronic method for controlling the prepaint chemical treatment process; and Granodine, for prepaint treatment of steel.

In the agricultural field, there are these well-known Amchem developments: Weedone, the original 2,4–D selective weedkiller; Weedazol, for control of hard-to-kill perennial weeds and grasses; and Amiben, for weed control in soybeans and other food crops.

Just recently, the firm revealed the part it played in evolving a technique for treating the ultrathin aluminum foil skin of NASA's Echo II satellite. Alodine 401 was designated as the coating because it stabilized the skin temperature, reducing its "space fever" to a moderate degree so that tracking radiobeacons would remain operational.

Besides its Ambler headquarters plant, Amchem has plants in: Philadelphia, Pa.; Chicago, Ill.; Detroit, Mich.; St. Joseph, Mo.; Houston, Tex.; Fremont, Calif.; and Windsor, Ontario.

Peaceful Coexistence—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I took occasion recently to bring to the attention of the House a book entitled, "Peaceful Coexistence: A Communist Blueprint for Victory," published by West Publishing Co. under auspices of the American Bar Association.

This work was prepared by Dr. Richard V. Allen, chairman of the Study Program on Communism at the Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, under commission from the Standing Committee on Education Against Communism of the American Bar Association, which committee is headed by Mr. Morris I. Leibman, of Chicago.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, Mr. Speaker, I will include, for the information of the House, certain introductory material of this important work, as follows:

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE: A COMMUNIST BLUEPRINT FOR VICTORY

FOREWORD

(This committee shall study, made report and recommendations, plan and give effect to programs of education on Communist tactics, strategy and objectives and encourage and support our schools and colleges in the presentation of adequate instruction on the contrast between communism and liberty under law.)

(ABA Bylaws, art. X, sec. 7: (j); (2).)

The American Bar Association's House of Delegates in August 1962 unnanimously adopted the above amendment to its bylaws establishing this standing committee. Under this mandate the committee has undertaken three primary programs:

1. A program of bar activities to encourage and support State, county, and local bar associations to undertake meaningful activities on the local community level paralleling our committee's activities on the national scene;

2. A teacher training institute program encouraging and supporting schools and colleges in the conduct of summer institutes for the training of secondary school teachers who have the classroom responsibility of instructing our Nation's youth on the contrast between communism and liberty under law;

3. A continuing research program on Communist strategy and tactics in consultation with individual authorities of various graduate centers of study specializing in the field of contemporary Communist tactics, strategy and objectives.

The August 1962 house of delegates action cited above signifies the continued concern of the American Bar Association for the threat posed by the international Communist movement to our national security and the concepts of human dignity and individual freedom protected by a rule of law. As early as 1950, the association's house of delegates created a special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives. Over the years this committee published a number of interpretive reports.

That committee's report of May 1961 was entitled "Peaceful Coexistence—A Blueprint for Disruption." This report focused attention on the publicly announced Communist strategy of peaceful coexistence as contained in the statement entitled "Statement by 81 Marxist-Leninist Parties" adopted unanimously in Moscow on December 5, 1960, at a meeting of Communist Parties and further elaborated upon in the statement by Nikita Khrushchev delivered at a top-level Soviet Communist meeting on January 6, 1961. In that report translations of these two documents were reprinted in full.

In the preface to the 1961 report the former special committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Henry J. TePaske, of Orange City, Iowa, expressed itself in the following manner:

"The (Communist) party line loses its effect when it is recognized as propaganda and its true meaning is understood. The party line must be exposed, and so explained that it will be understood by the citizens of the free world as well as by the party elite. * * * Widespread knowledge of the Communists' tactics, strategy, and objectives is essential to national survival."

In the latter part of 1963 our committee commissioned Richard V. Allen, chairman of the study program on communism at the Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, to undertake a current documen-

tary study of the Communist strategy of peaceful coexistence. In his examination of this area, Mr. Allen analyzed over 500 articles, documents, and speeches of Communist origin representing some 11,000 pages.

The Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, whose director is Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy, retired, former Chief of Naval Operations and member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is one of the Nation's outstanding graduate research centers engaged in the study of the multifaceted threat posed by the international Communist movement. This committee is privileged to be able to turn to such knowledgeable and responsible scholars in the field as represented by Mr. Allen and other members of the center for strategic studies.

The committee wishes to express its sincere appreciation to the West Publishing Co., of St. Paul, Minn., which has freely provided the printing and publishing services necessary to produce this study.

Obviously, no single pamphlet or publication will in itself constitute an adequate answer to communism. For this reason, the committee will continue to sponsor quality materials from responsible sources in this complex field.

This study is informational and is not intended as a policy statement of the American Bar Association. We urge leaders of the organized bar, teachers, and civic leaders to acquaint themselves with the facts contained herein. It is the hope of this committee that greater knowledge of the Communist threat will be gained by all citizens, and that the real dimensions of Communist objectives will be more clearly understood in the light of principal strategic pronouncements.

The members of this committee, and its staff which so capably assist in this work, is in accord with our national desire to lead a peaceful existence in conjunction with all nations. But we want to coexist without surrendering for ourselves or for others the concepts of human dignity and the protection of individual rights under a system of due process and the rule of law. Genuine peace is one thing; the charade of Communist peaceful coexistence as a game of quite different intent.

July 1964.

MORRIS I. LEIBMAN,
Chicago, Ill., Chairman.

Standing committee on education against communism

Members: H. Lynn Edwards, Washington, D.C.; Egbert L. Haywood, Durham, N.C.; John G. McKay, Jr., Miami, Fla.; Raymond W. Miller, Washington, D.C.; William C. Mott, Washington, D.C.; Louis B. Nichols, New York City; Mario T. Noto, Washington, D.C.; C. Brewster Rhoads, Philadelphia, Pa.; John Ritchie, Chicago, Ill.; and Jackson A. Wright, Columbia, Mo.

Staff: Boudinot P. Atterbury, consulting counsel; Frank R. Barnett, consulting program manager; Dorothy M. Belina, secretary; Francis J. McGuire, administrative assistant; and Dorothy E. Nicolosi, research assistant.

PREFACE

On both sides of the Atlantic, it is now rumored that the cold war is obsolete, except for the hostility of Mao Tse-tung and his followers. Khrushchev is pictured as a "reformed" Bolshevik, dreading nuclear war and seeking to lead Soviet communism away from world revolution toward the rule of law and middle-class affluence. From this premise, some contend that the West need not strengthen military, economic, and psychological barriers to types of Soviet aggression that may shortly cease to exist. It is urged, rather, that the next order of business is to encourage Khrushchev's "moderation" by pressing for détente and relaxation of trade restrictions with Russia and her satellites. Some statesmen even argue that we should prepare for the neutralization of central Europe and the eventual disengagement of American forces from the Continent. In short, on the hypothesis of a "peaceful evolving Soviet Union," one new objective for NATO may be to preside oyer its self-liquidation.

Obviously, few in the West would object to reducing defense budgets if genuine peace were in prospect. But is it? Or is Khrushchev using Pavlov and the hidden persuaders to advance Lenin's unchanging goals? Suppose that the massive "peaceful coexistence" propaganda of the U.S.S.R. and its oversea agents conceal an ambush? Suppose that current interoffice memos of the Communist chiefs and ideologs call not for a reduction in tension but for an increase in class warfare, subversion, and ideological combat? Suppose Communist communiques promise more guerrilla thrusts into the vitals of Afro-Asia and Latin America? Suppose that very recent Communist documents (published after the 1963 Treaty of Moscow) openly reveal how Moscow is again using "peaceful coexistence" as a charade to feint the democracies off guard? Assuming shy motives in the Kremlin (a not unreasonable supposition after 44 years of broken treaties and deceptions), who stands to benefit from another relaxation of vigilance?

Is today's emphasis on peaceful coexistence a new departure for the Kremlin, or is it the repetition of a time-tested gambit for retooling world revolution from temporary positions of weakness? It is useful to appraise Khrushchev's current tactic in the context of history; for, seen in this framework peace to the Communists is simply the continuation of war by other means.

Marx himself believed that Communist and capitalist states were wholly incompatible. Marxism as official dogma still influences the behavior of Communist elites despite the flaws in his prophecy; and Marx taught the inevitability of Communist triumph in the highly developed nations of the West. In a sense, communism deprived of its faith in the necessary obliteration of capitalism would be religion without belief in the certainty of judgment and life everlasting. Marxism must reject any genuine form of peaceful coexistence (on anything more than the temporary basis of expediency) or cease to be.

Lenin, the arch pragmatist of world revolution, taught his cadres how to survive through concession. Confronted by hostile bourgeois states which did not succumb to worker uprisings in the wake of the Russian revolution, Lenin devised the technique of temporary and tactical "peaceful coexistence." At Brest-Litovsk, he signed a formal treaty with Germany which allowed Mother Russia to be dismembered. Still hoping for a chain reaction of revolution now that the "weakest link" had been broken, Lenin made temporary peace with capitalism inside Russia in order to build the economic sinews of his base.

After Lenin's death in 1924, Trotsky contended that "socialism in one country"—a thesis advanced by Stalin—violated the basic principles of Marx and Lenin and betrayed the world revolution.

The savage polemics that preceded Trotsky's exile and assassination in Mexico by the victorious Stalin has obscured the fact that the disputing heirs of Lenin were not nearly so far apart as they seemed. True, Stalin wanted to consolidate power in Russia before risking everything on revolution elsewhere; but Stalin never believed that Soviet "socialism" was an end in itself. More cautious than the theoretical Trotsky, Stalin wanted secure possession of the sturdiest lever and most powerful fulcrum for the eventual upheaval of capitalist citadels. Therefore, he became the manager of "planned periods of peaceful coexistence" which enabled not only communism, but also Stalin, to survive.

It is clear, therefore, that even for the patient Stalin, peace was a tactic and not a goal. It gave him time to purge his rivals in the party. It gave him time to collectivize the peasants. It gave him time to industrialize Russia. But even as Stalin led the Soviet Union into the League of Nations, he financed plots, subversion, and popular fronts all over the world. The Communist "peace movements" of the 1930's were designed primarily to ensure that a weak (but developing) Soviet Union would not be crushed from the encircling capitalist powers; they in no way inhibited Moscow's agents from covert operations, industrial espionage, or building international fifth columns.

When Stalin's game with Nazi Germany exploded in his face, he was quick to form alliances with those hated centers of capitalism—England and America—whose arsenals could furnish him with tools of defense. At war's end, he was prepared to exchange token gestures of cooperation with London and Washington for freedom to seize Eastern Europe.

He even dissolved the Comintern in 1943 to underscore the end of Communist subversion abroad, an event hailed in Western circles as the formal termination of Bolshevik ambitions and a sure sign of evolution.

Somehow, the imagemakers have made the buoyant Khrushchev seem less threatening than the cruel Stalin. Thus, we forget how often Western experts on Russia proved Stalin's devotion to peace by citing his reluctance to risk major war and the cynical sacrifice of foreign Communists to the interests of Russian foreign policy. In retrospect, evaluations of Stalin's foreign policy as peace oriented seem naive. Yet, ironically, the dread hand of Stalinism was more constrained to avoid world war than the flexible fingers of Khrushchev, who sought recklessly to engineer a nuclear ambush from Cuba. (For that matter, despite the inflammatory words, Red China's relative restraint with respect to invading the offshore islands, Taiwan, India, and southeast Asia shows Peiping is not much more adventuristic than was Moscow with its wall in Berlin, its rocket threats over Suez, and its hidden missiles in Cuba.) That Khrushchev, like Stalin, often tempers an activist foreign policy with prudent regard for the future of Russia only underlines the essential continuity of Soviet strategy from Lenin to the present.

Communist philosophy, consistent Soviet behavior over four decades, and recent party directives combine to show that peaceful coexistence is a carefully formulated strategic course of action designed to attain revolutionary goals at minimum cost and with minimum risk to the headquarters of the conflict elite.

It behooves the American people, therefore, to ask the question, "Cui bono?" Who benefits, and how, from the illusion that Khrushchev is different not only in degree but in kind from Stalin or Mao? Or perhaps we should ask Lenin's question, "Who is doing what to whom?"—relevant to the cooperation of Communists with their antagonists.

CONCLUSION

Communist actions and Communist words prove that Communist goals are unchanged. The danger may well be greater now, in our moment of one-sided relaxation, than in the tense days of naked Stalinism. The "split" between China and the U.S.S.R. may be of benefit to freedom in the long run. In the short run, polycentrism in the Communist world means we are menaced by two competing strategies: (1) the revolutionary violence of Chinese-oriented Communists in Afro-Asia and Latin America; (2) the more sophisticated Popular Front subversion of Russian-alined Communist factions. Moscow and Peiping agree that capitalism and

human liberty are still the primary targets. Both subsidize class war, ideological war, and guerrilla war, while debating with each other as to whether we are a paper tiger or a nuclear lamb. There is no evidence, in Communist documents or actions, that U S. policy can be safely based on hopes for genuine accommodation or convergence. Quite to the contrary, Moscow and Peiping both assert that capitalism must be forced to disappear from the earth. Their debate is, "How and When?"

Nevertheless, the Communist bloc has weaknesses: industrial, agricultural, ideological, and political. It is vulnerable to economic sanctions and political warfare. Its disregard for human dignity saps its vitality. Communist Parties all over the world can be embarrassed, isolated, rendered impotent. Until there is genuine change in the goals and techniques of Communist dictatorship, the United States must maintain a shield of invincible military deterrence. From behind that shield, we should use our own propaganda sword to quarantine, divide, and undermine aggressive Communist power. That no genuine change in Communist aims has as yet been effected is abundantly clear from the analysis of current Communist documents which follows:

"As soon as we are strong enough to defeat capitalism as a whole, we shall immediately take it by the scruff of the neck."—Vladimir Lenin, 1920.

"A fight is in progress between these two systems, a life and death combat. But we Communists want to win this struggle with the least losses and there is no doubt whatsoever that we shall win."—Nikita Khrushchev, 1963.

THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AGAINST COMMUNISM.

Justice From the Streets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I have been immensely impressed with the observations of a native South Carolinian as reported by Marguerite Higgins in the "Point of View" column of the September 21 Washington Evening Star.

Without entering into the difficulties that may exist in South Carolina politically, I feel that these expressions are consonant with the feeling of a great many people in our Nation. We cannot proceed on any program of progress, any program of constructive education, any program of prosperity—which I suppose means the elimination of poverty—with justice coming from the streets. Rioting and looting are too often the handmaidens of protest that graduates to violence. We must have law and order that is commensurate with the dignity of this great Nation that espouses freedom of the individual, his right to progress, his right to education and his freedom to achieve that of which he is capable. Any diversion from this format is, in my opinion, not in agreement with our destiny.

The article follows:

SOUTH'S NEW STIRRINGS AID GOLDWATER'S DRIVE

(By Marguerite Higgins)

GREENVILLE, S.C.—In all fairness, Senator GOLDWATER's tour of the South added up to nothing less than a smashing personal triumph.

But most fascinating now that it is all over is to investigate the reasons and the light they shed on some deep new stirrings in this part of America.

Watching the GOP nominee in action immediately brought to mind the great contrast in campaign styles between President Johnson and Senator GOLDWATER.

President Johnson cries hallelujah—Senator GOLDWATER cries havoc. With the President, it is good tidings all the way and, glory be, a great society just around the corner.

With Senator GOLDWATER, there are intimations of doom—a nuclear gap, a morality gap, a legality gap, a victory gap—and predictions that socialism is going "to git you if you don't watch out," all delivered in the matter-of-fact tones that might be used by a teacher describing how to put together and operate a ham radio set.

FRIENDLY AUDIENCES

With Evangelist Johnson, the audiences have been friendly, often enthusiatic, although in individual conversation they sometimes give the impression of being more against Senator GOLDWATER than for President Johnson.

But here in the Southland, in the case of the matter-of-fact Mr. GOLDWATER, there was evangelism all right—not in the candidate's manner, certainly, but in the audiences whose fervor had to be witnessed to be believed. And it is not just a speech-day thing either.

Here in the lovely green foothills of the Carolinas, the Republicans have been working steadily and doggedly. In the Greenville-Spartanburg area alone, they have quadrupled the number of volunteer Republican campaign workers. Crossovers from the Democrats to the Republicans have increased 25 percent over 1960.

VICTORY ANTICIPATED

The rest of the State claims roughly the same percentage of gain. Republican leaders here point out that in 1960, Richard Nixon, with only a skeleton GOP organization, lost to John Kennedy by barely 10,000 votes. So the Goldwaterites think they spy a Republican victory in November because they expect more Democrats to join their ranks, checkmating a probable increase in the Negro vote against Senator GOLDWATER.

Who are these Carolina Goldwaterites?

They are the newly minted middle classes—lower, middle and upper—who are the South's new breed.

It is a new breed of self-made men and women who have turned their back on the mores of the decayed southern aristocracy where charm was sometimes held to be more important than accomplishment and where an aristocratic heritage was a frequent excuse for indolence.

This new breed of self-made southerner has come into dominance because of the swift industrialization of the South since 1945—an industrialization so new that it has been free of the slum-making accompaniment of the past.

PROGRESS IS SEEN

Integration, for example, has progressed sufficiently in the schools so that there is a ring of sincerity about it when a Carolinian says: "We are not against Negro rights. We are against the Federal Government's encroachment, not just in the civil rights field but all fields."

What does this new breed want?

By and large, it is not to turn the clock back though there are a few Federal functions that the people would like to see turned back to the individual State. In the main, the South's new middle class wants to put a brake on the Federal Government's power. It is a "this far and no farther" attitude. Social security as presently organized is fine but any drastic increase or change would be opposed.

A SOUTHERNER SPEAKS

But where Mr. GOLDWATER touches these people most deeply is in his philosophy of what America and Americans ought to be. It is not easy to discover a southerner's real feelings because he rarely puts them into words and often is embarrassed to try and do so with newspaper reporters who are regarded automatically as members of the "liberal establishment"—an establishment whose values are viewed as at least partly responsible for what's wrong with America.

As one Republican precinct worker put it: "This country is suffering from a bad case of double standard.

"If there is a riot, these slick liberal writers ooze sympathy for the 'poor rioters.' It's not really the fault of the guy that bashed the cop's head in and broke the store window and stole six television sets, or so we are told. This poor guy just got riot happy because he is living in poverty, the neighborhood is a slum, there is garbage in the alley, or his mother didn't love him enough.

"None of these liberals ever say this rioter is a bum, a criminal and lazy and no good.

"So long as the rioter is treated as a hero and the cop is treated as a beast, the decline of law and order is inevitable. Nobody ever says that tenants can be just as responsible for creating slum conditions as the landlord.

"Why don't they have a clean up and paint up Harlem week? If they don't like garbage in their alleys, why do they dump it there in the first place? My family was so poor that as a teenager I had to be up at dawn milking cows, delivering groceries, and the like.

"I could hardly wait for each day to begin. It was a happy life and it never occurred to me to go and start a riot because I only had one pair of shoes every 2 years and didn't taste ice cream until I was 15.

"Some of America's finest hours were in the days when most of the population was living in what the sociologists would pityingly label as poverty. In those days poverty was not something you started gang warfare over or stole or rioted or killed. It was something that you used grit, self-reliance, and pride to overcome.

"Those qualities were not sneered at then. Now they are sneered at. Pride in country is considered naive.

"It is even considered naive to think that a great power like the United States should have insisted that the Soviet Union live up to its international treaties instead of knuckling under as we so shamefully did when the Berlin wall was built. The more Central Government takes over control of the human being's destiny, the weaker he becomes, along with his moral fiber and his country's moral fiber.

"People like GOLDWATER believe in such things as moral fiber and you Easterners can sneer all you want. He is trying to stop the process of decay and that is why we are for him because we think our lives, our pride, and our human dignity are at stake."

Repression of Jews in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, for more than a dozen years, there has been

increasing evidence of anti-Semitic activity on the part of the Government of the Soviet Union. Once prominent and among the leaders of the professions, sciences, and administrators of the Government and the Communist Party within the U.S.S.R., since 1948 Soviet Jewry has been increasingly subject to religious, social, economic, and employment discrimination.

There are estimated to be some 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union, although the number cannot be exactly figured because of many hundreds of leading Jewish intellectuals who were imprisoned in 1948, and of whom many perished. In fact, some two dozen of their leaders were executed in 1952.

Although Soviet practice and, in fact, the Soviet Constitution recognizes the right of cultural and national groups within the U.S.S.R. to maintain and perpetuate their own identities, this right is not accorded to the Jewish community—the only minority group to which it is denied.

Jews are forbidden schools of their own, are not permitted classes in Yiddish or Hebrew in the other schools, and are denied classes in the Russian language on Jewish culture and history. The effect, of course, is to deny Soviet Jews any real opportunity to perpetuate their identity and cultural values. In addition, the Jewish religion is subjected to particular discrimination by forbidding them to maintain national religious organizations, by the forcible closing of synagogues in many areas, and by vicious press attacks against Jewish groups and the few synagogues which do remain. Because the Government controls the press in the Soviet Union, the responsibility for these attacks must be borne by the Soviet Government. In addition, leading officials of synagogues in Moscow and Leningrad have been arrested and imprisoned on charges of espionage. The Soviet authorities usually claim that these men are spying for the State of Israel.

The severe hampering of religious activities, and the antipathy of the authorities toward religious observances is, of course, an official program of the Communists and is directed against all activities which seek to worship a Supreme Being. However, their activities against the Jewish religion in the Soviet Union have been much stronger and show a particular strain of hate and repression.

The proportion of Jews in universities has declined from more than 13 percent, 30 years ago, to about 3 percent today. Official observers believe this has been brought about through a planned policy of discrimination and quotas.

Thousands of Jewish families were broken and spread over other parts of the world as the result of the Nazi invasion. Many of the refugees now live in Israel or West European countries Yet the Soviet authorities have denied permission to Jewish family members remaining in the Soviet Union to leave the U.S.S.R. in order to be reunited with their families elsewhere.

Despite the full recognition of these, and many more effects of obvious Jewish repression within the U.S.S.R., the official policy of our Department of State has been, and continues to be, that no official protests should be made to the Soviet authorities. The reason given is that such official recognition and pressure on the Soviet Government by our Government might bring about certain repercussions and retaliation on Soviet Jewry. Obviously, no one can predict what reaction would take place within the Soviet Government to an official protest by our Department of State, but I do feel that the Department's policy, while taking cognizance of this problem, has the effect of sweeping it under the rug. I believe that more official recognition should be taken of Jewish repressions in the Soviet Union, and that more publicity should be given throughout our Nation and the world to the undeniable facts of Jewish persecution by Communist authorities. I call upon the Department of State and all other appropriate agencies of our Government, such as the U.S. Information Agency, to increase their activities in this regard, and I strongly hope that the President will direct them to do so.

Frank L. Auerbach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of loss that I learned of the death of Frank L. Auerbach, Deputy Director of the Visa Office of the Department of State. I had come to know and respect greatly Mr. Auerbach. His career bespeaks his unique talents. He was Immigration Counsel to social agencies in Germany and assistant case consultant to social agencies in the United States. He worked with the War Relocation Authority of the Department of Interior and was a lecturer of both Hunter College and Columbia University in New York City. He began his work with the Department of State in 1948 as a consultant to the Chief of the Visa Division and became Assistant Director of the Visa Office in 1955 and Deputy Director in 1962.

Mr. Auerbach is the author of "Immigration Laws of the United States, "Nationality Problems of Children," "Principles Which Should Underlie our Nationality Laws," "The Admission and Resettlement of Displaced Persons in the United States," and "The Immigration and Nationality Act, a Summary of Its Principal Provisions."

Mr. Auerbach's matchless knowledge of the immigration laws, his compassion, his dedication to his work, his unfailing courtesies to all who sought of his time and his talent, made him the public servant beyond reproach. His death leaves a void in an area where there are too few experts. He served us well and he will not be forgotten.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and children, and to all of the members of his family.

Debt and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, if in these times of economic prosperity our Government cannot balance its budget and limit its spending within the revenues it receives, can it ever do so?

In time of economic adversity and in time of war, expenditures in excess of revenues are frequently necessary. In time of general prosperity, sound fiscal policy requires a balanced budget with provision for the reduction of public debt.

At the beginning of the present Congress, the Kennedy administration presented for our consideration a budget intentionally unbalanced. On February 28, 1963, I reported to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan my concern about the new econoics in the following words:

"Economic theorists close to the President are trying to convince the American people—as they have already convinced the President—that the way to an ever-expanding prosperity is to cut the revenues, increase the spending, and go further into debt.

"It is tragic that the power of government has fallen into the control of those espousing so unsound a doctrine. A prosperity based upon debt is indeed a house built upon sand. Debt is borrowing from the future. In the future, the debt must either be paid or repudiated. There is no third alternative.

"In the experience of us all, debt is a burden and a reduction of net worth. Still, the New Frontier speaks of increasing the national debt as though it were an asset. The President refers to 'increasing the debt in ways that serve to strengthen the debtor.'

"Such strange doctrine is a complete reversal from the sound beliefs of George Washington, who said: 'Avoid the accumulation of debt, not merely by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burdens which we ourselves ought to bear.'

"Washington's admonition was followed in every generation until our own. In these times of relative prosperity, we should be reducing the national debt. The President urges us to increase it. He tells us that the size of the debt may be disregarded. Let it increase, he says, and reduce the income tax to spur what he calls a sluggish economy.

"Now a tax cut is appealing. If we could take home a greater portion of the paycheck, we could purchase more, save more and invest more. But consider what will be the situation if the Government goes on spending without stint. By reason of the tax cut, the tax revenues will be reduced, so, in order to pay for its spending, the Government will

have to borrow more to fill the gap between revenue coming in and spending going out.

"If the Government borrows from the people, it will take from them all the increase they thought they would have for use in the free economy. If the Government borrows from the banking system, more dollars will be issued to pay the Government's bills, resulting in inflation. In that case, the expected increase in take-home pay will evaporate in increased prices. If taxes are reduced, there must be a reduction in Government spending; otherwise, there can be no spur in the free economy.

"If our economy is sluggish, as the President says is the case, it is because of the deficit—debt policy of the Government. A government which actually lived within its tax income and systematically reduced its debt would so stimulate the economy that the economy would move forward with confidence and enthusiasm. Then we would experience a sound economic expansion, producing revenues sufficient perhaps to permit a tax reduction."

Now, in 1964, as this Congress comes to a close, it must be recorded that our national debt limit has been increased from $308 billion to $315 billion to $324 billion—in a 2-year period of general prosperity.

We are living off the future when we ought to be living within our means; when we ought to be reducing, not increasing, the national debt.

Complexities of Police Protection Amazes Reporter on Patrol Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the public is concerned with the problems facing law enforcement officers. The public is also rightfully concerned with the disregard for law and order that is flourishing in various parts of the country.

The Enterprise Publications, of Brookfield, Ill., assigned its staff writer, Miss Lyn Daunoras, to cover the police department on a typical tour of duty.

I submit her article for the RECORD as I feel it places the problems of law enforcement in a very practical light and merits our attention:

COMPLEXITIES OF POLICE PROTECTION AMAZES REPORTER ON PATROL DUTY

(By Lyn Daunoras)

It was Saturday, August 29, and I had been given approval by Police Chief Edward Barcal to accompany a squad car from 9 to midnight on its routine patrol of the village.

I sat in the back seat alone with Sgt. Tony Azzarrello at the wheel and Police Commissioner Joe Wazny at his side. Along with many other residents, no doubt, I had always assumed that police protection meant merely answering and checking out complaints registered by citizens.

That was a very wrong assumption. Police protection is all-embracing and fantastic in its thoroughness. All residents would find it fascinating to tour with the men in blue as they patrol and protect the village during a shift, looking for trouble, covering bad traffic intersections, checking out business houses, alleys, schools, parking lots, homes, questioning loiterers, stopping violators they note with a quick, observing eye, all between investigations of complaints.

In 3 hours, there were only two calls from the police desk to check out. The rest of the time was just touring, touring and checking, checking, checking. Nothing went unnoticed. A young couple sitting in a doorway holding hands was questioned by Azzarrello and when he found neither one lived in the apartment house whose doorway they were utilizing, he asked them nicely to move along.

Asked why, since it seemed almost a shame to disturb them, he responded that apartment tenants and landlords complain about persons who do not live in the buildings taking up the doorway. Sometimes, when tenants want to enter or leave the building and they find couples or gangs sitting on the doorstep, they get abusive language in response to their request to move aside. Therefore, complaints are lessened by getting right to the source.

Groups of teenagers are watched carefully and the grouping is discouraged wherever possible. Reason for this is that another gang, cruising in a car may stop before a group standing around a corner and suddenly a "rumble" erupts. On this night four boys crossing Prairie Avenue joined three others in front of the Purple Plum and they proceeded down Grand Boulevard.

At the same moment the first message from the desk came through: someone had broken the drinking fountain at Kiwanis Park at the base and the water was gushing out heavily. It was possible the four crossing Prairie had come from the park since they were coming from that direction. "If they're responsible for the destruction, they'll be wet," Azzarrello said and drove off in pursuit of the group which he intercepted at Washington.

He stopped, talked to all of them, viewed their identification and checked for any wetness. There was none. None of the boys were from Brookfield; they were all polite and cooperative. One 15-year-old had no I.D. and Azzarrello asked him why. No reason, just didn't have any, he was told.

Back in the squad, Azzarrello questioned the wisdom of parents who allow their children out without any type of identification. He pointed out that a boy or girl walking alone could be hit by a car and taken to a hospital where he might need an emergency operation in order to save his life. A doctor cannot operate or even treat a minor without consent of the parents. How would they locate the parents of an unconscious youth with no identification?

Around the swimming pool we went, checking from every vantage point with flashlight. The spotlight is not used because it tends to scare off persons a block away who might be up to malicious mischief and are thus warned of an approaching squad. The pool was deserted, as was its immediate vicinity.

Going down Shields, Azzarrello suddenly flashed his light on the car in front, bringing that driver to a halt. As he talked to the driver, I looked the car over carefully, trying to find why he had stopped him. Nothing appeared out of order. So when he said, "OK, be sure you take care of it now" to the teenaged driver and got back into the squad car, it was our first question.

There was no light over the back license plate. Again he flashed his light at the departing car. "See that?" he asked. Then I did. "In case of a burglary, how could witnesses take the license number? Such a car becomes a suspicious object. I just warned him to get a light on there." Meanwhile, he had taken the youth's name, address and license plate number and will be checking it out to be sure the light is there next time. Just a precaution that could be a lifesaver at a later date.

Then the second message came through. Resident at 4307 Eberly Avenue reported someone peering into a window. Young, thin man who ran north through the alley. In a whisk, we tore off to Eberly Avenue from Washington and McCormick. In minutes flat we were there, going up and down the streets, side streets and alleys, checking and flashing. There was no one in sight. But Azzarrello made a wide sweep around the area, taking no chances of missing anyone afoot getting away.

And then we went on a round of veritable death traps for police. There were narrow, dark passageways where a squad car would be at a handicap, hidden stairways, high, flat roofs made easily accessible for those hiding out. Azzarrello flashed his light down one passageway leading from the alley to the street. "See anything?" he asked. We didn't. Then he lowered the flashlight and the sidewalk bellied in the center, making it an ideal place for a person to lie flat.

A policeman unfamiliar with the gully, would flash his light straight through, as he had the first time, and see nothing. "For 100-percent protection, it is absolutely essential for a policeman to be completely familiar with every place in the village," he said.

This, we made a mental note, was another good argument against a metropolitan police force. How would a policeman from Oak Lawn or Chicago know about a gully in a certain sidewalk in Brookfield?

The dangers lurking in the shadows of business houses bothered me, and I asked if business operators were aware of the pitfalls they presented police in the performance of their duties. But Azzarrello wasn't complaining. "I consider it a personal challenge," he smiled. "I know these trouble spots so well by now that I feel if anything happens to me, I deserve it for letting it happen."

But what of the new men? There are too many places where they'd be sitting ducks. It's something residents should know about because the protection at every angle given by their police department borders on the unbelievable. Even cobwebs on doorways are examined because they indicate no one has opened the door in 24 hours. Periodically the department or village hall will receive a note of gratitude from a resident who has had first-hand experience in utilizing the services of the department in an emergency.

But emergencies are just a small part of the facets of police work they do not know about and probably will never know about. They can only be assured that Brookfield is one of the best protected suburbs in the county. The fact that only four messages came through in 3 hours on a Saturday night (the other two were handled by the other squad car under Officer Rick Gallas) proves the point.

Of course, this was an unusually quiet evening. The police department averages about 7,000 complaints per year and as of September 1, had already passed the 4,000 mark.

It was obvious that residents do nothing to make their jobs easier. There were open overhead doors on garages, just begging burglars or delinquents to help themselves, cars standing unattended with motors running.

The fact that 60 miles had been put on by Azzarrello during his shift from 4 to 12 p.m. and that upward to 100 miles per shift have been put on by squad cars, just within the limits of Brookfield, certainly proves without doubt the vigilant, careful, thorough pro-

tection given the residents of Brookfield. They'd have to see it to fully appreciate it, but it's a great comfort to know it's there.

Religious Persecution in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following letter describing religious persecution in the Soviet Union was sent by way of Poland to the editor of Novoye Russkoye Slovo, a Russian-language newspaper published in New York City. It was brought to my attention by Mr. Paul Voronaeff, of Indianapolis, Ind., and its graphic description of intimidation and terror lends little support to the theory that the Soviet Union is mellowing:

To all children of God who compose the church of Jesus Christ—to all evangelical Christian Baptists living in our land, from east to west and from north to south, "Grace be unto you, and peace, from Him which is, and which was, and which is to come" (Revelation 1: 4).

Beloved brothers and sisters in the Lord.

We decided to inform you about a sad event of which we were the witnesses. The grief which we wish to share with you is our common sadness, because we all are one church which is the body of Christ (1 Corinthians 12: 26): "And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it."

January 11, 1964, Sister Maria Ivanovna Chmara, living in Village Kulunda, Altai Region, received information from the prison in the City of Barnaul that her husband passed away. It was confirmed by a telegram communication that she is now a widow, with her four children between the ages of 13 years to 1 month. Her husband, Brother Nicolaj Kuzmich Chmara, born 1916, together with his wife, joined the church in 1963. This short life in Christ was a vivid example of a new life to all with whom he led his former life of drunkenness.

The church at Kulunda, of which he was a member, testifies of him that he sincerely loved the Lord and served Him with all his house. He loved to sing the hymn:

"I was called to work on this earth,
To fight with every idol,
Not looking on the fearful friends,
To be a witness before the world.
And not afraid of the judgment of the men."

It was December 24–27, 1963, that he, with Brother F. I. Subbotin and his brother and sister, B. K. Chmara and L. M. Chmara, appeared before the court and together with others was sentenced for the name of Christ for good and conscientious behavior. After the sentence of the court he spent just 2 weeks in prison, and then the communication came that he is dead.

January 13, 1964, the widow and relatives of the dead, together with us, got from the prison the body of Nicolaj Kuzmich. During the trial by the court, the relatives and friends had seen him in perfect health and cheerful. But what did we see when we got him dead? On his hands are seen marks of chains. The palms of the hands are burned; the fingers and bottoms of both feet are burned. The lower part of the abdomen has marks of wounds made by piercing with a sharp and red-hot object, right leg is swollen, both feet have pierced wounds, and the body with signs and bruises. When we saw all this we had mixed feelings—of deep grief and joy. Our grief is because our dear brother Nicolaj Kuzmich had to pass through such brutal trials and accept death in the prison walls. We grieve for the unhealed wounds made by godless hands upon the innocent hearts of children. Not for evil deeds, but for good, for love to the people, to the Lord, and for His name, he bore it all as a good soldier of Jesus Christ and was faithful to Him unto death. We are filled with a deep sorrow at seeing the widow and her children crying at the casket, with difficulty recognizing the face of their father. We tried to comfort them and ourselves with the fact that we all have the Father of orphans and widows—and there is a righteous Judge, the Christ.

During 4 days and nights at the casket were many brothers and sisters from afar and from the local area who solemnly conducted services. The funeral service took place in the afternoon of January 16, 1964, with a procession through the town singing hymns and carrying placards which read:

"For to me to live is Christ and to die is gain."

"Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul."

"I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God."

After the burial of the body of the deceased brother we returned to our respective places with thanksgiving and with greater zeal to serve the Lord and to be faithful to Him unto death as our brother was.

Beloved brothers and sisters, we know that the first question that will arise in your mind is—What for? What official charges were presented against him by the court of prosecutors and for what reason was he sentenced to death?

For the answer we present some transcripts from the sentence of Altai Regional Court, Act No. 142, where it said that a group of Baptists conducted illegal meetings under unsanitary conditions, drawing the youth and teenagers into the sect group. Under cover of "cleaning up," they propagated against CUECB (Council of Union of Evangelical Christian-Baptists in Moscow) and its position and kept contact with other likewise illegal groups and other like charges.

This is the definition of the court, according to which Brother F. I. Subbotin was sentenced to 5 years of strict imprisonment; two brothers, Wasilij and Nicoalj Chmara, to 3 years of jail; and their sister, L. M. Chmara, to 2 years with suspension.

Yes, in our days "unusual" things happen. We call your attention: Discuss and tell this to all people who love the Lord. Tell about this to large and small. To all who still fear God and who desire to meet with Christ.

Signed by brothers and sisters of the city of Barnaul, Village Kulunda, 120 persons.

A Tribute to Loren Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, in the recent appointment of Loren Miller to the municipal court of Los Angeles as a judge, well-deserved recognition has been given to one who has assiduously and without personal aggrandizement given of his time and talent to the cause of human justice.

The following article by Paul Weeks, staff writer for the Los Angeles Times, highlights some of his major accomplishments in the field of civil rights, and I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD:

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 17, 1964]

NEW JUDGE RELUCTANT MEMBER OF PROFESSION: DRAGGED INTO LAW "KICKING AND SCREAMING," SAYS NEGRO NAMED TO BENCH BY GOVERNOR BROWN

(By Paul Weeks)

Los Angeles' newest municipal court judge is a spindly, bespectacled man of 61 who admits he never wanted to be a lawyer.

"I was dragged kicking and screaming into the practice of law because, you know, in those days a Negro could be a doctor, lawyer or schoolteacher—and that's about all," said Loren Miller as he relaxed in his Silver Lake district home late last week.

A few days earlier, Tuesday to be exact, he had been appointed by Governor Brown to fill the unexpired term of the late Judge Ernestine Stahlhut.

BEGAN ON FARM

Miller views his rise from Nebraska farm boy to the bench with easygoing, low-key humor. But it's been a long time since Loren Miller was a farm boy setting out to practice law.

Today he is regarded as one of the Nation's great living civil rights attorneys, with a trailblazing history of triumphs, particularly in the field of housing discrimination, behind him.

The most celebrated, *Shelley* v. *Kramer*, came in 1948 when the U.S. Supreme Court delivered the epochal decision that racial covenants on property cannot be enforced by the courts.

HIGH COURT VICTORY

"That was for a Detroit man who bought a piece of property, and was denied the right to occupy it when it was found he was a Negro," Miller recalled. "We lost that one all the way up—until the Supreme Court reversed it."

Miller said he "guessed" he had tried about 100 racial covenant cases, beginning in about 1939, "before we got that Supreme Court decision."

That was followed by a series of precedent setting legal victories by Miller against housing discrimination. They included: A California ruling that a white property owner could not collect damages from another Caucasian because the latter sold racially restricted property to a Negro.

A 1954 State supreme court decision which forbade the city of San Francisco from following neighborhood racial patterns in renting public housing.

A 1962 appellate court ruling that a landlord cannot evict a tenant because of his race. Miller fought the case for an engineer who had rented a Pasadena apartment only to be evicted when the landlord discovered his new tenant to be a Negro.

In virtually all his civil rights cases Miller has acted as counsel for the NAACP, of which he is national vice president, as well as regional counsel.

In the latter role, he has played a major part in striking down school desegregation barriers, including the case which led to the historic U.S. Supreme Court decision of 1954 which discarded the old "separate but equal" theory.

Born in Pender, Nebr., on January 20, 1903, the second of seven children, Miller was graduated from high school in Highland, Kans. He attended the University of Kansas at Lawrence, Howard University in Washington, D.C., and finally received his law degree in 1928 from Washburn University in Topeka.

MOVED HERE IN 1929

He moved to Los Angeles in 1929, where his mother was then living, upon learning of the

death of a sister. For 4 years he was a reporter, first on the California News and then the California Eagle—weeklies circulated in the Negro community.

In 1933, after his marriage, his wife persuaded him to take the bar examination and return to law. Mrs. Juanita Miller is a USC graduate in social work, and is today still carrying on a career of her own as a social worker in the State department of welfare's Los Angeles office.

The Millers have two children, Loren, Jr., 27, also an attorney, of 1319 South Highland Avenue, and Edward, 18, a student at Valley Junior College. Loren, Jr. and his wife, Anne-Marye have two children, Michael, 5, and Robin, 4.

OWNS NEWSPAPER

Miller is one of the few newspapermen to achieve the goal of owning a newspaper, for which he once worked. In 1951, he bought the California Eagle, in which he has regularly written a militant, goading column with a "freedom now!" message.

A Democrat since he voted for Al Smith in 1928. Miller has espoused often unpopular causes (he defended Black Muslims after a violent clash with Los Angeles police) in law and in politics.

ONE OF REGRETS

But one of his regrets as he leaves law practice for the bench is having to withdraw from participation in a case which he feels ultimately will result in invalidation of an initiative measure on the November ballot.

It would amend the State constitution, nullifying all antidiscrimination legislation in housing and blocking future legislation.

Miller is convinced the initiative is unconstitutional—but he and his allies lost preliminary skirmishes to keep it off the ballot.

The Big Gyp That's Costing You $200 a Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, frequently issues that are not widely discussed by the American people because they do not know enough about them are the very issues that are the most important.

Such an issue is one that a crusading Texas Congressman by the name of WRIGHT PATMAN has been calling to the attention of the Congress and the people for the past several years. It is the issue of tax-free foundations. Congressman PATMAN, although not of my political party, has been doing a job for the benefit of the country. There is no politics in his operation. I endorse his effort sincerely and heartily.

If there are massive abuses of tax-free foundations and tax evasion on the part of those best able to pay taxes, business manipulations done under the cover of educational or charitable foundations, then it is time for the Congress—Republicans as well as Democrats—to support Representative PATMAN in legislating corrective measures.

An article appearing in Saga magazine, October issue, discusses PATMAN'S effort at length. It was written by Fred J. Cook, a first-rate writer who has written books about unsung Revolutionary heroes, crime in New York, Pentagon extravagances, and many other interesting matters. He has never written about a more intriguing subject and he has done it well. Cheers to Saga magazine, Fred Cook, and above all, to my good friend and hard-working colleague, WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas.

The article follows:

UNDER AN UMBRELLA OF PIOUS CHARITY LURKS THE BIGGEST, JUICIEST TAX DODGE OF ALL TIME

In his long career in the House, he has been one of that body's guttiest fighters for the common man—and against the power complexes of our time: the millionaire industrialists, the huge corporations, the powerful banking trusts. The bigger they are, the harder WRIGHT PATMAN fights them.

Right now, PATMAN is waging the battle of his life on behalf of the little man, which means nine-tenths of all Americans. He is out to apply the coup de grace to what he calls "giants with tax umbrellas," and his opponents are only people like the Rockefellers and the Du Ponts, who consider a million dollars mere pin money. The particular "giants with tax umbrellas" whom PATMAN is fighting are the huge, tax-exempt foundations set up by such great industrial dynasties.

These foundations represent a tax escape hatch that, to PATMAN, is the most vicious and unjust in the whole income tax structure. Through this escape hatch, he says, the extremely wealthy avoid paying anything like their proper share of the tax burden—and the rest of us have to make it up. Just how far down in our jeans do we have to dig to keep the elite in the tax-exempt status to which they have become accustomed? The figures, as PATMAN cites them, are fantastic.

He has uncovered deals in which, by use of the foundation device, individuals have escaped paying taxes on literally millions of dollars in profits.

The total annual loss from such Brobdingnagian tax dodgers runs into the billions. And this means that the average man gets soaked—and soaked hard—to make up the deficit. "This year's tax cut would be peanuts compared to what would be possible if foundation frauds were eliminated," PATMAN declares.

PATMAN would like to see the Treasury Department figure out exactly how much better off Joe Doakes would be if he were not helping to pay the taxes of the Rockefellers, etc., but Treasury has exhibited no wild enthusiasm for dredging up the facts. In the absence of such explicit knowledge, the best that can be offered is an educated guess. That guess goes this way: Assume that foundations were required to pay taxes on their gross income like other businesses, then if the much-ballyhooed 1964 tax cut saved you $100, closing the foundation tax loophole could probably save you double that amount—another $200. So you are losing, out of pocket, $200 a year.

The gimmicks PATMAN has exposed show the extent of the abuses. Foundations compete with banks, making multi-million-dollar loans with their tax-free money and often giving highly preferential rates of interest to the donor—or his friends, or his businesses. They run restaurants, invest in real estate, build and lease gas stations—enterprises in which, naturally, they hold an enormous competitive edge over businessmen who have to pay taxes. In one startling case, PATMAN'S researchers found a broker, a member of the New York and American Stock Exchanges, using three family foundations (assets: $28 million) to run an unregulated, tax-free security enterprise for himself and his fellow magnates.

"There's one wealthy, residential area outside of Philadelphia where virtually every other house has a foundation set up to send its kids to college at the taxpayers' expense," PATMAN declares.

He explained the deal as follows:

Randolph Enterprise Jones is a wealthy industrialist with an income that places him comfortably in the upper brackets. He has a couple of sons who will soon be going to college. So what does Enterprise do? He creates the Randolph Enterprise Jones Foundation to provide scholarships for worthy college students. In anticipation of future need, he takes a nice, round sum, say $25,000, and donates it to the foundation. For this generosity Uncle Sam rewards him in two ways. Since this presumably qualifies as charity, he pays no income tax on the $25,000, and in addition, if this burst of benevolence has dropped him into a lower income tax bracket, he saves a further tidy hunk of pocket money on the taxes he pays on his remaining income. Enterprise, as can be seen, is making hay with this deal, and if he can just arrange to recapture the $25,000, he'll be home scot free. This last step is not too difficult. Enterprise scouts around and finds an obliging college that is positively overawed by the scholastic attainments of Randolph Enterprise Jones, Jr. Then Junior gets the scholarship from his father's foundation—and all his college expenses are paid with tax-free money. The same deal is later worked with son number two, the foundation being kept alive by carefully gaged bequests until there are no more deserving Enterprise Joneses to be rewarded.

"All of this is a kind of city slicker deal," says PATMAN, who comes from the north Texas farmlands. "There are more city slickers in the United States today than ever before, and their deals mount up to a lot more in money. It used to be that the city slicker was working to euchre you out of $5 to $100; today, it's millions.

"To the very rich, our tax system is just like passing around the hat. If they want to put in, they can. If they don't, they don't have to.

"Suppose everybody took advantage of this. Suppose every American had his own foundation? You know what would happen? We wouldn't collect enough money to pay the Capitol's police force. We couldn't keep Congress in session. The whole thing would collapse."

Most of us have probably been brainwashed into considering foundations as essentially noble enterprises. Some of them are, of course. At their best, foundations finance important medical research, help care for orphans and the aged, support the arts and education. But there is a huge—and constantly growing—number of foundations whose principal function is to pile up huge fortunes, giving only a pittance to charity as a tax-escape cloak. Such foundations, exempt from all taxation, act in reality as holding companies, dominating huge industrial empires, making the wealthy ever wealthier and more powerful at the expense of the average man.

After a dogged, 3-year probe of what he calls "the foundation mess," PATMAN cites some specific examples:

The Rockefeller foundations.—At the close of 1960, seven Rockefeller family foundations held 7,891,567 shares of the common stock of Standard Oil of New Jersey. (In mid-May 1964, Jersey Standard was selling at $88 a share and paying $2.80 annually. This would make such a holding worth $694,457,896—and would result in $22,096,387 of tax-free income.) But Jersey Standard was not by any means the only major oil stock in the portfolios of the Rockefeller foundations. They also owned hundreds of thousands of

shares in each of the following: Socony Mobil, Continental Oil, Ohio Oil, Standard Oil of Indiana, and Union Tank Car Co. PATMAN points out that the Justice Department in Teddy Roosevelt's day once broke up the Standard Oil monopoly, but now, he claims, it threatens to return again, exercising the same kind of tight, competition-stifling control through the medium of tax-exempt foundations.

This pyramiding of power, under the proper circumstances, might even boost a man into the Presidency. "We would be naive indeed to think that Nelson Rockefeller's candidacy wasn't helped along by a lot of tax-exempt foundation money," PATMAN says.

The Du Pont foundations—The kingpin of the group, the Longwood Foundation (receipts: $32,952,885 for the years 1951 through 1960) didn't even bother to file returns from 1955 through 1958 to let Uncle Sam in on the secret of how much it was getting. For such an oversight, the average taxpayer would be penalized, fined or jailed, PATMAN points out; but you don't do things like that to the Du Ponts. They didn't get so much as a slap on the wrist from Internal Revenue. Another huge hunk of the Du Pont fortune is tax sheltered in the Nemours Foundation, created in the will of Alfred I. du Pont when he died in 1935. To get some idea of what is involved, consider this: the Du Pont Estate is now valued at some $392.7 million and controls resources in excess of $1 billion. It holds huge blocs of E. I. du Pont de Nemours stock and General Motors stock; it controls 31 national banks in Florida, the Florida East Coast Railway, a paper company, a telephone company and a baronial sweep of Florida real estate. PATMAN is incensed at the thought that the entire income from the vast empire ($7.5 million in 1962 alone) soon won't be paying a dime in income taxes. Under the provisions of Alfred I. du Pont's will, the shares of beneficiaries as they die go into the Nemours Foundation. The major beneficiary has been the widow, Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont, now 80 and the recipient of $6.6 million in 1962. When she dies, the Nemours Foundation, which the Du Ponts will still control, will shelter virtually all of the multimillion-dollar annual Du Pont income from the income tax.

The Ford Foundation—the foundation enabled the Ford estate to dodge onerous inheritance taxes in settling the estates of Henry and Edsel Ford. It was instrumental in keeping the huge motor company in the hands of the Ford family. PATMAN is concerned because he feels the Ford Foundation's oversea deals often seem to defy the foreign policy of the United States. The National Government has been worried about our vanishing gold reserves; the drain was so severe that, in 1961, we even brought servicemen's families home to ease the foreign spending. But at the same time, PATMAN says, the Ford Foundation was shipping $33 million overseas, practically undoing national policy. Much of this foundation money sent abroad is invested in foreign companies, helping to build foreign businesses to compete with our own, and taking jobs away from our workers. This outrages PATMAN. "The clear intent of Congress in granting tax exemptions to foundations," he says, "was to encourage charitable activities at home. I think there's a very great question about the legality of foundations shipping tax-exempt funds abroad."

The abuses possible in the foundation setup, the kind of thing that might happen if every Joe decided to set up his own foundation, are illustrated by the case of Frank Lloyd Wright, the famous architect. When Wright died in 1959 at the age of 93, he had not filed an income tax return for 25 years. During that period, all of his income had been donated to the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation of Spring Green, Wis. When Internal Revenue began a belated probe, it uncovered this picture:

Wright had always earned good money. In 1955, for example, his income was $34,862. It all went to his private foundation, which took care of Wright's living expenses. It paid him amounts ranging from $2,370 to $3,300 a year for food, living quarters and personal expenses. It paid from $300 to $1,057 a year for clothing; from $200 to $715 a year for medical and dental care. It paid him up to $6,000 a year in lecture fees, and it paid from $500 to $1,300 a year from 1941 through 1949 to educate his daughter, Iovanna, the child of his third wife, Olga Lazovich.

For 25 years, the income tax laws that apply to others hadn't applied to Wright, and he had lived well—and tax free—off his private foundation. Not until Wright was dead did the Government begin to wonder about his finances; and now, since it cannot collect from him, it is trying to sock the foundation for $76,972 in back taxes, interest, and penalties.

This is the kind of thing that WRIGHT PATMAN is determined to stop. So far Congress hasn't exhibited any passionate fervor for PATMAN's reforms; but the record of the past 35 years says quite clearly that he's not a man to be sold short. More than once, he's kept plugging away until finally the country and the Congress saw things his way. The outstanding example occurred during the depression-ridden thirties when PATMAN drove through the soldier's bonus, inflicting on Franklin D. Roosevelt one of his rare and most stunning congressional defeats.

The bonus battle was a pivotal point in PATMAN's career. It was the beginning, in fact, of his interest in foundations—and his suspicions about their unwarranted immunity and influence.

"It got me interested in the whole field of money," PATMAN explains. "I began to see all the unfair advantages the big take of the little. I could see that these people who were against the bonus—and the foundations were right in the middle of the fight—were serving their own selfish interests and were against the veteran or the little man ever getting what was due him. I began to look around, to look at their interests, and to jump on them."

Once the worst of the depression crisis had passed, PATMAN became concerned about the fantastic growth of the chainstores. He felt that the great grocery chains menaced both the farmer and the small businessman. "I introduced a bill and came near getting it through, that would have limited the number of stores in any chain to 50," PATMAN recalls. "I would have gotten it through, probably, except that the farmers were on the wrong side on that issue. All that they could see was that the chainstores were bringing them cheaper prices on the things they bought."

PATMAN's abortive attack on the chainstores brought him once more into collision with foundations. The moment he began to probe chainstore prices, he was faced with the phenomenon of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.—and the Hartford Foundation that stood behind it. PATMAN wanted to find out what kind of special discounts and rebates A. & P. was giving in its drive to kill off competition, but every time he probed this issue, he developed "staff trouble." His staff, for one reason or another, just couldn't seem to find the answers to the $64 questions, and so PATMAN, in desperation, turned to a Texas friend who knew the intracies of business—a man whom he could trust implicitly.

The friend was Rowan Howard, who was employed by the Duncan Coffee Co. Howard answered PATMAN's call and came tramping into Washington in typical Texas attire, wearing a 10-gallon hat and boots with the mud still on them. PATMAN gave him a large, rawhide briefcase, a highly ornamented piece, presented him by a grateful veterans' post in Texas for his work on the bonus. With this under his arm, Howard departed for New York. Still in boots and 10-gallon hat, he barged into the office of George L. Hartford, then president of A. & P. and the guiding hand behind the Hartford Foundation. Rowan Howard explained his business and said he'd like to take a look at the A. & P. files.

"Of course," said Hartford. "We have nothing to hide."

So Howard, with PATMAN's rawhide briefcase under his arm, began to prowl. "Rowan knew business and he knew exactly what he was looking for," PATMAN explains, with a chuckle. "He'd go through the files, and he'd spot something he wanted—and, pop, it would go into the briefcase."

When Rowan Howard came back to Washington, he was loaded with all the information PATMAN previously hadn't been able to get about A. & P. discount practices. PATMAN used the information well. Putting a prominent A. & P. official on the witness stand, he began to fire specific questions at the official, who became surprised and flustered at PATMAN's exact knowledge. He kept referring to a little black book, checking figures in it. "Here, let me see that book," PATMAN said to him finally, and the official passed it over. PATMAN took one swift look, saw that the book exposed A. & P.'s full and variable discount scales. He whirled around. "I'll offer this in evidence," he said.

PATMAN chuckles at the memory. "I thought that A. & P. man was going to faint on the witness stand," he says. "That night all the newspapers had big headlines about the use A. & P. made of discounts to crush competition."

Such clashes whetted PATMAN's appetite for his eventual showdown battle with the foundations. PATMAN had founded the House Small Business Committee in 1941 and remained its chairman until 1963, when he became chairman of the more influential House Banking and Currency Committee. In early 1962, he began to probe foundations in earnest, and for nearly 3 years now he has been examining the incredible system under which tax-free money, squirreled away in foundations, becomes a virtual law unto itself, controlling the destinies of some of the mightiest corporations in the land—and affecting the lives and pocketbooks of every one of us.

PATMAN's invaluable assistant and dogged digger of statistics in this enterprise is a trusted friend of some 20 years' standing, Harry A. Olsher. Between them, Olsher and PATMAN have submitted to Congress three exhaustively detailed reports on foundation inequities and subterfuges, and they take pride in the fact, in PATMAN's words, that "not a single fact among the literally thousands of facts in those reports has been successfully challenged."

The Treasury Department, PATMAN says, is a fountain of ignorance on the matter. At the end of 1952, Treasury's records showed that 12,295 foundations existed; just 9 years later, at the end of 1960, it cataloged 45,124. But these were only the foundations that Treasury knew about. PATMAN's researches disclosed that there were thousands of others, like the one set up by Enterprise Jones to send his kids to college. Many foundations just took their exemptions for granted, without even bothering to get Treasury's approval for their tax-exempt status. In one instance, PATMAN and Olsher uncovered a foundation that had been prospering for 35 years, completely unknown to the Treasury Department.

Just what kind of money is involved? How serious is the foundation tax-escape dodge that PATMAN is fighting?

You begin to get some idea when you realize that PATMAN and Olsher, with limited re-

sources, have managed only to scratch the surface. In their first report at the end of 1962, they told Congress that, out of 45,124 foundations known to Treasury, they had been able to make a detailed analysis of only 534. Yet they had discovered that this relatively small number of foundations was sitting on a mountain of $10.2 billion tax-free. And the mountain was growing all the time. From 1951 to 1960, these few foundations had had incomes of $6.9 billion (of which slightly less than half, $3.4 billion, had been spent for their announced charitable purposes); and in the single year of 1960, they had had incomes of $1,034,710,518—a figure that was almost 20 percent larger than the $864,435,000 earned, after taxes, by the 50 largest banks in the United States.

Such figures are testament to foundation power. PATMAN illustrated this same power in another way. He reported to Congress that 111 of his examined foundations held 10 percent or more of the stock of 263 different corporations. They exerted control, either persuasive or outright, over a broad cross-section of some of the mightiest corporations in the land.

"The record shows * * * that foundations are the perfect holding company device," PATMAN says. "The founders of great fortunes—fortunes built many times on fraud and chicanery—can dodge the inheritance tax laws and the income tax laws that apply to the rest of us. They can pile up ever greater fortunes in their private foundations."

Charity has nothing to do with it; the charitable pretense is sometimes so flimsy and transparent it is a joke. In his first report to Congress, PATMAN cited the manner in which two of the most powerful New York banks used the foundation device to avoid payment of taxes on heavily profitable stock transactions. Four of the city's major banks held 60 percent of the stock of Discount Corp. of America, a primary dealer in U.S. Government securities, bankers' acceptances and negotiable time certificates of deposit. By concerted agreement, quite evidently, the banks decided to dispose of this control. But, in making this decision, two of them were suddenly overwhelmed by charitable impulses.

The Morgan Guaranty Trust held 9,739 shares of Discount Corp. In early January 1961, these shares were worth $2,493,184 and represented a profit of $945,005 to Morgan Guaranty. Instead of selling the stock and paying a 25-percent capital gains tax, as Joe Doakes would have to do, Morgan Guaranty hastily set up the Morgan Guaranty Charitable Trust, to which it contributed its Discount Corp. shares. These shares represented the only assets the charity had. On August 31, 1961, the charity sold the shares for $2,515,735.47, and subsequently, on March 12, 1962, it asked the Federal Government for tax exemption. This was granted—and made retroactive, covering the million-dollar profit on the stock deal.

An identical pattern was followed by the Chemical Bank of New York. It, too, was suddenly possessed by magnanimous impulses, and it, too, created a brandnew charity—the Chemical Bank Trust Foundation. Just like Morgan Guaranty, it donated all its Discount Corp. shares—4,998, on which it had a profit of $1,087,065—to its foundation, and just as in the case of Morgan Guaranty, these shares constituted the only assets the foundation had. Then on August 31, 1961, the same day Morgan Guaranty sold its shares, the Chemical Bank's charity sold its shares—and subsequently, just like Morgan Guaranty, it also applied to the Federal Government for retroactive tax exemption.

To PATMAN, the present "foundation mess" threatens the very foundations of American democracy. On the one hand, the unconscionable use of foundations as a tax escape hatch drastically narrows the tax base and puts the most crushing burden on the poor and the middle classes, those least capable of supporting it.

This first great evil, in PATMAN's view, is father to a second. The tax-free funds amassed in the hands of foundation baronies represent enormous financial leverage on our entire society. There is virtually nothing that they cannot do, and they sometimes indulge in activities that have not the remotest connection with charity.

In St. Paul, Minn., for example, he found that three foundations—the Louis W. & Maud Hill Family Foundation, the Amherst R. Wilder Foundation, and the Tozer Foundation—"have been purchasing gasoline service stations and commercial buildings and leasing them back to the sellers, Pure Oil Co., Cities Service Oil Co., General Electric Co., and F. W. Woolworth Co." These deals, PATMAN says, enable "these big oil companies, General Electric and the Woolworth chain to expand without having to go into the money market for capital. Thus, these foundations are not only in the commercial investment business, in competition with real estate investors, but they are being used as a handy tool to speed up control of our economy by corporate giants and to limit opportunities for small, independent businessmen."

The favors that foundations do for their creators and for fellow foundations are infinite. The Ford Foundation, for example, supplied the Duke Power Co., of Charlotte, N.C. (controlled by the Duke Endowment), with $3 million on a 20-year loan at 2.65-percent interest—at a time when other borrowers were paying 6½ percent. In 1961, when the Ford Motor Co. was seeking control of Philco, it needed more than a million shares of Ford stock to trade for 4.1 million shares of Philco. Where did it get the stock? From the Ford Foundation, of course.

Incensed by such discoveries, PATMAN fired off a series of sharply worded questions to Internal Revenue Commissioner Mortimer M. Caplin. He wanted to find out if there were any limitations on what foundations could do, and he discovered that there were virtually none.

Though PATMAN's 1962 report attracted some attention, Internal Revenue proceeded on leaden feet to act on the revealed abuses. In October 1963 PATMAN bluntly called IRS's supervision of foundations "a dud, a dismal failure." He pointed out that IRS had not even attempted to audit 11 Rockefeller-controlled foundations, 8 Ford-controlled foundations, 5 Carnegie foundations; it hadn't attempted to audit 4 of 6 Mellon-controlled foundations, and 6 out of 9 Du Pont-controlled foundations. Stung by the criticism, Internal Revenue promised action and appointed an advisory committee on foundations to help it study the knotty problems PATMAN had raised. PATMAN was promised some action on a program by the end of last year; then the action was deferred until this spring—and now it's been put off again, until the end of the year. PATMAN, after examining the composition of IRS's advisory committee, hasn't much doubt about the reasons for the protracted stall.

"Ten of the fourteen members of the advisory committee are tied in with foundations," he says. "That's like appointing the goose as guardian over shelled corn."

IRS and its flock of trained geese may still have a rough time with PATMAN. He is convinced that facts and logic are on his side, that his idea of curbing the privileged might of the foundations will take root and grow, that the time will come when not even the massed power of obstructive billions will be able to stop it.

Nightmare in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, an unprecedented and intensifying reign of terror now threatens the Negro community of McComb, Miss., with death, injury, and unlawful detention.

Today, the very day that President Johnson is to meet with three women whose houses have been recently bombed, reports from McComb foretell a total breakdown of civilization there.

Two new bombings are reported. Twenty-four people, most of them school aged, have been arrested and charged with criminal syndicalism for the sole reason that they live in the neighborhood of a recent bombing and it is rumored that one young person residing there has damaging evidence about the attackers.

Owners of bombed dwellings are under suspicion, even arrest, for the crime against their own lives and property. A young civil rights worker has been jailed and charged with being an accessory after the fact to a bomb incident; it is explained that he illegally failed to come forward with evidence about the attack, when it appears that he had merely observed aloud that bombings were occuring in McComb. A Negro, recently hired as a local policeman, has declined to follow orders to brutalize other members of his race, and has resigned; his house has also just been bombed.

This situation demands a greatly increased Federal presence in Pike County, and much more vigorous initiative by the Department of Justice. These steps are being urged on the administration in the appropriate way at the present time, and it is ardently hoped that the President will take the lead in turning back this tide of brutal reprisal before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, in light of today's events a remarkable article appearing in the September issue of the Progressive takes on even greater significance. Entitled "Nightmare in Mississippi," it was written by Dr. Peter Weiss, director of the county mental health project at the University of Wisconsin. It ranks among the very finest pieces of writing thus far to emerge from the Mississippi project, and I commend it to the attention of all Members.

The article follows:

NIGHTMARE IN MISSISSIPPI

(By Peter Weiss)

In Mississippi this summer, against the background of the jack-booted terror of official and unofficial reprisals, one could not avoid being startled by the success of the summer project, an education and voter registration program sponsored by the Council of Federated Organizations (COFO), and by the enthusiasm and concentration of the young civil rights volunteers working on it. It has split Mississippi wide open and revealed to the Nation a social order so rotten

and corrupt that it defies comprehension. The student volunteers who came here from middle-class Northern homes early in the summer are already veterans, as hardened to their battle as any soldiers can be, and the likelihood of frightening them away has all but disappeared from the mind of white Mississippi.

The war on racism is a serious one, and these student volunteers have moved constantly in the shadow of violence and death. But the words "freedom now" burn in their stomachs, and they have learned to live with their fear and perpetual concern about safety. In doing so, they have implicated all of us and revealed that had we thought of the Negroes as people we would have been implicated long ago.

Such courage born of purpose is still hard for us to believe. In Jackson, I met a tall, soft spoken, tow-headed Stanford University student who had just been bombed out of the Freedom House in McComb and was recuperating from his injuries. His ear drums had been split, and he had a mild concussion and cuts from glass. He was frightened and at first spoke little (the night before he had awakened screaming in a thunderstorm).

He told me that he was on his way back to McComb to help with repairs and to continue canvassing for voters. He explained that McComb was a new project (in the dangerous southwest hill country where the Klan has been very active) and that in time the community would become more tolerant. "When they see that we mean to stay, then they will slow up." He said this less than 24 hours after he had left McComb and after a wild chase given by carloads of armed whites up the highway to Jackson.

Again, in a church in Meridian, I witnessed a similar display of courage in a young Negro member of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), who was planning to go back into Neshoba County, a death trap for civil rights workers and the place where the bodies of the three young volunteers, James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner, who "disappeared" in June, have now been found: "I will go up there on Saturday with Lilly (a local volunteer) and stay the weekend. Then on Monday we'll move in." They would go there armed only with pencils and sample registration forms and a deep commitment to nonviolence. "God help this boy" a woman jumped up and cried, "He's going there for you and me and I haven't the nerve to go with him. He is going up there to die for us just like James Chaney and the other boys did."

Courage such as this is already legendary in the young movement of nearly 1,000 volunteers recruited by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, CORE, and other civil rights groups. There is hardly an SNCC staff member around who hasn't been clubbed, beaten, and drenched in his own blood by the police and the young hoods that serve them. What is overpowering about the summer project and the COFO organization is not the program, which is startling enough, but the people in it. They reveal the passion that is their youth, and they are armed with the ideals of Christ and Patrick Henry and Jefferson and Gandhi. The righteous raging at the "student volunteers—the beatniks, the wild-eyed, leftwing nuts, the unshaven and unwashed trash * * *" reveals a desperate need among the local racists to create as much social distance from the students as possible, lest they see too closely the broken promise of their own youth.

Thus, while the white citizens don their sheets and tough sheriffs go around looking for someone to "knock the fire out of," COFO has been nailing its message to the door of Mississippi. Biracial teams have fanned out daily into Negro neighborhoods to plead with the people there to "go down and register." They have met the apathy and resignation that constitute the Mississippi Negro and they have read the fear that has been laminated into his hide.

This work is discouraging, often infuriating, but mostly humbling, because on those fearful black faces is the searing truth about tyranny: So many of the subjects have collapsed before the king and are cooperating in their own beheading. "And when," puzzled one project youth, "they ask us, 'What you goin' to do when they knock my head off, if I go down to register?' what can we say?" There is nothing that can be said, but the Negroes do see these COFO workers risking life and limb, and they, like the whites, cannot help but be impressed. The summer project is moving a civilization just by its very existence, and the paltry returns from the voter registrar's office do not detract from this.

If Negroes cannot be placed on the regular voting rolls then COFO will register them on its own freedom rolls. Thousands are being registered this way, allowing them to vote, even if it is not legally recognized. What cannot be done within the racist political structure of Mississippi is being done outside it and within the structure of the new Freedom Democratic Party (FDP). This political move has an uncertain future, but as an experiment in political education it is already a stunning success.

At a church meeting one night the breathtaking truth of this was revealed when a young Negro COFO worker staged a mock election. With the sensitivity and finesse of King Solomon, he drew shy and retiring people into a contrived precinct meeting and assigned them participating roles. He explained to them the meaning of an election and what a precinct was and told them of the coming county FDP convention. He explained how they were to elect a chairman for their group.

Then they tried it. A woman nominated herself for chairman. Someone had to second the nomination, and the COFO worker showed them how. They did it over again. They squirmed, and someone stood up and complained that she didn't know what was going on. The worker patiently went through the process again, and you could feel the tension and the impatience and the frustration they felt in their ignorance, in front of white people who were in the audience.

These Mississippians were enacting fundamental democratic roles which the caste system has forced them to ignore. They were full-grown adults who were participating, for the first time in their restricted lives, in the basic process of a free society. The light of pride in their faces showed through their embarrassment. Moreover, as they became absorbed in this process, they began to function on a new level. They elected a committee to seek the use of the courthouse for the FDP county convention. The subjects of the king had declared themselves citizens of the republic.

It is difficult for a subjugated people to take advantage of such an opportunity merely by having it presented to them. The cost of political interest is so high for the Mississippi Negro, and he has learned so well to avoid it, that in many ways citizenship is not yet a psychological possibility. Education, here, is thus not the mere acquisition of skills but also the process of developing an awareness of self and learning the significance of one's own life experience.

The crushing effects of the caste system in Mississippi, as elsewhere, have left the Negro so severely depressed that he walks in a haze, never knowing who he is and never understanding the real meaning of his trying life. His education has been a preparation for an adjustment to a white world that does not recognize him. It is an education—what there is of it—for a life of servitude, turning him away from opportunities that are not his and teaching him not to see them. COFO is trying to supplement this thin diet with its voter registration drive, with its encompassing mass-meeting workshops, and, more pointedly, in the establishment of freedom schools with their enriched curriculum of Negro history and contemporary problems.

These schools have functioned all over Mississippi this summer in the hope of providing Negro teenagers with some awareness of their past and its significance in terms of their present life situation. The courses in Negro history, English language expression, art, and other subjects are all designed to encourage these young people to get into the freedom movement and to work for social change. The social renewal of a broken people is a complex task and cannot rest solely on voting. In Mississippi an enlightened local leadership needs to be developed, and people need to be awakened.

For similar reasons community centers are being established not only as a resource for recreational, educational, and welfare activities but also to validate the need for people to express varied aims in life so that they can advance beyond working and bearing slave children. As with the freedom schools, these centers also provide Negro children with an opportunity to see the possibilities of an integrated world and to learn something about people beyond their being dangerous or safe. The program is undermining some of the intense hatreds that otherwise would inevitably consume these children when they grow up, and is providing them with some new meanings about freedom that have to do with an inner sense of belonging to this world.

All of this has sparked the summer outrage of white Mississippi, and the violence of its reprisals has left its people spent of their energy for cooperation. White Mississippi lacks heart and courage, but most of all it lacks perspective. It is choking on its own lynch rope and pulling the knot tighter and tighter around its own neck. Here are the white victims of the caste system and its racial mythology that keeps them entranced in a state of dysphoric excitement.

The COFO program in its entirety is open to white Mississippi on a segregated basis if need be. The response from whites has been less than enthusiastic, and the rare inquiries that are made make COFO news. On July 5 in Ruleville a local white man came into the community center to inquire of the activities there and to engage in a critical but friendly dialog (the beginning of enlightenment). He was arrested. More often such dialogs with COFO takes place from the window of a pickup truck, guns blazing with buckshot to scatter "them nigger lovers."

This is Mississippi's ruthless reply to the COFO peace corps. To date this State has an almost unblemished record of lawlessness, which is supported by the limitless patience of the Justice Department. The present restraint of official violence against the COFO volunteers, however encouraging, is misleading, because local Negroes suffer the reprisals. Bombings, burnings, whippings, shootings, and job dismissals continue to occur with unfaltering regularity. It is appalling to find them appearing in the Northern press as "scattered incidents."

To the Negroes of Mississippi and to the COFO staff, these incidents are a nightmare reality that faces them daily. I cannot recall an instant of my visit in Mississippi that I was not afraid. And you don't have to be a civil rights worker or a COFO supporter to get hurt. If you are black, you might still get killed in a night's "funnin'," and be dumped half and half into the river.

Those who catch the worst of this terror are the Negro civil rights workers, especially those from SNCC who are frequently faced with being beaten by the police in the jailhouse while "resisting arrest." Somehow

personal dignity and nonviolence combine to terrorize the authorities and sorely try their already limited capacity for restraint. The record is full of incidents such as this one:

On June 8, five SNCC workers were passing through Columbus, Miss., en route to a staff meeting in Atlanta. They were stopped by the State highway patrol. (Gov. Paul Johnson relies heavily on the patrol in his struggle with the county sheriffs for the control of Mississippi.) The patrolman walked up to the car and said, "You goddamn niggers want to change our way of life." (This to my knowledge is not a traffic problem.) He then ordered the five out of the car and searched it, finding Summer Project literature and Fanny Lou Hamer (a Negro candidate for Congress sponsored by COFO) campaign posters. He called the sheriff of Lowndes County and searched each one of the five young men. The sheriff arrived and took four of them, handcuffed, to jail. The fifth went with the highway patrolman to a spot about a mile from where the car had been stopped. The affidavit dated June 8, 1964, and signed by James Black, age 17, reads:

"He told me to get out of the car; I refused to get out. So he pulled me out. He started hitting me with his fists, and after about twenty blows he got out his blackjack and hit me one time with it and knocked me down. Then he told me to get back in the car. While he was beating me, he asked if any white folks had ever treated me bad; I told him yes, and he hit me again. He asked me again had any white folks in Mississippi treated me bad, and I told him no. At that point he helped me back into the car.

"Then he took me to the county jail (Lowndes) where I was questioned by the sheriff. The sheriff asked for my driver's license and to take everything out of my pockets * * * I had a friend's I.D. card in my pocket and he asked me if my friend was a Negro or a nigger. I told him a Negro. The same highway patrolman was there, and took out his blackjack and again asked if my friend was a Negro or a nigger. He started to hit me with the blackjack, and I told him my friend was a nigger."

The four other young men were questioned similarly throughout the night and finally charged with reckless driving. James Black was tried, convicted, and fined the following day in court. All were released, after paying $4 each for their night in jail.

This is a common occurrence in Mississippi. In it the cry of "Jew! Jew! Jew!" echoes from the Nazi past amid the thumping cadence of blows to the head and groin, only to be thinly covered up by the barest formalities of the judicial process. And people say, as they once said, "We didn't know."

In its deep commitment to the safety of its volunteers, COFO has covered Mississippi with a security network that would make the Central Intelligence Agency envious. COFO knows when you are out and where you will be and the route you will take and your time of arrival. If at any point in this process a person "disappears," the Federal Bureau of Investigation is notified, and search parties set out immediately. Sometimes the sheriffs get coy and start shifting a prisoner around in order to foul up the search. In one case the sheriff's wife took the jailhouse telephone off the hook to prevent the location of a COFO prisoner. None of this has so far succeeded.

The three young students who disappeared in June were not sacrificed, as was cynically claimed, to bring Federal pressure on Mississippi. Federal attention to the constitutional rights of the student volunteers is what it was from the start—minimal. In a statement to the press July 10 in Jackson, J. Edgar Hoover stated that the FBI does not "and will not give protection to the civil rights workers." And, indeed, the FBI has not. The opening of a permanent FBI office in Jackson and the addition of 50 agents in Mississippi were not very encouraging to the civil rights workers, since the existing contingent of 100 did not allow itself to become overworked.

The catalog of official and unofficial violations of Federal law, especially interference with voter registration work in the first month of the summer project, covers eight legal-size pages of single-spaced type. The FBI arrested three people in one case. It has been called repeatedly for help and has done little if anything. When Chaney, Goodman, and Schwerner disappeared on June 21, the FBI was notified at 10 p.m. It entered the case 20 hours later, after 16 calls had been made to the FBI and to the Justice Department. This is usual. It leaves the impression that the FBI, this summer in Mississippi, had been little more than a telephone answering service for the Federal Government.

The FBI is not entirely to blame, however. Its activity depends on Federal policy. Hoover's televised gesture of solidarity with Mississippi officials was a tour de force. They looked as if they were getting married as they upheld the rule of law and order and exchanged vows of allegiance to it. But of the flagrant and systematic violations of the State and Federal Constitutions in the denial of due process to U.S. citizens in Mississippi, nothing was said.

The problem of anarchy—the lawlessness of Mississippi law enforcement—seems to have been referred once again to the local authorities. The Federal Government is not enforcing the law. Its failure to do so has encouraged local indifference to it in Mississippi. If a Federal judge, hearing a voter registration case in the name of the United States, refers from the bench to the applicants as "a bunch of niggers who are acting like a bunch of chimpanzees," then what can be expected from a county sheriff in the discharge of his duties?

Here is the alarming frustration of the civil rights movement. You fight your way past the bottles and curses to the courthouse. Then you fight your way through a gantlet of billyclubs up the steps to the registrar's office only to find that you cannot exercise your birthright as an American citizen. Then you fight your way back home again through the same mob. That night your house is bombed, and you stumble dazed and deaf into the front yard where a policeman stands spitting on your grass, trying to conceal his glee. Mississippi, 1964, is Germany, 1936, revisited.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board of independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Lithuanian Festivities at World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 25, 1964

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I was privileged to attend Lithuanian Day ceremonies at the New York World's Fair last month and to join in paying tribute to the brave people of Lithuania. Jospeh Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires of the Lithuanian Government, also spoke on that memorable occasion as well as on August 23 at the Lithuanian song and dance festival.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the remarks of Mr. Kajeckas on those occasions.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR KEATING'S REMARKS ON LITHUANIAN DAY AT THE WORLD'S FAIR, AUGUST 23, 1964

I always welcome an opportunity to pay tribute to the oppressed people of Lithuania and the cause they represent.

What is at stake in Lithuania is the great question that will determine the future of mankind—the question of whether men and nations should be free.

Two historic movements are in conflict throughout the world. On one side are the democratic nations of the West which have worked steadily since World War II to spread human freedom by granting independence to their former colonies.

On the other side are the new imperialists of international communism who have moved relentlessly to extend their tyranny by swallowing up smaller and weaker nations.

Lithuania's present state is a tragic example. I have admiration for this brave little land which reestablished its independence in 1918 and victoriously fought off Soviet Russian attempts at conquest for 3 long years. I mourn Lithuania's loss of its hard-won freedom during World War II when the Soviet Communists finally succeeded in taking over the country by military force and annexing it against the will of the people.

Lithuania as a nation disappeared from the map of Europe, but it still lives on in the hearts of its sons and daughters who loathe their Communist masters.

There are some in the United States today who say that we should accept the map as the Communists have redrawn it. They say that we only delude ourselves and the Lithuanian people when we talk of future freedom for Lithuania.

Those who offer these counsels of defeatism call themselves realists. I call them shortsighted. They are unable to see beyond the surface map of the moment to the underlying realities of our world situation.

It is totally unrealistic to suppose that by condoning Russia's annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic countries we can expect Soviet comunism to become more conciliatory. Instead, the Soviets will be encouraged to pursue their aims of conquest all the more aggressively.

It is equally unrealistic to suppose that if we yield in such matters of principle we can retain effective leadership among free world nations. Instead, there will be a loss of confidence in the United States among our friends and allies.

True realism demands an opposite course. We must make it unmistakably clear that in our dealings with the Communist world we will never bargain or make concessions on the fundamental issues of human rights and freedom. So far the defeatists in our ranks have not prevailed. The U.S. Government, with the backing of not only 1 million fine Americans of Lithuanian origin, but the American people as a whole, has continued to withhold recognition of the Soviet conquests of the Baltic republics.

We must stand firm on this policy, and we should go farther. We should not be content with a passive policy of nonrecognition. We must proclaim at every opportunity the right of self-determination for the Lithuanians and for the many other subject peoples now suffering under alien Communist oppression.

In so doing, we can reassert before the world the absolute falsity of the Communist claim to be the liberators of humanity.

We must give our support to the cause of freedom in Lithuania as a matter of right and justice.

We must give this cause our support if we are to succeed in the great struggle to advance the cause of freedom throughout the world.

REMARKS BY JOSEPH KAJECKAS, CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF LITHUANIA, AT THE LITHUANIAN SONG AND DANCE FESTIVAL, SINGER BOWL, NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, AUGUST 23, 1964

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, at the last New York World's Fair held here in Flushing Meadow, on the eve of World War II, Lithuanians exhibited to the world the happy fruits of the peaceful progress under freedom and independence which they had enjoyed since 1918. They demonstrated the indomitable spirit of a people whose language and culture are older than that of most other countries of the world. Since that last New York World's Fair, however, Lithuania has been a captive nation and the victim of ruthless, flagrant and continuing aggression. We meet here today to honor the thousands of valiant Lithuanians who have died in the just cause of freedom, and also to demonstrate that the desire of Lithuanians to be free and independent again continues to burn with undiminished strength. Earlier today, we participated in ceremonies at the Lithuanian Wayside Cross erected here at the World's Fair; that cross symbolizes the suffering of our people, but it also symbolizes their hope and determination to be free again.

Here at this song and dance festival, we see an expression of the flowering of Lithuanian culture. The variety and vigorous life of our native arts encourage us to hope that the creative energy mirrored in art can lead to a better world for all peoples, if only we remember how to dream, how to be dedicated, how to spend ourselves. Our songs and dances teach us how to put aside inhibitions, how to go out of ourselves, and how to join with others in "taking arms against a sea of troubles." We are doubly proud today to have as the mistress of ceremonies of this festival Miss Ruta Lee Kilmonis, who just a week ago succeeded, after long years of effort, in effecting the release of her grandmother from behind the Iron Curtain. She has given us all an example of how to persevere in a just cause. I am privileged to congratulate her and all the participants in this Lithuania Day, especially Chairman Prof. Jack J. Stukas and his committee, and to welcome the visitors to this event of the Fair.

REMARKS BY JOSEPH KAJECKAS, CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF LITHUANIA, ON THE OCCASION OF LITHUANIA DAY AT THE U.S. FEDERAL PAVILION, NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, N.Y., AUGUST 24, 1964

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege to greet you at this observance of Lithuania Day at the Federal pavilion. By gathering here today, we are honoring a nation whose language and culture are older than that of most countries of the world; a nation that played a great part in the formation of modern Europe, and whose people have for centuries demonstrated their dedication to human freedom; we honor a nation well over a million of whose sons and daughters on American soil have played a substantial part in helping America meet the challenges of freedom.

In the early middle ages, Lithuania was one of the most powerful states in Europe, but her power dwindled, and she was engulfed by a more powerful neighbor. For centuries after that, Lithuanians struggled to regain their freedom and independence, and this they did in 1918. From 1918 until 1940, Lithuania achieved a wonderful record of peaceful democratic progress in all spheres of national life. But in 1940, Lithuania was gobbled up by her imperialistic and totalitarian neighbor in a flagrant and ruthless act of aggression. That illegal occupation continues to the present day, and the atrocities and genocide which it involves are public knowledge. Here at the fair there is a Lithuanian wayside cross opposite the garden of meditation; this cross is dedicated to the thousands of brave Lithuanians who have died in the struggle to regain their country's liberty. That cross expresses the suffering of my enslaved nation, but it also stands for the hope and determination of my people to be free again.

I have talked about these aspects of Lithuanian history because the theme of this fair is "Peace Through Understanding." One of the things we must understand is that there is no real peace without human freedom based upon the dignity of the individual; as Abraham Lincoln said, the world cannot endure half slave and half free. And if men and nations are to cooperate peacefully, there must be justice between them. There is, in other words, no peace without justice, and that is the principal problem facing the world today. In this sense, the present fate of Lithuania, a nation unjustly enslaved, has for almost a quarter century served as a paradigm of a world out of joint. Yet the determination of the Lithuanian people to be free again stands as an example of hope to all freedom-loving peoples. And the contributions made by Lithuanian-Americans to build a good and free society

in America, their adopted country, shows how hope must be made manifest in action.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is no doubt that we live in a paradoxical age. Millions of people have made the voyage to America, a voyage so eloquently documented in a film here at the Federal pavilion, and then passed through New York Harbor and the welcoming presence of the Statue of Liberty. Now, hundreds of thousands of people who approach this Federal pavilion must pass by the Berlin pavilion, which reminds us of injustice and wanton disregard for human dignity, but it also expresses the hopes of the people of West Berlin. Such a seeming contradiction helps to remind us that a just political order takes years to build, but injustice and greed can tear it down overnight. Evil forces have a much easier time of it than the forces of justice, because evil forces can afford to be unscrupulous. As we enter this Federal pavilion, we pass by an excellently fashioned bust of a man who knew how to be patient and courageous in the face of this paradox. John Kennedy once described the unfinished business of freedom-loving peoples as "the long twilight struggle." No one has put it better. The Lithuanian people who have enriched these American shores know that lesson very well. Their patience and courage in the pursuit of regained independence for Lithuania is matched only by their gratitude to their fellow Americans for the steadfast support and encouragement which Americans have given to the Lithuanian cause. And I echo their gratitude as I warmly thank you for your presence here on Lithuania Day at the Federal pavilion.

Report of Congressman John Brademas on the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, every 2 years I send to the citizens of the Third Congressional District in Indiana, whom I have the honor to represent, a report, printed at my expense, on the work of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of my report on the 88th Congress:

THE 88TH CONGRESS ENACTS MAJOR LEGISLATION—A REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 1964.

DEAR FRIEND: As I write, the 88th Congress is still in session discussing important legislation. Although we have not yet adjourned, I want to send to you, as I have done every 2 years, this report, printed at my expense, on the 88th Congress (1963–64).

This Congress passed highly important legislation in the areas of education, tax reduction and reform, civil rights, nuclear testing and anti-poverty, as well as updating existing programs in manpower retraining, the Peace Corps, housing, mass transit and natural resources conservation, and scored a legislative "first" in the field of mental health.

Members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, have given long and conscientious consideration to their responsibilities. The Washington Post said that, in quantity and quality, the 88th Congress is destined to rank as one of the top legislative performers of our time and added: "It can never be said of the 88th that it 'rubber-stamped' anything. Nearly every administration bill rolled out for action has been the subject of a swift and roughneck rumpus."

This report is necessarily brief and centered on my primary duties as a lawmaker. Of course, I also spend a large portion of my time helping Third District citizens on such matters as veterans' problems, social security, small business and military service; working to bring new industries and Government contracts to our area; seeking approval of new and improved post offices; in short, serving as a link between you and your Federal Government.

JOHN BRADEMAS,
Member of Congress.

TOWARD FULL EMPLOYMENT: A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

The State of Indiana and most of the third district have been sharing in the extraordinary expansion of the U.S. economy since early 1961. For example, 42 new industries have begun in Elkhart so far in 1964. The insured jobless rate in Elkhart County was only 1.1 percent in mid-August 1964, down from 8.9 percent in January 1961. The insured unemployment rate in La Porte County fell from 12.6 to 1.7 percent in the same period.

The Studebaker shutdown of last year was chiefly responsible for damaging the remarkable gains in the South Bend-Mishawaka area. From 11.1 percent of the total labor force unemployed in January 1961, the rate fell to 2.1 percent last October—a 10-year low.

When Studebaker management decided to halt production last December, an army of individuals and agencies got busy to help: my own office, Senators VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH, the Departments of Labor, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare; Indiana State and South Bend officials, and local community leaders.

President Johnson immediately set up an Interdepartmental Committee to assist South Bend in meeting the problems growing out of the shutdown.

Here are some of the actions taken:

1. New industry has come to South Bend: Kaiser-Jeep, Cummins Engine, Allied Products. In February Kaiser-Jeep took over Studebaker's $80 million Army truck contract and in July won more Government work. Altogether Kaiser holds nearly a quarter of a billion dollars worth of contracts to make Army trucks in South Bend.

2. Senators HARTKE and BAYH and I and the South Bend-Mishawaka Chamber of Commerce sponsored an Industrial Procurement Conference to encourage increased participation by area firms in government business. The chamber has since established a local office of Federal procurement and business assistance to encourage new jobs and payroll.

3. At the suggestion of Dr. Harold L. Sheppard, President Johnson's expediter in South Bend, Mayor Lloyd Allen named an economic action council to coordinate the community's development efforts.

4. Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz directed speedy approval of manpower training projects for unemployed Studebaker workers.

5. The Agriculture Department agreed to expedite distribution of surplus food to unemployed workers where necessary.

6. FHA and Veterans' Administration cooperated with local lenders where employees requested postponement of payments on federally insured mortgages.

There are no easy answers to the human and economic problems caused by a major plant shutdown. But the close cooperation by Federal, State, and local officials and community leaders and the determination of the citizens of this area give solid hope for the future. As President Johnson said following his visit, "South Bend is a city that is fighting back. It is retraining its workers and attracting new industry."

We will continue these efforts until South Bend and Mishawaka are booming along at the same pace as neighboring cities and the rest of the Nation.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT MEANS ATTACK ON POVERTY IN UNITED STATES

On March 16 this year President Johnson sent a message to Congress pledging the full resources of the Government toward the elimination of poverty, a condition which affects one-fifth of the Nation's population. In August, I was present at the White House to receive from the President one of the pens with which he signed into law the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This act will enable the United States to begin a massive attack on the paradox of poverty in the richest nation in history.

Economists generally define poverty as an annual income below $3,000 for a family of four, or $1,500 for an individual living alone. Thirty-five million persons, or 20 percent of the American people, live below the poverty line.

The new Office of Economic Opportunity, to be headed by Sargent Shriver, will administer the several programs authorized by the new law, including:

1. A Job Corps to provide 100,000 youth, age 16–21, with a 2-year vocational training and work experience.

2. A work training program to enable 200,000 youths to work and train in their own communities on projects selected by local organizations or governments.

3. A work-study program to provide part-time employment for 140,000 needy students to continue college.

4. A community action program to encourage urban and rural communities to prepare long-range plans to assist low-income individuals and families obtain education, employment, job training and counseling, vocational rehabilitation, housing, and welfare.

5. A corps of volunteers in service to America to act as a domestic peace corps among needy Americans.

Community leaders in South Bend and officials at the University of Notre Dame have already indicated interest in local participation in certain programs provided by the Economic Opportunity Act.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SALUTES SOUTH BEND'S ROLE IN MANPOWER TRAINING

When President and Mrs. Johnson visited the manpower training classes at the Cline School in South Bend earlier this year, they were deeply impressed by the community's program of retraining unemployed workers to help them find new jobs.

Said the President: "We have gone through this school and have been stimulated and inspired by what we have seen—men and women who have lost their job but not their determination. * * * They are working and preparing themselves to do a better job today than they did yesterday. When I get back to Washington I am going to say to the leaders of that great Capital that I wish they could come here to the heartland of America and see what the people are doing for themselves."

South Bend was one of the first communities in the Nation to set up classes under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, on which I worked as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee. In 1963 Congress amended this act to authorize literacy programs to prepare those insufficiently educated for occupational training. South Bend Tribune Publisher Franklin D. Schurz, head of both the Indiana State and St. Joseph County Manpower Advisory Commissions, testified before our committee on the need for courses in reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Unemployed workers are learning new skills in the many different training projects now underway in South Bend. Fortunately, South Bend had several manpower classes in action when Studebaker closed its gates, so it was possible to move swiftly to set up additional courses in the community's effort to find new employment for several thousand workers.

One of the toughest problems caused by the Studebaker shutdown unquestionably is the dilemma faced by the man in his midfifties, too young to retire and too old to find another job easily. South Bend is one of five cities in the United States receiving funds under the Manpower Act for a program specially aimed at helping unemployed workers over 50. In June 1964, the Labor Department extended for another year the life of Project ABLE, which is concentrated on helping some 2,000 workers over 50 find jobs where available, or retraining them for new ones and encouraging area employers to hire on the basis of ability without regard to age.

PEACE CORPS SHOWS AMERICA AT ITS BEST

The 88th Congress, by sweeping bipartisan votes, passed bills to expand the Peace Corps. Members of both parties praised Sargent Shriver for his able administration of the Corps.

As one of the original sponsors of the 1961 bill establishing the Peace Corps, I am naturally highly gratified at the great success of this program to aid developing nations while promoting a better understanding between the peoples of our country and theirs.

I have several times talked with Peace Corps volunteers training at the University of Notre Dame for service in Chile and Uruguay and have been deeply impressed by their ability and dedication. The Peace Corps shows our American heritage at its best.

THE OLDER CITIZEN—18 MILLION AMERICANS

Among the chief problems faced by the nearly 18 million older Americans are adequate health protection, housing and retirement income.

As I write, Congress has not yet acted on the issue of providing some form of protection against the cost of hospitalization and nursing home care through the social security system, as proposed by the late President Kennedy and President Johnson.

Here are some of the facts behind this proposal: (1) Hospital bills have increased tremendously (up from $9.39 a day in 1946 to about $40 in 1964); (2) people over 65 use 3 times as much hospital care as those under 65; (3) the elderly have limited financial resources (half the aged couples have less than $2,800 in annual income); only half the Nation's elderly held hospital insurance as of 1962.

With a few days to go before adjournment, however, Congress now appears more likely to provide some increases in cash benefits to social security beneficiaries than to pass a health care measure. This would push the issue into the Congress next year.

The 1964 tax cut law contains changes important to people 65 or older, including: (1) a higher limit on the amount of retirement income on which the retirement income credit is based; (2) more liberal rules on medical expense deductions.

In 1964 Congress also extended and broadened the program of low-interest loans for housing for the elderly.

The problem of job discrimination because of age continues to be a serious one for many older workers and will certainly command the attention of the next Congress.

CONGRESS PASSES BIGGEST TAX CUT IN HISTORY

On February 26 this year, President Johnson signed into law the largest tax cut in the Nation's history—$11.5 billion in individual and corporation income levies. In doing so, he ended a campaign begun by President Kennedy 13 months earlier.

The Revenue Act of 1964 lowered the tax rates on individuals from a range of 20 to 90 percent to a new range of 14 to 70 percent and cut corporation taxes from 52 to 48 percent over a period of 2 years. Congress also revised the rates to give special benefit to small businesses.

The tax cut already has helped spark the longest peacetime business expansion in U.S. history. Four million more people are working today than in January 1961. Personal incomes are reaching new all-time peaks, and so are corporate profits. The total output of goods and services (gross national product) will hit about $625 billion this year, up $120 billion since 1960. And business plans to invest 13 percent more in plant and equipment this year than in 1963. This means still more jobs.

In spite of this unprecedented economic expansion, due in large measure to the tax cut and the general climate of business confidence, the U.S. record of price stability exceeds that of any other nation. Inflation has been kept under control.

What will the tax cut of 1964 mean to individual taxpayers? Income tax rate reductions in 1965 will average about 20 percent. Here are some average cuts per income level:

	Reduction in percent
Up to $3,000	39.0
$3,000 to $5,000	26.9
$5,000 to $10,000	20.6
$10,000 to $20,000	17.0

I agree with President Johnson's statement that the tax cut is "the single most important step that we have taken to strengthen our economy since World War II."

THE EDUCATION CONGRESS

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I take particular pride in the outstanding record of the 88th Congress in the field of education. Among the accomplishments:

1. Higher Education Facilities Acts: will help colleges and universities like Bethel, Goshen, St. Mary's, Indiana, Purdue, and Notre Dame build classrooms, libraries and laboratories. Provides $1.2 billion in grants and loans over a 3-year period. I authored one section of the bill which earmarks about $50 million annually in grants for technical institutes and junior colleges, to train vitally needed 2-year, college-level, semiprofessional technicians to assist our scientists.

2. Vocational Education Act: provides $956 million in matching grants for the expansion of State vocational education programs in the next 5 years. South Bend has already applied for Federal funds to build one of the new vocational schools provided by the act. The law also authorizes work-study grants for needy vocational students.

3. Medical and Dental School Act: authorizes $175 million in grants to build such schools; also provides loans for students of medicine, dentistry and osteopathy.

4. Mental Health Facilities Act: authorizes grants of $51.5 million over 3 years to train 20,000 teachers of mentally retarded, and other handicapped children.

5. National Defense Education Act: increases funds for college loans (students at Bethel, Goshen and St. Mary's Colleges and Notre Dame received $400,000 in loans last year); continues programs for science, mathematics and foreign language training, and for counseling services. Under the National Defense Education Act, Notre Dame also received over $100,000 for a graduate fellowship program in 1963 and over $80,000 for a language institute.

6. Library Services and Construction Act: authorizes $25 million to help develop and expand existing libraries to cover urban as well as rural areas; also provides $20 million for new library construction.

U.S. DEFENSES STRONGER THAN COMBINED MIGHT OF ALL NATIONS IN HISTORY

As your Representative, I have served with three Presidents of the United States—Johnson, Kennedy, and Eisenhower—and I have given solid support to all three on legislation affecting our foreign policy and national security.

Since 1961 we have greatly strengthened our defense posture against possible challenge from the Communist world. As President Johnson said on June 3, 1964: "In every area of national strength America today is stronger than it has ever been before. It is stronger than any adversary or combination of adversaries. It is stronger than the combined might of all nations in the history of the world."

It was this massive arsenal of balanced military forces which enabled President Johnson to choose the appropriate response to the outrageous attack on U.S. destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin. President Kennedy had shown similar firmness and skill during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. We now have a limited war capacity which allows us to select the kind of military response to punish an aggressor without risking an all-out nuclear war.

I have voted for legislation which has made possible the development of this powerful and effective defense structure. The cost of maintaining freedom is high, but I know Americans are willing to pay it.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964: AN HISTORIC ACHIEVEMENT

Five days after the assassination of President Kennedy, President Johnson made clear to Congress and the Nation that the new administration attached the same high priority to civil rights as President Kennedy had done.

On July 2, 1964, after long months of debate in the Senate and an historic vote to halt a filibuster, President Johnson signed into law the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The act, a major landmark in American history, was passed with overwhelming bipartisan support. In the House the vote was 290 to 130, with 152 Democrats joining 138 Republicans for the bill, and 96 Democrats and 34 Republicans against it. In the Senate the vote was 73 to 27, with 46 Democrats and 27 Republicans for, and 21 Democrats and 6 Republicans against.

Although I am a Democrat, I want to pay tribute to the work of House Republican Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK and Senate GOP Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN. Without their support, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 would never have become law. The support of the churches and religious leaders of the Nation also was of decisive importance in winning passage of the bill.

In signing the bill, President Johnson said: "The purpose of this law is simple: it does not restrict the freedom of any American, so long as he respects the rights of others. It does not give special treatment to any citizen. It does say the only limit to a man's hope for happiness, and for the future of his children, shall be his own ability.

"It does say that those who are equal before God shall now be equal in the polling booths, in the classrooms, in the factories, and in the hotels, restaurants, movie theaters, and other places that provide service to the public."

Because there has been much misrepresentation about what the Civil Rights Act really does, I should point out some things it does not do. The Civil Rights Act does not affect job seniority rights; it does not require quota hiring of minority groups; it does not permit (in fact, it specifically forbids) the Federal Government to transfer students among schools for racial "balancing"; and it does not permit the Federal Government to tell a home or apartment owner or real estate operator to whom he must sell or rent.

The Justice Department has advised me that the Federal Civil Rights Act will in fact have little effect in Indiana because: "(1) Indiana has a long history of good race relations; (2) there is relatively little discrimination in Indiana as compared to other areas of the country; and (3) Indiana already has State laws dealing with discrimination."

POST OFFICES—EXPANDED FACILITIES

No agency of the Federal Government is closer to the daily lives of more citizens than the Post Office Department. I have given particular attention to helping win approval of either new or improved post offices in every county of our district.

For example, this month I helped lay the cornerstone for a new and long-needed post office building in Elkhart and, in June, I took part in ceremonies dedicating a fine new post office in La Porte. Here are other Third District communities which have had or will have new or improved post offices during my term as Congressman: Argos, Bourbon, Bremen, Bristol, Donaldson, Goshen, Hanna, Michigan City, Millersburg, Middlebury, New Carlisle, Plymouth, Tippecanoe, Union Mills, Wakarusa, Walkerton, and Wanatah.

VOTED AGAINST COTTON-WHEAT SUBSIDIES

I do not believe a responsible Congressman should vote for bills simply because they are recommended by a President of his own party or oppose them just because they are offered by a President of the other party. So, just as I supported President Eisenhower on foreign policy legislation during my first term, I voted against President Johnson's major farm proposal this year—the cotton-wheat bill.

The measure was passed in the House by only eight votes and the pressures upon me to vote for the bill were therefore intense. But I believe, that the bill, which provided Federal subsidies for cotton and wheat, would do little good for the farmer, the consumer or the taxpayer. So I voted against it.

This year Congress extended the food stamp program, which provided help to a number of families in our area displaced by the Studebaker shutdown. As I write, we are still considering stepping up the highly succesful food for peace program under which we have for years helped reduce farm surpluses, earned dollar benefits and won good will from hungry peoples abroad.

HUMPHREY AND GOLDWATER SUPPORT FEDERAL PAY RAISE

With strong support from both Republicans and Democrats, the House and Senate passed a bill raising the pay of 1.7 million Federal employees. The bulk of the pay boost—$536 of $556.8 million—went to 1.6 million civil service and postal employees; the rest to top Federal executives, judges, Members of Congress, and legislative and judicial branch employees. The raise for Senators and Congressmen does not go into effect until January 1, 1965.

The measure was designed to bring Federal salaries to levels comparable to those in private industry. Leaders of both parties, including Senators HUMPHREY and GOLDWATER, MANSFIELD and DIRKSEN, voted for the bill.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN MAY BE KENNEDY'S CHIEF LEGACY

History may record that the overwhelming vote of both Democrats and Republicans in the U.S. Senate in favor of the nuclear test ban treaty in 1963 will be President Kennedy's chief legacy in the field of foreign policy.

By a 4-to-1 margin, Democrats and Republicans, led by Senators MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, and EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, voted to prohibit nuclear testing in the air, in space, and under water. The treaty, ratified by 105 nations, does not forbid underground tests.

The air we breathe and the milk we drink are freer today of nuclear contamination because of this treaty. Yet our Government maintains the fullest safeguards to detect and respond to any violation of the treaty.

Nearly every newspaper in our area supported the treaty. For example, the La Porte Herald-Argus said the treaty "is an indication that the nuclear powers, having arrived at somewhat of a stalemate, very costly and very dangerous, now wish to express their hope for a less perilous world, a coexistence which will at least reduce the chances for civilization's suicide."

The test ban treaty is certainly no final solution to world tensions, but it is a hopeful sign pointing to more peaceful agreements. President Kennedy described the treaty as "an important first step—a step toward peace—a step toward reason—a step away from war."

Even the first step toward preventing nuclear war is of immense significance in today's dangerous world. Many people do not know that even the average-sized tactical nuclear bomb (which some—mistakenly—call conventional) in Western Europe today has an explosive power five times the yield of the first atomic bomb dropped in Hiroshima in World War II.

Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as the residents of my congressional district know, I believe it to be my duty and my trust to exercise independent judgment on the merits of each proposal which comes before the Congress, as well as to publicly report to my constituents at the end of each session. This report on the major accomplishments and shortcomings of the 88th Congress is a reflection of these responsibilities. Each citizen in Pennsylvania's Sixth Congressional District will receive a copy which I hope will be read and studied.

The 88th Congress is one of the longest in our Nation's history. The first session did not end until the night before Christmas last year. This second and final session was not yet adjourned when this report was prepared.

But this 88th Congress has also been described by competent and impartial observers as one of the most constructive in the annals of American history. As President Johnson said, it has enacted more legislation, met more national needs, disposed of more national issues than any other Congress in this century or the last.

SERVED WITH PRESIDENTS

In my 16 years as a Representative I cannot remember any Congress that has been more creative and hardworking than the present one. To me it was a high honor and privilege to serve in this great representative body under President John F. Kennedy and President Lyndon B. Johnson. For this I am deeply grateful to the Sixth District citizens whose confidence and faith in me have made this possible. I have known both Presidents since I was elected to Congress in 1948 as colleagues and as personal friends and as men of great dedication, vision, and ability.

President Kennedy will live throughout history as one of the great men of our time. In the hour of national tragedy when the beloved President Kennedy was assassinated, we were indeed fortunate to have as Vice President a man of stature, experience, and judgment in Lyndon B. Johnson. He was able to pick up the reins of the highest office in the world without faltering and without permitting any loss in national momentum. He has worked toward those great objectives for which President Kennedy laid the groundwork.

DISTRICTS VISITS LIMITED

I deeply regret that I did not have the opportunity to appear before more groups of my constituents, particularly in Northumberland and Schuylkill Counties, which I have represented the last 2 years since the merger of Berks, Northumberland and Schuylkill Counties into this big congressional district. The population of our Sixth District is 553,000. It is larger than any of five States of the Union. It is more than half the size of 20 of our States. Nevertheless, this new big district was a challenge to me, particularly because of economic distress in many of the coal region areas of Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties.

It gives me a great deal of satisfaction to note that substantial progress is evident throughout our Sixth Congressional District as a result of the Kennedy-Johnson legislative program and the cooperation I received from Congress and the White House and from local community leaders.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

Citizens have a right to know about their Congress and the record and the performance of their Representatives. Decisions of the Congress affect every family in our land and determine the course of our Nation in keeping a prosperous and strong economy.

For this reason I consider it my duty and responsibility to make this report to the people I represent in the Sixth Congressional District.

FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCES SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD

It is quite obvious that many persons do not realize how closely their welfare, their opportunities for jobs, for education, health services, old-age and disability pensions, good housing, and a decent livelihood are affected by decisions of the Congress.

It is important to know the fundamental differences between our two great political parties and their conflicting philosophies of government. To better understand the controversy over the antipoverty program, Appalachia, education, social security, redevelopment, taxes, public works, conservation, and other progressive programs, it is essential to know and understand these basic differences. From them sharp conflicts arise on social and economic questions.

Fiscal and economic policies vitally affect the performance of the whole American economy. They affect the price level, the levels of production and employment, the rate of economic growth, and the standard of living.

They affect the degree of economic opportunity afforded to the small as well as the large, the weak as well as the strong. They affect not only the degree of economic stability and progress, but also the degree of economic justice or injustice.

CONFLICT OF ECONOMIC PHILOSOPHIES

Democratic Senator RUSSELL LONG put it in plain language in a Senate speech when he pointed to the cleavage between the Republican and Democratic Parties. Senator LONG said:

It reflects a difference of fundamental economic philosophy—a difference which has persisted throughout our history as a Nation, and particularly during the current century. The difference is between those who believe in an economy of scarcity and those who believe in an economy of abundance; between those who feel that we must stand still, have occasional recessions or depressions, and those who feel that we have the brains and the tools to move forward without substantial interruption. It is a difference between those who feel that social injustice is the price we must pay for economic progress and those who feel that social justice and economic progress are one and inseparable.

Never before in our history were these differences more sharp and clear than in this presidential and congressional election year.

Regardless of election campaign oratory, the decision at the polls in State and National legislative contests this year will determine which one of these two courses the Nation will follow to meet the challenge and problems of our time.

RECORDBREAKING CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has called this Congress one of the most productive in recent history. The record speaks for itself. Encouraged by congressional economic legislation, the Nation is currently enjoying the longest peacetime expansion in its history.

Our gains and prosperity are evident by any index—personal income, employment, corporation profits, industrial expansion and production, or gross national product. And while promoting the general well-being, Congress has also moved to improve the lot of the poverty-stricken minority of invisible Americans. We have made a strong effort toward erasing the paradox of want in the midst of plenty.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY REVERSES TREND

When President Kennedy took office in January of 1961, the Nation was in the midst of its third recession in 7 years. To fight unemployment and get the economy moving again, President Kennedy stepped up the release of funds for Federal procurement, for highway construction, and other public works. He called for the enactment of a bold antirecession program.

Congress supported President Kennedy in enacting legislation such as public works, manpower training, educational aid, and development programs designed to stimulate the economy and help the unemployed find jobs.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON CARRIES ON

During the 1st session of the 88th Congress the Kennedy programs were expanded and refined. In the second session, under President Johnson, tax cut legislation was enacted to further encourage growth and increased job opportunities. It had my support.

The Revenue Act of 1964 provided the biggest tax cut in our Nation's history—$11.5 billion in individual and corporate incomes. Designed to bring our economy to its fullest potential, the largest share of the individual tax cut is going to families with incomes of $10,000 or less—and this group accounts for 85 percent of all taxpayers—an additional $2.2 million per month has gone to residents of the three counties of the sixth district as a result of the tax cut bill. Business gains have resulted from the $2.5 billion investment incentive for modernization and expansion, the corporate tax cut of more than $2 billion, and the release of millions of dollars into the spending stream.

WAR ON POVERTY

Also passed was the historic Economic Opportunity Act, or war on poverty program, designed to open the door of opportunity a little wider for more of our people.

Both President Kennedy and President Johnson have put strong emphasis on the need for a balanced economy. Both recognized the real waste in our Nation, a waste which results from mass unemployment and lost productivity. This loss in real wealth runs into untold billions of dollars. The drive for legislation to help our Nation's youth reflects the concern of the President about loss of talent and brainpower due to our failure to meet growing educational needs.

While great progress has been made in meeting public and human needs, there is deep concern about the many citizens who are not sharing in the progress and prosperity that most of our citizens have enjoyed. The President's program for Appalachia, his war on poverty, his desire to improve social security, and his efforts for improved educational and job opportunities are all part of his program to keep our Nation strong and forever moving forward.

The poverty program focuses attention on the needs of the 35 million Americans who live beneath the poverty line. It sets up educational, vocational, and work programs for young people, provides technical aid and grants for community projects, provides aid for the rural poor and migratory laborers, and allows concerned citizens to join a Domestic Peace Corps and serve as teachers and advisers.

THE "EDUCATION" CONGRESS

Without progress in education, there will be no progress in society. A free nation can rise no higher than the standards of excellence set in its schools and colleges. Yet the demand for qualified teachers, adequate school facilities, and proper finances so outweighs their actual supply that the United States suffers from an education gap at all levels of instruction. And the gap is growing larger.

John F. Kennedy sent Congress a special message on education in late January 1963, requesting us to "keep an eye on the whole system" of education so that all Americans might "develop their talents to the utmost." The 88th Congress responded so emphatically to his request that it was called the education Congress. Here are a few projected results of education legislation passed by this Congress.

COLLEGE EDUCATION

The College Facilities Construction Act, called the brick and mortar act, encouraged construction of college classrooms, new junior colleges, and new graduate schools to accommodate 7 million young people entering colleges in the next 7 years. Amendments to the National Defense Education Act will extend a program of loans for college education to between 70,000 and 90,000 new students; 600,000 students have already received loans under this act.

All this legislation had my support.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

This Congress passed three bills—including key sections of the poverty bill—to improve work-study and work-training programs of vocational education. For the first time the Federal Government will cooperate with the States to finance experimental programs of vocational education and construction of new vocational education facilities.

PROGRESS ON MENTAL HEALTH

In response to President Kennedy's plea for a bold new approach to attack mental illness and retardation, Congress, for the first time, acted on a program to meet our largest health problem. The Mental Health Act of 1963 provides grants for the construction of community mental health centers, emphasizing care and treatment in patients' home communities. It also authorizes a broad program to prevent and treat mental retardation by providing States and communities with needed research, manpower development, and facilities for health education, rehabilitation, and vocational services.

As ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Health and Safety and as a member of the joint Senate-House conference committee which approved this important mental health legislation, I was invited by President Kennedy to the White House to take part in ceremonies when the bill was signed. President Kennedy noted that the act "was one of the most important pieces of legislation passed by the 88th Congress."

My House subcommittee also helped steer the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 through the Congress. It was a 3-year program for construction or rehabilitation of medical, dental and related professional schools, including colleges of podiatry, and a 6-year program of loans for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy.

The effect of these programs will be more fully realized when they are completed and in full operation.

Due to my efforts for this legislation, the American Foot Health Foundation presented me with their 1964 Foot Health Award.

In the previous Congress I also received the Award of Merit from the Association of Schools of Public Health for helping to improve public health personnel training through sponsorship of the Hill-

Rhodes Act of 1958, authorizing Federal grants for the training of needed professional public health personnel. My legislation was a forerunner of the historymaking Health Professions Education Assistance Act and the Nurses Training Act of 1964, both of which will help combat the shortages of needed medical and health professionals in our growing counrty.

Two other awards were presented to me for my efforts on health legislation. One was presented by Dr. Ernest L. Stebbins of Johns Hopkins University representing the Association of Schools of Public Health. The other was a presentation by the Indoor Sports Club, a national organization of handicapped citizens.

LIBRARY SERVICES

Education should not stop in the classroom—it should be fostered for all a citizen's life. This year Congress authorized $20 million in matching grants to the States for public library construction, and $25 million for development of other library services.

I voted for this legislation.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

The Housing Act of 1964 which I supported authorized $1.2 billion for urban renewal, for 45,000 new public housing units, for loans for housing for the elderly, for farm housing, and for other programs. This was supplemented by extensions of a rental housing program for the elderly in rural areas and by a program of constructing 19,800 housing units on military bases. My proposal for presubsidence payments for homes damaged by mine cave-ins was included in this legislation.

CONSERVATION

This Congress with my support approved a national wilderness preservation system, permanently preserving 9.1 million acres of federally owned lands in their primeval, untrammeled state. The lands finally included in the system will be a paradise for sportsmen and for campers who really want to "rough it" in the splendor of untouched nature. Over the next 10 years the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture are to make recommendations concerning possible inclusion in the system of nearly 52 million more acres of Government land now classified as "primitive" national forests, national park areas, seashores and game ranges or refuges.

Also enacted into law with my support was the important land and water conservation fund of 1964 to assist the States in providing adequate outdoor recreational facilities to meet growing public needs. This legislation will be especially helpful in the Sixth District where new highways and development of natural resources to attract tourists will further stimulate economic growth and employment.

VETERANS

Veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict and their widows and children, were not forgotten by this Congress. H.R. 1927, which had my full support, increased veterans pensions by excluding certain types of income in determining pension benefits. These exclusions amount to 10 percent of payments to an individual under any public or private retirement annuity. Cash benefits accruing to veterans under this bill alone are estimated at more than $330 million during the next 5 years.

H.R. 1927 was a fitting climax to other veterans' legislation passed by the 88th Congress. Other legislation: Increased payments to parents, widows, and children of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities; permitted the Veterans' Administration to waive recovery on defaulted home loans in certain hardship cases; provided educational assistance to children of veterans with total and permanent service-connected disability; extended disability income provisions of national service life insurance policies through age 65 under certain conditions, and authorized a 5-year $25 million program of matching aid to States for nursing facilities in State veterans' homes.

Legislation which I and several other Members introduced for a World War I pension was put over to the next Congress.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Congress enacted into law the first meaningful civil rights legislation in 100 years. It took a much-needed step toward guaranteeing to a minority of Americans the protection of the Constitution which the majority of our citizens have long enjoyed. It gave to all Americans what Pennsylvania had already legislated for every resident within its borders.

Ignoring the issue or failing to take positive national action on civil rights would only delay the inevitable and necessary, and intensify the hazards of change. An overwhelming majority in Congress voted to enact the legislation.

The bill does not in any manner establish so-called quotas whereby Negroes must be hired to replace Caucasians, nor does it affect the seniority rights of union or nonunion workers.

The provisions of the Civil Rights Act are morally right, intellectually sound, legally correct, and socially necessary.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

Both Houses have approved an increase in social security benefits as well as a broadening of eligibility requirements for the program. The increase is expected to be $7 a month. The Senate version of the social security bill includes a modified hospitalization program financed through social security.

The passage of a social security bill has been delayed by the dispute over the inclusion of medicare. Those of us who support an expanded social security program seek enactment of the bill before adjournment. As this is written the final decision has not been made.

I strongly support social security and efforts to improve the program. In a Nation that worries about its surpluses, automation, and increasing production, retired elderly citizens should have the opportunity to live out their twilight years without the fear of crippling ill health, poverty, and neglect.

In a House speech during the social security debate, I pointed to the need of coverage for all citizens over age 65 including those who did not have the opportunity to receive coverage during their working life. I urged that benefits be paid on retirement at age 60 to both men and women. I also proposed a ceiling on individual social security taxes which now put a heavy burden on lower income workers and called for a partial financing from the General Treasury to meet future needs.

Social security became an issue at the GOP convention in San Francisco. Extremist elements now influential in the Republican Party have opposed what they call compulsory social security. The John Birch Society and other extremist groups would repeal it. At their national convention in Minneapolis, Young Republicans also opposed compulsory social security.

New York Governor Rockefeller opposed these GOP extremists by pointing out that the social security program would be killed if the compulsory provision should be repealed.

From its beginning social security has been a controversial issue as it is sure to be in this presidential election year.

FOREIGN POLICY

A nuclear test ban treaty limiting tests of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere was finally signed after 17 years of fruitless negotiations with the Soviets by Democratic and Republican administrations alike. This treaty in no way weakened our defenses or compromised our position on the many substantive issues. It was an explicit recognition of the restraint and responsibility that all governments must exercise in the nuclear age.

Similarly, unprovoked Communist attacks on our ships in the Gulf of Tonkin resulted in the adoption of a joint resolution of Congress reasserting our determination to maintain international peace and security in southeast Asia, and our resolve to support the President's efforts to prevent further acts of aggression.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Sixty percent of all money spent by this Congress went for a purpose to which all Americans would subscribe—maintaining the strongest Defense Establishment in the world. This sum is eight times more than the total financing of all health, education, labor, and welfare programs, the second largest category of Federal spending which accounts for only 7.6 percent of the national budget.

Still, under the responsible and effective leadership of Secretary McNamara, economy has been a guidepost in defense spending. Last fiscal year alone more than $2.5 billion was saved through prudent budget management, and this without in any way impairing our Nation's superior defense posture. On the contrary, our military might today is greater than at any time in history.

The result of our space effort was dramatically pointed out with the recent successful Ranger moonshot, an historic achievement which muted the cries of those skeptics who describe all space ventures as "moondoggling."

KEFAUVER AND WALTER

In addition to President John F. Kennedy, death claimed two other outstanding and prominent Americans during the 88th Congress. They were Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, and Congressman Francis Walter, of Pennsylvania. Both of these men were very dear friends of mine. Walter was dean of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation. Kefauver was best known as a fighter against corruption and crime.

I was closely associated with Senator Kefauver when I served as chairman of a House Subcommittee on Morals and Ethics. President Kennedy declared that Kefauver's devotion to the public interest and welfare of the people made him a powerful influence—and his death deprived the Nation of one of its greatest leaders.

Indeed, death has deprived our country of three of its greatest leaders.

FARM LEGISLATION

The 88th Congress enacted two major pieces of farm legislation. In 1963 it voted to extend the feed grain program authorizing payments to producers who voluntarily reduce their feed grain acreage. The controversial Wheat-Cotton Act, which I opposed, became law in 1964.

Legislation to extend important farm programs under the Agricultural Research Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Agricultural Marketing Service, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Farmers Home Administration was also approved with my support. Under these programs over $2 million in necessary Federal assistance has aided Sixth District farm families.

DEMOCRATIC WHIP

In this Congress I again served as assistant House whip and floor leader of the Pennsylvania Democratic delegation. As a party whip, I worked with House and Senate leaders, with President Kennedy and later with President Johnson, in seeking enactment of their progressive programs.

My attendance record was again one of the highest in Congress.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

During the first session of the 88th Congress I served as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the House Administration Committee and several subcommittees.

In the second session of the 88th Congress I was elected to the important House Ways and Means Committee headed by Chairman WILBUR MILLS.

COPTER TRIP WITH PRESIDENT

Two weeks ago I was honored by President Johnson with an invitation to fly with him and his wife, Lady Bird, in the presidential helicopter from the White House lawn to Harrisburg. It was a thrilling experience which gave me the opportunity to thank the President for his personal interest and help to our district. Two years before, I received a similar invitation from President Kennedy but unfortunately was held in Washington by a night session of Congress.

DISTRICT OFFICES

District offices have been opened in each of the three counties of the Sixth Congressional District in order to better serve constituents. They are located in Sunbury, Pottsville, and Reading.

Hundreds of students and club groups come to Washington to visit their Nation's Capital and to tour its historic sights. It has been my policy to welcome and meet them and to help make their visit an interesting and educational experience.

The many individual citizens who have visited my district and Washington offices were welcomed and afforded all possible cooperation and help.

BALLOT FRAUDS

Many Northumberland County citizens have written to me to request the Justice Department to oversee the balloting in Northumberland County this year. Deep concern has been expressed that no final decision has been made in regard to the contested election in last year's county commissioners' contest. Protests pertain to the handling of absentee ballots peddled in county hospitals and institutions and charges of violations of the election law.

Disappointment has been expressed over failure of the State attorney general to investigate voting fraud charges and take necessary steps to protect the balloting in Northumberland this year.

I discussed this matter with U.S. Attorney General Robert Kennedy before his resignation. Although the Federal Government does not have jurisdiction in a local election contest, the Justice Department will be prepared to act against any violation that may occur in Northumberland this year because it will be a Federal election.

The right of the people to a free election choice is one of our Nation's sacred principles. To protect this right, the people of Northumberland County can be of help by promptly reporting any evidence of fraud or dishonesty in this important election year.

PROGRESS IN THE SIXTH DISTRICT

Substantial economic progress is evident throughout our Sixth Congressional District as a result of the Kennedy-Johnson legislative program.

Unemployment in Northumberland and Schuylkill Counties has declined to less than half its 1960 level. It has dropped from 15 percent to less than 7½ percent. In Berks County it has dropped to below 5 percent.

The increase in jobs was made possible by the impact of the administration's antirecession program and the cooperative effort of local community leaders and public officials in taking advantage of the Federal aid programs.

In the past 2 years approximately $30 million has come into our district in Federal assistance for public works, sanitation, housing, area redevelopment, small business highway, recreational, farm aid and water projects. It was my pleasure to have voted for legislation making these projects possible, and to have given my full cooperation to local officials applying for needed Federal assistance.

HIGHWAYS

In the last 2 years $2.5 million came to our district in highway assistance. The Keystone Shortway and the Anthracite Expressway are outstanding examples of the Federal Government's role in helping to meet State and local needs. They were initiated, planned, and executed by the State government with Federal cooperation—90 percent of the cost was supplied by the Federal Government.

The completed highway projects will make the Sixth District, and especially the coal regions, more accessible to tourism and industry and have given a major boost to economic development and employment in our district.

URBAN RENEWAL AND HOUSING

Ten million dollars has been provided for housing and urban renewal in Reading and Pottsville and for urban renewal projects in other district communities.

Pottsville has mader emarkable progress in the last few years and is moving forward with urban renewal and redevelopment projects, industrial redevelopment, and other programs to provide improved public facilities to meet public needs and to provide needed job opportunities.

The elderly housing projects going up in Pottsville are a credit to the community, reflecting intelligent and enlightened leadership of public officials and commnuity leaders.

In Reading the third elderly housing project is being constructed. Reading was the first city in the Nation to have an elderly housing project. I was glad to play a role in making this possible. Other cities in our district should explore the possibility of an elderly housing project. My office will give all possible support to such efforts.

COALDALE MINE CAVE-IN PROBLEM

Owners of properties damaged by mine cave-ins will receive presubsidence value for their homes as a result of legislation which I introduced and helped pass. This was good news for families vacated from the area where the renewal project is located.

PUBLIC WORKS IN SIXTH DISTRICT

Sewage, drainage, water system and other public works construction projects were granted over $6 million by Federal agencies during the 88th Congress. These funds, to which local communities and businesses contributed percentage shares, not only helped build needed public facilities and provided funds for business expansion, but created an estimated 5,000 man-months of employment in the Sixth District.

Public works and sewer and water construction grants were made to communities throughout the Sixth District including Cumru, Fleetwood, Spring Township and Sinking Spring in Berks County; Pottsville, Cressona, Coaldale and Tamaqua in Schuylkill County, and Milton, Sunbury and Watsontown in Northumberland County.

Public works planning advances, amounting to over $600,000 were approved to help plan sanitation, hospital, parks and educational facilities in communities.

Several Sixth District industrial development corporations were given loans totaling almost $600,000. Included among these were loans to the Mount Carmel District Industrial Foundation for expansion of the Arcwire Corp., to the Shamokin Area Development Corp. for construction of a railroad siding; and to the Great Tamaqua Industrial Development Enterprises for construction of sewer lines and an access road to Tidewater Industrial Park.

WATER, FISH AND WILDLIFE

Over $550,000 was provided by the Federal Government for ground water and surface water research, fish and wildlife restoration aid, and for mine safety in the sixth district.

A $100,000 appropriation was approved to begin preliminary planning and engineering work on the proposed Blue Marsh Dam in Berks County; $1 million was appropriated with my assistance to begin construction of the Blanchard Dam and Reservoir on Bald Eagle Creek.

SMALL BUSINESS LOANS

Also important to the quickened pace of economic progress in the sixth district was the almost $2.5 million in U.S. Small Business Administration loans granted to firms in each of the three counties. Most of these loans were for construction, purchase of equipment or machinery or for purchases of inventory, and thus helped stimulate the entire economy and created additional jobs.

SOCIAL SECURITY AIDS SIXTH DISTRICT

Every month almost $5 million in social security benefits comes into the sixth district counties of Berks, Northumberland, and Schuylkill for the aged, disabled, widows and dependents. Over 70,000 sixth district residents receive these benefits.

Besides helping aged and disabled citizens and their families, it is an important business stimulant.

BILLS INTRODUCED

In this Congress, as in the past, I have introduced legislation in the House of Representatives which I believe to be in the public interest. As in previous Congresses, some of my proposals were enacted into law. Some were passed in amended form, or as part of an omnibus bill.

These are some of the bills I introduced in this Congress. They would:

Raise income tax exemptions from $600 to $800;

Provide further opportunity to State and local employees, including schoolteachers, to elect coverage under social security;

Allow social security benefits to both men and women at age 60;

Grant deduction for income tax purposes to handicapped persons for transportation expenses;

Increase to $1,800 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn while receiving social security benefits;

Allow presubsidence value for homes damaged by cave-ins when acquired for urban renewal;

Authorize Commerce Committee to conduct an investigation and ascertain need for improvements in passenger train service;

Provide a pension for World War I veterans;

Provide for Federal assistance for the construction and expansion for community junior colleges;

Increase minimum monthly social security benefits.

PART OF NATIONAL PROSPERITY

Local projects have contributed to community progress and are an example of administration programs responsible for the historymaking 44 months of our Nation's economic growth and prosperity.

Opponents of President Johnson in the Congress, and particularly extremist elements throughout the Nation have opposed Federal assistance programs which have helped our district and the Nation. They have charged that the Federal Government is too big and strong, that our freedom is being lost and that initiative is being destroyed.

The truth is, President Johnson has said, that far from crushing the individual, Government at its best liberates him from the enslaving forces of his environment.

Does the Government subvert our freedom through the social security system, which guards our people against destitution when they are too old to work? Does Government undermine our freedom by bringing electricity to the farm, by controlling floods, or by ending bank failures? Is freedom lessened by efforts to abate pollution in our streams or by efforts to gain knowledge of the causes and cure of crippling and killing disease?

Is freedom really diminished by banning the sale of harmful drugs, by providing school lunches for our children, by preserving our wilderness areas, or by improving the safety of our airways? Is freedom betrayed when in 1964 we redeem the pledge made a century ago by the Emancipation Proclamation? Those of us who support President Johnson say emphatically, "No."

In President Johnson's words these programs, "are the goals of a compassionate government which keeps faith with the trust of its father and cherishes the future of its children. Through compassion for the plight of one individual, Government fulfills its purpose as the servant of all the people."

These words of President Johnson are the answer to his critics, particularly extremist elements which have opposed the programs I have mentioned.

Basically the future of our free society hinges upon whether or not we as a free people can work out rational and responsible policies to deal with this central question: How do we keep America fully employed, how do we harness the increasing abundance that is now within our grasp and relate that abundance to the unmet needs in education, housing, medical care, highway development, resource development and many other things that make up the long list of unfinished work on the agenda of America's democracy?

The legislation for which I indicate support in this report is, I believe, the answer to this question.

Peaceful Coexistence—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker on yesterday, I offered for the information of the House prefatory material from the book "Peaceful Coexistence: A Communist Blueprint for Victory."

At this time, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an additional significant segment from this publication of the Standing Committee on Education Against Communism of the American Bar Association, as follows:

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE: A COMMUNIST BLUEPRINT FOR VICTORY

INTRODUCTION

There is little doubt that the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the world of today would be the first choice of the overwhelming majority of mankind. To be rid of the uncertainties and tensions of human conflict, and to have assurances of being able to live, work, and enjoy the great spiritual and material benefits which the world of today offers—these are priorities for all people in all nations.

But as the days and months and years progress, we seem to be no closer to these elusive goals. The sphere of human conflict, far from having contracted, and has been enlarged, and today there is virtually no corner of the globe which can isolate itself from the events which develop and aggravate such unrest.

Hence the principal feature of the absence of peace, the "cold war," is to many an integral part of contemporary international relations, something which is uncomfortable in that it threatens the American way of life, expensive, in that it imposes great financial burdens upon the government of the people; and complex, in that its language and dialogue have become more obscure with the passage of time.

Clearly, the cold war is something every American would rather do without. But nearly every American is equally aware that settlement of the cold war on the terms now offered by our main adversary, the Soviet Union, would be unacceptable.

Unquestionably, the American people do not bear malice toward the Soviet people; but they know that the words of Soviet leaders, the words of Communists, are not the words used in the language of true democracy and freedom. Although it has been said that Americans have no sense of history, nearly every public opinion poll ever taken has yielded a heavy negative response to such question as, "Can we trust the Soviets to keep their word if an agreement is made on the issues of x or y. * * *?"

While there is awareness of the realities of the Soviet record, there is also a sense of frustration which reflects our apparent inability to communicate clearly our desires to the Communists. It would seem that by now the Communists should realize that the United States really does not want war, that it wishes to make the world safe for diversity, that it wants to live side-by-side with its neighbors in peace. On hundreds of occasions the United States has officially proclaimed its peaceful intention vis-a-vis the Soviet Union and the Communist camp, but the unrelenting pressure on the defenses of the free world continues.

For their part, the Communists claim to be the insulted and the injured; they, "the champions of peace and democracy," are the ones who are "threatened" by "the aggressive forces of U.S. imperialism"; it is they who constantly "strive for the reduction of tensions" and are impeded by the "capitalist camp"; it is they who have thus far shielded mankind from a destructive war through their "consistent policies of peace"; and it is they who ultimately will "liberate" the world from the "evil system of capitalism." In a word, it is their policy which "represents the best interests of mankind," and that policy is called the policy of peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems.

While such Communist claims are at best equivalent to their claims during the late 1940's and early 1950's that they had discovered everything from baseball to the steam engine well in advance of the rest of the world, there is a certain air of "legitimacy" to their appeal for "peaceful coexistence." The term is in itself not repugnant to our concepts, because on the face of it, it sums up some of our basic desires: we do in fact wish to "coexist peacefully" with the rest of the world.

For Americans, "coexisting peacefully" consists in a variety of conditions which can be summed up roughly as follows: "You live there, we live here; what's yours is yours, and what's ours is ours; we will not interfere in your affairs, and you will not interfere in our; our affairs involving you will be conducted on the principles of equality, honesty, and candor, and your affairs involving us will be likewise governed; and on this basis, we will progress, each in his own way, toward the goals which we each have set for ourselves."

If this were the principle used to regulate the affairs of state on a worldwide basis, friction and tension would be greatly reduced. But even to achieve the limited aim of greatly reduced friction and tension, it would be necessary for each participant in world affairs to have a clearcut and unobstructed notion of what is meant by "peaceful coexistence." In others words, the meaning of the term would necessarily have to be identical for all concerned.

The nations of the free world have such an understanding of peaceful coexistence. In their dealings with one another, a common language with precise meaning is employed.

But for the Communists, the meaning of peaceful coexistence is quite different. It is not a description of what is or what should be in the conduct of international affairs, but is rather a subtle and complex strategic doctrine designed to serve the cause of the worldwide Communist movement in its prosecution of the proletarian revolution.

It is well to note that while the nations of the free world may acknowledge the general validity of living in peaceful coexistence with friends and enemies alike, they have never felt a need to define the concept in the form of a doctrine. Hence the term itself is somewhat alien to the language of diplomacy and other global affairs, and as a doctrine it has never found a permanent place. But because it does, as noted earlier, appear to encompass some of the basic desires of all nations, the free world has been reluctant to decline to use it for fear of appearing to be uninterested in promoting the cause of peace.

The Communists, noting Western reluctance to refuse to adopt any term which seems to signify a devotion to peace among men, have consistently sought universal recognition of peaceful coexistence as a regulating concept. At every opportunity they have emphasized it as the basis of their foreign policy, and have waged a singularly impressive campaign for its adoption among the non-Western and underdeveloped countries.

Because by their own admission the term is elevated by the Communists to the position of strategic doctrine, because it defines so much of Communist strategy for the present and for the foreseeable future, and because it is complex, the following pages are devoted to an exposition and analysis in depth of peaceful coexistence.

The new requirements for Americans who live in the nuclear age demand an extraordinary expenditure of effort and determination. Foremost among them is the clear-cut recognition that our way of life now faces in the Communist threat the gravest challenge of its history; but merely to acknowledge the existence of that challenge will no longer suffice. It is incumbent upon us to know the enemy and to be prepared to do combat with him on whatever level he chosses to utilize for advancing the cause of world communism.

Therefore, it is no longer acceptable to be prepared to state merely that the Communists "seek to dominate the world." It is vital to know what instruments they are now employing to further that cause. There can be no doubt that communism is in fact attempting to dominate the world, but an educated and enlightened citizenry will ultimately prove to be the single greatest stumbling block the Communists will encounter.

The citizenry of the most advanced Nation in the world thus has an especially great obligation to understand and be prepared to meet the elaborate Communist strategy designed to destroy its way of life. At the same time, the obligation of renewing the heritage and tradition which has provided the impetus to wealth and greatness that this Nation enjoys must also be recognized. If the best defense against an armed aggressor is to understand his strategy and tactics, then certainly the best defense of a way of life is to be dedicated to, and mindful of, its guiding precepts.

A NOTE ON COMMUNIST SOURCES

In connection with their "peace offensive," during the past few years, the Communists have increased by several times the quantities of propaganda materials made available to the non-Communist world. Nearly every major document or speech is translated into the major languages, and Radio Moscow and satellite transmitters operate on intensive daily schedules to all parts of the world.

A striking example of this expansion is the revolution in miniature electronics which has produced the transistor radio. Now that production of such radios in quantity and at prices within the reach of nearly every citizen of the world has been made possible, additional importance has been attached to the role played by radio propaganda.

The Communists have taken the measure of this technological breakthrough, and have harnessed their propaganda activities to it. Hence it is possible for the peasant in Africa to receive transmissions in his native language from the Soviet Union, and for the campesino of Venezuela to tune to Radio Havana. A March 1964 U.S. Information Agency report points out that Communist broadcasting activities reached a record high of 4,288 hours a week in 1963. This figure represented an increase of 11 percent over the previous year, and by the end of the year broadcasts were being beamed in 67 languages.

Standardized Communist publications are easily procured in the world's major cities and by mail. For example, the official ideological journal of the international Communist movement, "Problems of Peace and Socialism," is published monthly in Prague in some 20 different editions (the English language edition is called the "World Marxist Review"). In all cases such literature is cheap, and is persuasively presented.

The literature of communism is indeed vast. The primary sources alone, the works of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, number over 75 volumes. Thousands of secondary works have been written, including those by Stalin and Mao Tse-tung, to develop the theories contained in the original works. But of greatest interest here is the behavior of Communists in recent times; and while the study of the remarkable continuity of the basic tenets of communism from the days of Marx in the 19th century to the days of Khrushchev in the second half of the 20th century is in itself interesting, it is impossible to include it in a study of peaceful coexistence.[1]

Thus, by focusing the attention of the reader on recent statements of the Communist movement, this study provides an up-to-date account of the goals and methods utilized in the quest to subvert and ultimately overthrow the free world. In addition to official Soviet statements, sources from both satellite and Western Communist Parties have been used wherever appropriate.

WHAT IS PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE?

Traditionally, Communists have always given the greatest care to defining carefully the strategic course of action to be followed over a given period of time. Tactics may vary within the period of time in which the strategy operates, but the latter will remain constant until officially changed and until that change has been proclaimed to the world movement. Hence as stated in fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, an authoritative manual for Communists everywhere, a careful distinction is made between strategy and tactics:

"The term tactics often implies a political line for a relatively short period of time determined by particular concrete conditions, whereas strategy refers to the line for a whole historical stage."[2]

The manual goes on to point out that:

"When elaborating the strategic line of the party under capitalist conditions, it is important, in the first place, to determine correctly the main aim of the working class at the given stage and the chief class enemy against whom it is necessary to concentrate at the given stage the class hatred and the shock force of all the working people in order to overcome this enemy's resistance."[3]

Despite what has appeared on the surface to be substantially complete break with the past of Stalinism, these definitions bear a remarkable similarity to those laid down by Stalin in 1924:

"Strategy deals with the main forces of the revolution and their reserves. It changes with the passing of the revolution from one stage to another, but remains essentially unchanged throughout a given stage.

"While the object of strategy is to win the war * * * against the bourgeoisie * * * tactics pursue less important objectives, for the object of tactics is not the winning of the war as a whole, but the winning of some particular engagements or some particualr battles.[4]"

From this it is clear that Communists set themselves certain well-defined priorities to be accomplished by the concentration of "class hatred" and the "shock force of all the working people" under the guidance of the "strategic line of the party." In individual cases the details may vary, but at heart it is always a question of assuming political power through the overthrow of the "enemy."

It is important to understand, then, what the Communists themselves understand as the "strategic line" to be followed for an entire "historical stage."

Is "peaceful coexistence" a strategy or a tactic?

Footnotes at end of speech.

"The Marxist-Leninists do not understand the policy of peaceful coexistence as a tactical maneuver designed for some limited span of time, but as the strategic line designed for the whole period of the transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale.[5]"

Peaceful coexistence is therefore the strategy which will carry forth the Communist revolution to the final overthrow of the free world and the establishment of worldwide Communist rule.[6] To take it as something less important than the "strategic line," or to dismiss it as a "semantic phrase" would be to ignore the fundamental statement of the plan to accomplish the final phase of the attack against the non-Communist world.

As the principal "strategic line" of the majority of the Communist movement, peaceful coexistence is quite young. It received its initial, cautious formulation and blessing by Khrushchev at the 20th Party Congress in 1956, but escaped widespread attention in the West because of the sensational nature of the "de-Stalinization" pronouncements made at that time. It was Stalin, however, who first affirmed that "coexistence" was a temporary possibility designed to buy time. Speaking at the 15th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1927, he said that:

"The period of 'peaceful coexistence' is receding into the past, giving way to a period of imperialist attacks. Hence our task is to pay attention to contradictions in the capitalist camp, to delay war by 'buying off' the capitalists and to take all measures to maintain peaceful relations. Our relations with the capitalist countries are based on the assumption that the coexistence of the two opposing systems is possible. Practice has fully confirmed this."[7]

Still earlier references to coexistence may be found in Trotsky and Lenin, but until recent years it has been a descriptive slogan; i.e., it described a condition to which, however unfortunate for the Communists, they had to adapt.

Under conditions of obvious inferiority to the "capitalist world," until 1956 the Communists described their position as one of "capitalist encirclement." The major task under those conditions, according to Stalin, was to strike incessantly at the "weakest link" of the capitalist chain in an effort to break out of the "encirclement." At the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956 the declaration was made that the chain had been broken, and that the worldwide revolution had begun to enter the final phase of human history, the "transition from capitalism to socialism on a worldwide scale." It is in this phase that the Communists relinquish the defensive position assumed under the previous conditions of peaceful coexistence, and go over to the strategic offensive under a new and enriched kind of peaceful coexistence.

While the phraseology has undergone no change—i.e., "peaceful coexistence" is still used to describe Communist policy objectives—the content of the slogan has changed radically to accommodate the new period of the offensive. Thus it is that the period of peaceful coexistence contains such nonpeaceful events as the construction of the Berlin wall and the Cuban missile build-up.

As to its specific content Nikita Khrushchev has said that:

"The policy of peaceful coexistence, as regards its social content, is a form of intense economic, political, and ideological struggle of the proletariat against the aggressive forces of imperialism in the international arena."[8]

From this definition, it would appear that peaceful coexistence, inasmuch as it prescribes "intense struggle," does not accord with the meaning of the word "peaceful." But the "Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers Parties" of December 1960, a major policy declaration, goes into greater detail:

"The policy of peaceful coexistence is a policy of mobilizing the masses and launching vigorous action against the enemies of peace. Peaceful coexistence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle. The coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism. In conditions of peaceful coexistence favorable opportunities are provided for the development of the class struggle in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. In their turn, the successes of the revolutionary class and national-liberation struggle promote peaceful coexistence. The Communists consider it their duty to fortify the faith of the people in the possibility of furthering peaceful coexistence, their determination to prevent world war. They will do their utmost for the people to weaken imperialism and limit its sphere of action by an active struggle for peace, democracy, and national liberation."

It should be noted that Communists consider peaceful coexistence and the "national liberation movement," i.e., the revolutionary movement in the underdeveloped countries, to be mutually reinforcing. The principal impact of this mutual reinforcement is the ability to "limit the sphere of action" of "imperialism." Accurately translated, this means that the successes of the Communists can be turned into an advantage by restricting the freedom of action of the Western countries, chiefly the United States.

---

[1] For reasons of space only. The reader will find at the end of this booklet a select list of books which probe in much greater detail both the historical and ideological aspects of the Communist movement.

[2] Otto V. Kuusinen (ed.), Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1961), p. 424; 2d ed., rev., 1963, p. 345.

[3] Kuusinen, p. 425; 2d ed., p. 346 (italic in original).

[4] Josef Stalin, "The Foundations of Leninism," in Problems of Leninism (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1953), pp. 83–84.

[5] "For the Unity and Solidarity of the International Communist Movement," Pravda, December 6, 1963.

[6] It has been pointed out, however, that "what is strategy on one level is a tactic on another." The merging of the one into the other gives rise to the possibility of differing interpretations of what actually is "strategy."

[7] Josef Stalin, Political Report of the Central Committee to the 15th Congress of the CPSU(B), December 3, 1927 (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1950), pp. 26–27.

[8] Nikita Khrushchev, "For New Victories of the World Communist Movement," Kommunist, No. 1 (January 1961). The famous speech delivered on January 6, 1961, has become a major document of the Communist movement. On February 2, 1962, Time magazine reported that President Kennedy considered it to be "one of the most significant speeches ever made by Khrushchev—Indeed, a Red blueprint for eventual world domination," and had directed the Nation's top policymakers to read the speech. The most comprehensive analysis of the speech has been made for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee by Dr. Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford University.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Congressman Fraser Reports to the People of Minneapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Congress is about to conclude one of the most productive sessions in history. I am proud to represent the city of Minneapolis in a Congress which has enacted so many important measures.

The tax cut, the civil rights bill, substantial aids for higher education, the antipoverty program, and the nuclear test-ban treaty underscore the resoluteness with which this Congress has acted to achieve lasting prosperity at home and enforceable peace in the world.

A TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Our accomplishments will go far to keep America strong at home and abroad. We have fashioned a living tribute to the memory of President John F. Kennedy, under whose tragically brief leadership our deliberations began.

I should like to set forth my voting record and comment upon the legislation that has come before us.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

It is reassuring to note that this Nation is stronger than ever before. U.S. armed might today represents a triumph of "strategy, science, and human ingenuity," greater than any military force in history. At the same time, economy measures which have been put into effect in the preparedness program will now save the Nation billions of dollars each year.

Congress appropriated almost $97 billion during the 88th Congress for the continuing maintenance and build-up of the U.S. nuclear and conventional Armed Forces. I supported all of these requests of the Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

My work as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee has reinforced my belief that the position of the free world is steadily gaining at the expense of the Communist cause. The West is standing firm in southeast Asia and in West Berlin while a serious rift is widening between the Soviet Union and Red China.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD U.S.S.R.

I believe, therefore, we are wise in continuing to pursue a three-pronged policy as enunciated recently by President Johnson: to convince the Soviet Union that it is dangerous to engage in aggression, futile to impose their system on unwilling people, and beneficial to their nation to join in achieving genuine peace.

The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the U.N. resolution against orbiting nuclear weapons in space, the hot line agreement, and the mutual action to cut back production of fissionable material for weapons are arrangements which greatly benefit the United States. Important work on these four steps toward peace was done by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

I was one of the cosponsors of the bill by which we extended the life of the Agency and increased funds for this vital work.

The United States has been able to make these advances in the field of international relations in part because of America's strength and the strength the United States has helped build in the free world. The diverse actions of this Congress will demonstrate that the United States continues to stand ready both to defend the security of the free world and share in solving its problems.

PEACE CORPS, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

We are endeavoring to expand world trade and lower tariff barriers. We have voted to expand the Peace Corps, "the most powerful idea in recent times." By 1965, there will be 14,000 American peace corpsmen in 46 nations. This Congress has also extended "food for peace" for 3 more years.

The United States is pledged to create working partnerships with the nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America to help them continue along the road to freedom. American foreign aid, including money for the Alliance for Progress, is to be distributed on a realistic basis emphasizing "self-help, reform, and performance."

This year, our foreign aid appropriations call for a "bare-bones" budget of $3.5 billion. I am pleased to report that I was among those who actively worked for this important piece of legislation which passed the House virtually intact.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Passage of the civil rights law was unquestionably our foremost domestic achievement. This great measure grapples directly with the fundamental moral and national issue of the times: the attainment of liberty and equality for all citizens regardless of race, religion, and color.

The long struggle to pass the civil rights law in the House was truly dramatic. I am proud to have authored a companion bill and to have actively worked for passage of the civil rights law.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

Some measures proposed to this House have threatened to impair the civil liberties of the people. I have questioned some of the procedures of the House Committee on Un-American Activities because I believe that the committee sometimes exceeds the proper role of a congressional committee as defined by the courts. I indicated my concern by a negative vote on appropriations for this committee and placed a statement in the RECORD expressing my desire that this committee be made a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee.

ONE MAN, ONE VOTE

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled last June that every citizen should have an equal vote with that of his neighbor in the election of members to the State legislature. In recent weeks many efforts have been made to overrule or delay that decision. I have opposed every such effort, for I believe that the political rights of American citizens must be jealously guarded.

DUE PROCESS FOR ALL

Congress took an important step this year to assure due process to everyone. Enactment of a bill which I cosponsored provides that indigent defendants in Federal courts will be provided with counsel who will be compensated for their work. The new law takes a giant step forward in making the right to counsel a reality.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The tax cut measure for which I voted early in 1964 is doing exactly the job it was intended to do. The $11.5 billion slash in personal and corporate taxes has spurred our economy by increasing purchasing power. This has created greater demand for goods. This demand, in turn, is creating more jobs.

Currently, the Nation's economy is booming. The United States is enjoying the longest and strongest peacetime expansion in the 20th century. In the first 6 months of 1964, record profits being shown by business have helped generate a $1.6 billion annual increase in tax revenues.

Today, 72 million persons are working, up 5 million in the past 2 years. An average factory worker earns $103 a week, also a record high. Prices have held stable.

Still, we cannot afford complacency. Five percent of the labor force is unemployed and 16 percent of our productive capacity is idle. One-fifth of the people do not enjoy minimum levels of decent living.

ANTIPOVERTY MEASURES, AUTOMATION

To begin a long-range effort to improve this situation, we passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, better known as the antipoverty bill. This 3-year program will begin to combat the poverty which afflicts tens of millions of Americans who are living on incomes of $3,000 a year or less for a family of four.

This is not a handout program. Rather, through Federal, State, and local agencies, it attempts to break a vicious cycle of dependency. It will give almost 400,000 youth new opportunities to escape their heritage of poverty and become self-

supporting, productive members of society. I particularly welcome the emphasis that the bill places upon vocational training and counseling. I know this measure will help Minnesota which now has 12,000 young people out of school and out of work.

Because the impact of automation continues to pose major challenges to workers and industry as well as to the public, Congress authorized the National Commission on Technology and Automation. This Commission will give intensive study to the effects of automation and recommend appropriate measures to insure that the increasing technology is harnessed to advance, not retard, human welfare.

EDUCATION

We are extending the National Defense Education Act at least through June 30, 1967, to strengthen teaching at all levels and provide financial help to qualified students through loans and fellowships. I was pleased to introduce a bill to aid students seeking higher education, for it is shocking to know that every year 60,000 to 100,000 students in the top quarter of their high school graduating class cannot afford to go to college.

LIBRARY, COLLEGE, AND VOCATIONAL AIDS

We have voted a substantial "education package" for the Nation—$1.2 billion for the first 3 years of a 5-year college construction program to help accommodate doubling college enrollments, an additional $175 million for medical and dental school construction, $30.7 million for loans for students in the health professions.

We have also voted for the first time to aid hard-pressed libraries in cities as well as in rural areas. The Library Services and Construction Act of 1964 will provide needed money for the Minneapolis library system.

Vocational education funds have been expanded fourfold to provide needed vocational schools and part-time work for youths. Teaching basic skills, curbing school dropouts and working with illiterate adults will go far to aid in the fullest development of this Nation's most important resource, its manpower.

CURBING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

We have also launched a new attack on juvenile delinquency. A bill I cosponsored will continue the entire juvenile delinquency program until 1967. This has made it possible for the youth development project of the Hennepin County Community Health and Welfare Council to receive a $250,000 grant to help reduce delinquency in two specially selected target areas in Minneapolis.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

As this report is written, the fate of medicare, the program of hospital insurance under social security, is uncertain. I have lent my hand to its passage wherever possible. I cosponsored the King-Anderson bill by introducing a companion bill as my first bill in Congress. I have debated American Medical Association representatives a number of times across the country, and I testified in favor of the bill before the Ways and Means Committee. Enactment of health care legislation for the elderly this year will be a great step forward.

Because Minneapolis has a larger than average population of older citizens, I was pleased to support the new social security bill now pending. It will give 20 million social security beneficiaries throughout the Nation an increase in monthly payments. I might add this is the first such increase to help offset rising living costs since 1958.

Meanwhile, this Congress has not been indifferent to the general health and welfare needs of the people. The Nation's largest health problem, mental illness and retardation, will be vigorously combatted with a 4-year program passed last year.

The 1964 Hill-Burton amendments permit large-scale construction and modernization of hospital and other health facilities. We have also begun an intensive program to add 130,000 nurses by 1970 to the Nation's current total of 550,000.

PURIFYING AIR AND WATER

Nor have we in this session ignored the very air America breathes or its water supply. The Clean Air Act of 1963, Water Resources Research Act of 1964, and the pending water pollution control amendments will go far to control exhaust and industrial fumes and other air and water pollution to which the cities are increasingly subjected.

HOUSING

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1964 contains a feature I requested that is of special importance to Minneapolis: $50 million in low-interest loans to help people improve their homes and avoid slums and blight. Another feature I supported will provide additional rental housing for our senior citizens. In addition $600 million will be available for urban renewal projects.

MASS TRANSPORTATION

The Urban Mass Transportation Act we passed this year is a start in the right direction. We must continue to make every effort to relieve the choked highways and improve local transit systems within the cities as well as between city and suburb.

AGRICULTURE

Although my district, comprising the city of Minneapolis, is entirely urban, Minnesota is a farm State and the economic health of the urban and rural areas are tied closely together. I have supported every measure to maintain and improve farm income and to use our food abundance to raise standards of living at home and abroad. If we had not passed the Wheat-Cotton Act, Minnesota farm income would have dropped nearly $10 million. Adoption of an expanded food stamp program will help to make American agricultural abundance available to those with low incomes or on welfare. We are already moving ahead with plans to bring Minneapolis into this program.

CONSERVATION

This has also been an important year for protecting nature's heritage. After a 15-year legislative struggle, the new wilderness bill guarantees that 9 million acres of underdeveloped lands will be preserved in their natural beauty for the good of generations to come. Contemplated for protection over a 10-year period are an additional 60 million acres.

A second, equally important, recreation measure providing a land and water conservation fund will result in Minnesota's receiving $2 million annually to plan for, acquire and develop land for recreational purposes.

Increased emphasis on leisure time has led more States to adopt daylight saving time thus permitting greater use of daylight hours. Because various States have adopted different beginning and ending dates, I introduced a bill establishing uniform dates for all States which elect daylight saving time. Hearings were held and a bill reported from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee but passage seems unlikely this year. Nevertheless this represents far greater progress than in prior years, and enactment of such a bill should receive prompt consideration in the next session.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN

Any report on the work of this Congress would be incomplete without emphasizing the greater opportunities for women that will now exist.

One worker in three in the American labor force is a woman. We have provided that women will now receive the same pay as men for the same work. We have liberalized provisions for child care deductions for working mothers in the new tax law. We are continuing to investigate various ways in which equal status for women may be assured in all States.

Also, as consumers, men and women alike will welcome efforts by this Congress to strengthen food and drug laws and insure fair weights and proper grade labeling.

RULES REFORM NEEDED

But I must observe that much of the legislation we have enacted has had to surmount formidable roadblocks arising out of the rules and procedures in this House. To the extent that a minority is able to thwart the will of the majority using these procedures, the democratic process has been subverted.

The voters who sent us to Washington are entitled to a fully functioning legislative branch of Government. A minority should not be allowed to block this entire body from considering fundamental legislative proposals.

When the 89th Congress convenes in January, I urge careful examination of the rules governing our operations so that all major legislative proposals may receive critical scrutiny under genuine majority rule and be voted either up or down.

A LOOK AHEAD

Four-fifths of this Nation's population reside in urban areas. Because the cities have so many common needs and problems, I believe their interests would most efficiently be served through the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, much as problems relating to Agriculture are concentrated in one cabinet department.

I am convinced this century's greatest continuing need concerns the education of the people. Modern technology has so increased the need for educated and trained persons, we must regard our an-

nual educational appropriations not as a national cost but as the best investment we can make to secure our Nation's future.

We must continue to explore opportunities to provide academic and vocational education to all, to the full extent of individual ability to learn.

Additional consideration must also be given at home to the health, welfare and recreational needs of the rapidly enlarging older population.

ANOTHER LOOK AT SELECTIVE SERVICE

The selective service system also needs critical reevaluation. If we can attract to the military sufficient numbers of high caliber career men and women, it may be possible to meet the remaining military manpower needs on a voluntary basis. Study is needed to see if this is so. In all events, we should aim at meeting our military manpower needs without social or economic injustice to anyone.

THE FUTURE OF FREEDOM

Abroad, Asia remains one of the most acute tension spots in the world. The ultimate future of freedom in the rest of the world may well hinge on the direction Asia takes. It therefore behooves the free nations of the world to insure that freedom coupled with economic and social progress goes forward in Asia. A U.N. presence in southeast Asia with an appropriate peace-keeping force could implement agreements which must be reached aimed at ultimately securing the complete independence of southeast Asia.

I strongly support strengthening the U.N. and enlarging the Security Council and the U.N. Economic and Social Council so that the U.N. may increasingly become the major instrument for achieving world peace under the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a table which lists major legislative proposals before this Congress and my position on these bills and resolutions:

My position	Issue	Outcome
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SPACE	
Supported	Increased pay and subsistence allowances for military personnel	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $93,972,061,000 for defense	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $3,156,848 for military construction projects	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriations for NASA and Atomic Energy Commission	Enacted.
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Supported	Foreign aid authorization and appropriation	Enacted.
Supported	Extend the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	Enacted.
Supported	Increase size of the Peace Corps	Enacted.
Supported	Limited nuclear test ban treaty (voted upon only in Senate)	Ratified.
Supported	Extend food-for-peace program for 3 years	Enacted.
Supported	Study for new canal in Central America	Enacted.
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Supported	Tax cut and reform bill	Enacted.
Supported	War-on-poverty bill	Enacted.
Supported	Program to combat poverty in Appalachian region	Passed Senate.
Supported	Mass transit program	Enacted.
Supported	Accelerated public works program	Pending in House.
Supported	Extend area redevelopment program	Pending in House.
Supported	Establish a National Commission on Technology and Automation	Enacted.
Supported	Equal pay for women	Enacted.
Supported	Davis-Bacon Act amendments	Enacted.
Opposed	Relaxing ICC control on rail rates	Defeated in Rules Committee.
	CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES	
Supported	Civil Rights Act of 1964	Enacted.
Opposed	Suspension of equal-time rule of FCC for 1964 presidential election	Passed House.
Opposed	Deny Federal courts jurisdiction over apportionment cases	Passed House.
Supported	Provide counsel for indigent defendants	Enacted.
	EDUCATION	
Supported	Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963	Enacted.
Supported	Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963	Enacted.
Supported	Vocational Education Act of 1963	Enacted.
Supported	Manpower Development and Training Act extended and funds increased	Enacted.
Supported	Extend and amend National Defense Education Act	In conference.
Supported	Library Services and Construction Act of 1964	Enacted.
	HEALTH AND WELFARE	
Supported	Housing and Community Development Act of 1964	Enacted.
Supported	Social security increase and medicare	In conference.
Supported	Provide for construction of community mental health centers	Enacted.
Supported	Establish air pollution control program	Enacted.
Supported	Food stamp plan to distribute food to needy families	Enacted.
Supported	Federal aid for construction and modernization of hospital and nursing homes (Hill-Burton)	Enacted.
	GOVERNMENT OPERATION	
Supported	Pay increase for postal and other Federal employees and officers	Enacted.
Opposed	Prohibit FCC regulating TV commercials	Passed House.
Opposed	Let NSA fire employees without a hearing	Passed House.
	VETERANS	
Supported	Veterans pension increases	Pending.
Supported	Providing nursing home facilities for veterans	Enacted.
Supported	Provide educational assistance to children of disabled veterans	Enacted.
	AGRICULTURE AND CONSERVATION	
Supported	Feed grain bill	Enacted.
Supported	Cotton-wheat bill	Enacted.
Opposed	Continue importation of Mexican farmworkers	Enacted.
Supported	Wilderness Act	Enacted.
Supported	Establish $2,000,000,000 recreation fund to assist States in developing outdoor recreation	Enacted.
Supported	Water Pollution Control Act amendments	Passed Senate.
Supported	Program to finance water resources research centers	Enacted.

Some bills I have sponsored

Number	Issue	Outcome
H.R. 4169	Medicare	In conference.
H.R. 7197	Civil rights	Enacted.
H.R. 5325	World War I veterans pension bill	Pending in committee.
H.R. 5372	Youth Employment Act (became part of war-on-poverty bill)	Enacted.
H.R. 6155	Extension of Juvenile Delinquency Control Act	Enacted.
H.R. 6499	Provide counsel to indigent defendants	Enacted.
H.R. 7196	Establishment of National Council of Arts	Enacted.
H.R. 7531	Extend Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	Enacted.
H.R. 7832	Reopen lapsed national service life (GI) insurance	Pending in committee.
H.R. 8587	Establish an Office of Consumers	Pending in committee.
H.R. 8998	Great River Rd. bill	Pending in committee.
H.R. 10620	War-on-poverty bill	Enacted.
H.R. 11206	Provide uniform period for daylight saving time	Approved by committee.
H.R. 11346	Tax relief for teachers	Pending in committee.
H.R. 12336	Aid for needy college students	Pending in committee.
H. Res. 412	Call Foreign Affairs Committee the International Relations Committee	Pending in committee.
H. Res. 476	Congressional committee to study federally supported research programs	Enacted.
H. Res. 580	North American Conservation Hall of Fame	Pending in committee.
H. Res. 860	Save airline service into smaller communities	Pending in committee.

The Erosion of American Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it is a real pleasure for me to insert in the RECORD a very stimulating and penetrating article written by Dr. Millard C. Faught, Doctor of Economics, Columbia University. I have not had the pleasure of meeting and knowing Professor Faught but I have read his essay and believe that my colleagues will agree that it is a timely and stimulating presentation. This is the type article that should prick the conscience of all citizens to assume a fuller responsibility in carrying out their civic duties. Apathy is as great a danger, if not greater, as aggression. Hence it is my belief, Mr. President, that this essay should be printed in the RECORD and made available to all our citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this essay, "The Erosion of American Citizenship" be placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

AN ESSAY ON THE EROSION OF AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

"Treason" is an ugly word. It describes the most despicable act which a citizen can commit against his country.

The paucity of treason's tarnish and of traitor's tracks on the pages of American history, by their very scarcity, have added cumulative testimonial to our high traditions of patriotic citizenship.

We who are today's American citizens are now the custodians of those traditions. They have brought to us a dual legacy of the greatest good fortune and the most commanding responsibility that has ever befallen a generation of citizens, in any country at any time, as a native heritage.

We are basking in the superlative citizen blessings of this American heritage beyond the beneficient dreams of any generation which helped to build it. But by conspicuous contrast.

We are discharging its equally superlative citizen responsibilities so inadequately as to invite the indicting judgment of history as being a generation of American traitors.

And it will not reduce the indictment, nor restore the long heritage of liberties lossable thereby, if the nature of our treason is less despicably overt than insidious by default.

But such it is.

The price of liberty, payable in vigilance, rises with its blessings. In this age of superlatives the price equates with the shining contrast between our democratic freedoms and the stygian depths of Communist tyranny. This same contrast is the measure of freedom's peril in these times.

Never was the price of liberty higher. Never was it less payable with deficits in vigil nor defaults in performance, such as those which tarnish our contemporary record of citizen stewardship of the American heritage.

As patriots we have become spectators to the point where vigilance by the many shrivels to tolerated vigilantism by the few. The uncast votes of the casual majority are vetoed by the casuistic but cast votes of venal minorities; until citizenship becomes more literally "sitizenship."

And thus does a placid apathy accumulate, lulled by ignorance of new and subtly sinister threats to our freedom, at home and abroad. In the face of evidence which generates its own uneasiness of mind and erosion of soul, even among the callow and the callous, I offer my fellow Americans no apologies for defining our collective citizen conduct in these times as treason by default.

If this publication of the reasons and logic, which lead me to this indictment by definition, lessens even slightly the probabilities of its becoming a judgment of history, then apologies become irrelevant; my error will have been that of remaining another silent citizen too long.

Overt or subversive treason by the few is the subject here only in that defaulted citizenship among the many makes it possible. Rather than solace to witch-hunters, I could wish this tract no greater success than that it disturb, mortify, frighten, provoke, or otherwise bestir its readers in proportion to their own citizen apathy; and I dedicate it to those sufficiently bestirred to do something about their own views and acts as American citizens. Where there is no citizen apathy there is no cause for umbrage here.

DOMINION BY OPINION

Nothing is so useless to a democracy as citizens without opinions. Only to the degree that citizens form and act on their own opinions can a democracy be strong. Democracy ceases to be an end whenever and wherever it ceases to be a means to self-government among men. To recognize and act on such motivating premises seems a logical beginning toward the objective of urging all citizens so to think and act on their own individual equity in America.

Had it not been for those generations of men who have thought, spoken, and fought for their opinions of freedom, and thus devised and secured what we so unthinkingly accept as our American heritage, it would not be safe for me to express nor for you to read what is written here as personal citizenship opinion. In the scant two centuries since Voltaire declared, "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it," millions of men have died to establish this right which we now have. Many are still dying for that same right elsewhere in the world.

Yet many among us who have it without earning it use it poorly for our generation and do little to pass it securely on to the next. This is the surest way to help lose it for all. And the steps toward its loss can be counted by the number of individual citizens who think, "my opinion doesn't count, so why should I have one?" Each of us is the only one who can make his or her opinion count as nothing. Even one such derelict citizen is too many.

The capacity to think, and thus to have personal opinion, is the most vital and distinguishing gift to man from his Maker. Of all God's creatures, only man has the intellect, emotions, and can secure the knowledge essential to the having of opinions. But it is our citizen freedoms which give right of exercise for our capacity to have personal opinion. In our way of life, therefore, citizen opinion should rank with self-opinion, and the one should reinforce the other. Both should reinforce our country. Unless strength does thus flow from us who are the only growing roots which our democracy can have, then we will have less and less democracy—until our progency have none.

As declared by its authors in preamble, the precious but fragile theory of our democracy becomes a working self-government only by consent of the governed. And the first essential of this consent is informed opinion among the citizens, personally delegated by expression. Authority delegated by citizen default to any representative is not democratic authority. It belies government of or by the people and denies government for the people. Not even the "public interest" is discernible in a public opinion vacuum derived from unexpressed private opinions.

If today we have a growing feeling of citizen emptiness, it is because we are creating ever larger such vacuums. Synthetic public opinion, enticed and expanded from tiny samples of the populace, does not fill in the voids of unthought personal opinion and unexpressed public opinion. Comparing and quoting pooled anonymous averages is a poor substitute for a personally and vigorously debated concensus among neighbors or throughout a nation.

In our citizen roles we grow in need of both a think-it-yourself and do-it-yourself movement. On what are called public issues, in lieu of "What do you think?" we might better ask one another, "Who's secondhand thoughts are you wearing today?" Even the bulk of our small talk on current events is less often invented than quoted. Our opin-

ions grow more patched and soiled as we do less of our own intellectual laundry. Among soviets of parrots such citizen hypocrisy would be sad, but less serious than in a democracy where the very foundation of freedom's dominion rest on citizen practice of personal opinion.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

That which we call the Bill of Rights is indeed a bill. Its price to each citizen should be, and morally is, a bill of responsibilities. Both lists appear to have been mislaid by many in these times.

There are 10 stated rights and implicit responsibilities listed in the Bill of Rights, which is in turn an integral part of our shield of freedom, the Constitution. Regrettably, our modern skills in measuring "public opinion" reveal that most adult citizens can identify less than half of these rights.

Two of those uppermost in public awareness are the right to free speech and the right to vote. The attending, and even preceding, responsibility of both is surely to think—to be aware of the consequences even of keeping silent or not voting.

Where there is suppression of either right, there is quickening public outcry, a trend which at least again bespeaks the kind of vigilance which is the price of liberty. Why then do we value so lightly in use these freedoms when they are not abridged? Vigilance is poorly served by ignorance of that which requires the vigilance, and not at all in a democracy by silence among the sentries in their forums and absence from their polling booths.

In the time of these rights' aborning for us, Thomas Paine observed that "It would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated." But more prophetically for us than necessary for the embattled citizens who secured our Bill of Rights, he also added, "What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly."

Is this why we keep uninformed and silent on public issues behind our ornamental think signs, and turn up absent at the polling booths? And when we do vote, how often is it to obtain cheaply for us what our children may pay again for as dearly as did our ancestors?

Yes, we have rights; no citizenry ever had more. If we cringe from accepting our own stewardship of them, it is not because we lack enduring criteria from the past, either as history or its profound interpretation. Wrote Edmund Burke, to us if we care to read and heed words which we ignore at our peril:

"Men are qualified for civil liberty in exact proportion to their disposition to put chains upon their own appetites; in proportion as their love of justice is above their rapacity; in proportion as their soundness and sobriety of understanding is above their vanity and presumption; in proportion as they are disposed to listen to the counsels of the wise and good, in preference to the flattery of knaves. Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon the will and appetite is placed somewhere; and the less of it there is within, the more there must be of it without."

THE ANSWERS ARE WITHIN

It has become fashionable in these evasive times for us to search outwardly for that "soundness and sobriety of understanding" which we should not need a Burke to tell us must lie within a citizenry. We go about asking, "What's wrong with America?" "What should be the new goals for America?" "How do we get America moving again?"

There is less wrong with America, as a Nation, than was or is wrong with any nation in history; and history itself is America's greatest attesting eulogy. Nor is there any more wrong with America's goals than was ever wrong with them; no nation has pursued higher goals more nobly.

Our Nation's Founding Fathers set themselves on a high course, and to it they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. As for getting America moving again on that course, the prime requisite is to get Americans moving again. Ours is less a lagging nation than a nation of laggard citizens. And the conscience of most of us would concede that there is little wrong under many headings that couldn't or wouldn't be quickly remedied by some self-correction of what's wrong with us who are the casual citizen custodians of all that is America and the American tradition.

Past problems in our Nation's history have not been solved by evasion of their true identification nor by disguising their root causes. And we affront that vigorous vernacular tradition of calling a spade a spade by the shoulder-shrugging, bysitting, buck-passing refusal to identify ourselves and our shameful citizen conduct as the root causes of whatever is currently wrong with America.

It is equally specious to sit back and heap abusive blame upon our elected leaders. It is a function of democracy to elect its own leaders, and those it elects reflect the direction in which its citizens are willing to be led. America has made her greatest leaders by following them to greatness, supporting them en route.

Nor do we lack directing documents adequate to our continuing journey which have been proven by test. We might better consult as guides, more than adulate as holiday ornaments, those same charts which have already secured men more freedom than have any other in history. They contain truths no less true, commandments no less clear, and directions no less dangerous for freemen to ignore than when they were written. But their formulas for freedom all work only by the responsible citizen use thereof.

On the seamy side of American history the raveled threads are those which run to the occasions where the citizenry have been tempted, or their leaders permitted, to seek the easy way around hard questions which blocked the Nation's progress. And most statesmanly silhouetted are those leaders who persuaded their citizen supporters to scorn the demeaning detours around principle. Even the American vernacular echoes with aphorisms which Thomas Edison well summarized in saying, "If the answer is easy, it is wrong."

THE CITIZENSHIP GAP

There is usually a wide gap between a hard problem and an easy answer. In matters of citizenship, the more evasive, inadequate, or otherwise knowingly "wrong" the answer, the more likely the gap is to be filled with bad feelings along with poor results. It should hardly be surprising, then, that there is an elusive something amiss in our midst which produces a malaise of emotions among Americans as Americans.

In our great "what's wrong?" debate there seems significance in the consensus that there is something emotionally missing from the American environment. Its inward absence bothers us more in spirit than does the outward presence of some new and more material problems, on which we try erroneously to charge off the blame.

There is no shortage of description of the too many, too big, too costly, and too complicated problems which confront us in these times. But, again, what a dearth there is of diagnosis in terms of defaulted citizenship. This omission is made even more ironic yet conspicuous by the now standard prescription of solution through more government.

Even granted that the size and complexity of modern problems make more government the seemingly easiest answer, they should also make more citizenship, and certainly better citizenship, equally essential. If ours is still a government of, by, and for the people, then more "of" and more "for" should require more "by"; and this can be supplied only by more and better citizen participation.

INNER CRACKS IN MANY LIBERTY BELLS

Renewed citizenship practice is most likely to be forthcoming if and when it is preceeded by a resurgence of that good citizenship feeling, once called "patriotism"—a term seldom used in everyday conversation anymore. It is not the crack in the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia, but rather the cracks in the bells of conscience within us as citizens, which mute patriotic expresssion among us. When J. Edgar Hoover voices with deep regret that, "The apologetic approach to patriotism is becoming fashionable," our consciences tell us why. Spontaneous patriotic display is liable to stir more of a sense of shameful hypocrisy than of pride if we are inwardly uncertain of how really patriotic we are, as measured by our citizenship conduct.

Conversely, it is equally understandable why our pent-up and frustrated patriotic feelings burst forth in self-renewing approval when a magnificently humble reincarnation of the American citizen prototype like the astronaut, Col. John Glenn, says for us, "I know I still get a real-hard-to-define feeling down inside when the flag goes by and I know all of you do too."

In this era when citizenship and even patriotism are obscured by the translation of "citizen" into "taxpayer," Colonel Glenn may well have given Americans a full return on the astronomical costs of his pioneering trip; less by his outer-space perspective on the earth, than by his introspective reminder that "I am an American citizen" can still be a patriotic speech in itself; that it can still stiffen the back with pride and bend the head with humility at the same time; that it still speaks inwardly about flags and heroes, ideals and rights; and that to feel like an American citizen can still be an unblurred good feeling.

LET US BE CITIZENS AGAIN

If we are surfeited with vicarious viewing from the subsidized sidelines, let us rejoin the American parade as marchers, as participating citizens. Obviously, we cannot all be astronauts; and the complex too-bigness of the challenges which beset us on all sides as citizens may seem only to add harassment to the embarrassing demand: "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country." But surely the worst thing we can do is to continue the conspiracy of silence whereby we cloak our citizenship concern in muted self-criticism which fools no one, least of all ourselves.

We must all start from where we are, but it is a minority indeed among us who have no means whatever to practice better citizenship where it begins—within the individual. One first step, as simple as it is basic, can be to take thought and then write down personal answers to the question, "What does American citizenship mean to me?"

It will come as a rude shock to many to realize that never once in their lifetime have they ever faced squarely up to this question. Yet simply to pose and ponder it honestly is the quickest and surest beginning on answers to "What can I do for my country?"

At the barest level there is self value as well as civic virtue in the answer that a better person makes a better citizen; and the line of bettermen runs in upward gambit through better parent, better neighbor, better participant in the whole of society under democracy.

As for better means toward such better ends, the very complexity which now attends every role in life dramatizes again the opportunity which first set man on his upward course to the democracy and freedom which we enjoy—access to growing knowledge. No more universal means can be found, toward goals that serve citizenship at every level, to

compare with knowledge; and never was more knowledge more accessible to more people in a free society. Equally, ignorance was never less an excuse for defaulted citizenship.

IN IGNORANCE LIES CHAOS

Ignorance is the dark side of knowledge and each generation must light the lamps of learning for the next. How much more enlightenment, then, must we generate in this age of accelerating change for that never-ending race between education and catastrophe, lest freedom plunge into darkness. It was out of concern for his America then and our America now in this race that Jefferson warned, "The Nation which expects to be ignorant and free expects what never was and never will be."

Today our very enemies renew this warning. In a declared war for men's minds, they have vowed to bury us. Their choice of weapons, amidst a truce of mutual terror in atomic armaments, is subversive propaganda and economic warfare. Citizen ignorance is our Achilles heel in either such conflict and the reasons are as direct as the danger is deadly.

That which we call the American way of life is as a bundle of freedoms, each one reinforcing all, and secured by our citizen vigilance in practice of the rights which bind the whole bundle of freedoms together. A critical danger, as revealed by the analogy, lies in the fact that even the strongest bundle can be weakened if any stick can be worked loose. By propaganda and economic warfare the Communists cunningly work to loosen those freedoms least secured by our citizen vigilance, backed by understanding.

It is no coincidence that they concentrate on our economic freedoms. The American economy is the central arsenal of the whole free world in both military and economic warfare materiel. Besides being the most productive and powerful economy on earth, itis also the most complex. It operates on the same principle of citizen participant control as does the democracy which it supports. However, by our own admission, our economic freedoms are less well comprehended by the average citizen than are such other freedoms in our bundle as freedom of religion, of the press, or of speech. To the degree that we are in frequent dispute, even among ourselves, over our economic freedoms, they are the least secure in our bundle.

It is all of a sinister piece, therefore, that our enemies center their war of words on our "capitalism," subversively within America and propagandistically throughout the world. Their lies are the cheapest of all possible ammunition and citizen ignorance is the least defense against such a siege. Where the truth is not known, our statistics of abundance convert easily into stigmas.

Wherever economic ignorance provides a stage, at home or abroad, our domestic prosperity can be reviled as capitalistic greed and our international largesse decried as materialistic imperialism. On economic issues our own citizen freedom of speech, practiced in luxurious and dangerous unawareness of fact, affords our enemies some of their most devastating propaganda against us. As with all problems of citizen ignorance in a democracy, the solution to which every individual can contribute lies in education, not censorship; in awareness, not apathy.

A TIME FOR CITIZEN WARRIORS

Americans no longer plow with muskets in hand. But if we wish truly to live consistent with our strong and honorable traditions of citizen soldiers, then we can all take up this modern conflict where our enemies have chosen to join it. In reality it is our strongest ground they seek to undermine. It is in our unique capacities to work together that the individual American has contributed so much economic strength to the miracle of America. And the truth about that miracle is its own best defense in wars of words for men's minds or in wars of productivity for men's well-being.

There should be no mystery then about what the individual citizen soldier can do to help his country in times of such conflict. Where our productive strength to protect every form of freedom at home and abroad depends on the decisionmaking wisdom of millions of individual citizens, economic literacy becomes as vital to vigilance as economic ignorance becomes an Achilles heel. Even behind a secure military defense our beneficient way of life can grow no faster than the soundness of decisions made by its beneficiaries. Every citizen has a role in making those decisions wisely.

WHAT MANNER OF LEGACY FROM US?

We recognize that freedom is indivisible among us. It must also be indivisible as between generations if we wish our children to receive, enjoy and pass on the legacy of American freedom. It is in this transfer that we as custodians of our heritage face a greater citizen challenge than did our predecessors; and for a reason that is everyday more evident to all of us. The truth that makes men free is not a static thing and ours is an era of knowledge explosion, even more than of population explosion.

As life grows more complex, more oil of knowledge is needed in every lamp of citizenship if freedom is to keep shining in all its facets. Whether it is for us whose paths along the American way of life have been bettered and extended by knowledge applied, or for our children who need still more knowledge for the still longer lives in prospect, ignorance becomes an ever greater adversary of citizenship.

Amidst the confrontations of complexity in life, concern mounts, beyond the natural doubts as between generations, about juvenile delinquency. Even as the need for more knowledge mounts, the more young are scorning the greater education which they need. Parents blame the schools and educators blame the parents. The whole process reflect an inherent citizenship defaultency, and democracy shares the loss with each dropout.

The complexities of our times do not change the principles of democracy, which rest on enlightened citizenship; but they enormously challenge its practice. And the more citizens there are in numbers, the more—rather than the fewer—informed citizens it takes to make the majority decisions, without which there can be no democracy.

DOMESTIC UNCOMMITTED NEUTRALS

The list grows ever longer, therefore, of things which every citizen can know as well as do for his country. And the price of freedom goes up with the degrees of ignorance against which it must contend. Every generation of democracy is divisible into its citizens and so is the price of its span of freedom. Every defaulting citizen adds to the price of both which must be borne by his neighbors. The can make up for his apathy even less than for his ignorance.

Against naked armed force in the world America is invincibly garrisoned. She does not want for brave and vigilant soldiers. Against the forces of ignorance in the war for men's minds America is not so well garrisoned. Nor is it the uncommitted neutrals in the world who hold the balance. Moreso it is the uncommitted neutral citizens within America's garrison who sap her strength. In wars of ideas, against ideologies which feed on ignorance, uninformed citizens make poor soldiers and worse sentries. Apathetic citizenship in such a war, declared and raging even within American, equates with treason by default.

Wirtz Decries Failure To Hire Due to Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written recently by Mr. Frank C. Porter which appeared in the Washington Post on September 24, 1964. By referring to page 2756 of the February 13, 1964, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is rather apparent very limited information is possessed by officials of various departments as to the number of older people who are refused work in the Government when they seek it:

WIRTZ DECRIES FAILURE TO HIRE DUE TO AGE

(By Frank C. Porter)

Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz ripped into employers yesterday for refusing to hire workers because of age.

"This is a shortsighted, cruel discrimination, which deprives our economy of much valuable skill and experience, and deprives older workers of a chance to contribute to the society of which they are a part," he said.

The Secretary addressed the Conference of State Agencies Administering Age Discrimination Laws. Later in the day he switched his attention to the other end of the age scale, speaking before a forum on youth employment problems.

While Wirtz's stand against age discrimination is not new, his remarks underscore a developing dilemma posed by a countervailing trend toward compulsory and early retirement for older workers.

Earlier this month the United Auto Workers signed contracts with Chrysler and Ford that lower the compulsory retirement age from 68 to 65 and offer a bonus to employees who retire as early as 55. Much of the same sort of deal with signed by the United Rubber Workers with major tire companies a month earlier.

The rationale for early retirement was succinctly explained by UAW President Walter P. Reuther at the union's convention last March.

"When there's a choice between an older worked bucking the line and a younger worker walking the street," he said, "let's retire the older worker and put the younger guy on the job."

At first glance it would appear that Wirtz is trying to put older workers into jobs at the very time Walter Reuther is trying to kick them out.

This is an oversimplification, of course. The Secretary made it clear, for example, that he was talking about workers too old to meet many employers' specifications but too young to retire.

But this in turn raises two perplexing questions:

What is a reasonable retirement age?

Is compulsory retirement in itself discrimination against the older worker?

The target age for most early retirement plans is 55. The object of the plan is obvious: To ration scarce work in a particular industry, particularly where employment is declining because of technological innovation, and to give the younger worker a break.

The Labor Department's 1964 Manpower Report, however, had this to say:

"When a worker leaves the work force at age 55, the economic loss to the Nation and to the individual is substantial. On the average, a 55-year-old man has 12 additional years of work ahead of him; this represents more than one-fourth of the entire work life expectancy for men."

Where the 55-year early retirement age is in effect it is usually not mandatory, although some of the rubber contracts leave it to the option of the employer or to "mutual agreement." On the other hand, the extra benefits above regular pension payments offered the early retiree are a not-so-subtle hint that he's no longer wanted on the payroll.

As for compulsory retirement, it is becoming more and more common, thus eliminating more and more job opportunities for workers over 65 at the very time the Johnson administration is pledging a massive effort to make them available for all those willing and able to work.

The main impetus for such restrictions and inducements generally comes during periods of high employment. The Social Security Act, for instance, was intended in large part to move older persons out of the work force and thus help younger ones at a time when unemployment was in the 20-percent range.

Today, business and consumer demand is accelerating rapidly and the unemployment rate is inching downward, raising hopes for a full-employment economy. This may prove to be older workers' best insurance against discriminatory hiring practices and against a premature one-way ticket to the rocking chair.

Father Patrick McPolin, Chaplain of the Chicago Police Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Father Patrick J. McPolin, chaplain of the police department, is one of the most dedicated of God's servants in the service of humanity. His work encompasses the entire field of human endeavor to serve the penniless and the friendless. He is cognizant of the problems of human rights, of individual freedom and personal liberty and works at it. You may find him in a courtroom interceding for a first offender or fostering the cause of an immigrant visitor overstaying his visa.

Father "Pat" as he is affectionately called is the true religionist who does not turn away anyone because of the unpopularity of his cause—he only requires truthful information and complete understanding of the problem. He attracts for his services the little people who wander through life, unwatched, unhonored, and unwashed—not the dregs of society, but the poor and unfortunate.

Father Pat, in his everyday life of activity, reflects the characteristics in principle of his patron, St. Jude—the patron saint of the department of police—the difficult and impossible cases as intercessor.

The mayor of Chicago, Richard Daley, accepts him as the distinguished advocate priest, who tempers public opinion in the defense of unfortunates who need a friend to plead for them for a chance to make good. The mayor is his friend as are members of the Illinois congressional delegation, city, county, and State officials.

Father Pat, in aiding the unfortunate and counseling men and women in their troubles, remains true to his trust in Christ. He has endeared himself to the people of Chicago because of his unselfish dedication in his services to others—and the members of the police department, regardless of their religious affiliation venerate Father Pat, not only for his work among the poor, but as a man of action in getting things done. The department supports his charitable acts and spiritual responsibilities to a man. To be loved by your fellows is the greatest reward to a man of the cloth—everyone is so proud of Father Pat. He has God's blessing in his meritorious work, together with our prayers.

The following article appeared in the Sunday issue, September 27, of the Chicago Tribune—special feature writer, Frank Haramija, did a masterful work:

FATHER PAT, POLICEMEN'S GUIDE—CHAPLAIN ON CALL FOR 24 HOURS A DAY

(By Frank Haramija)

One of the busiest men stationed at central police headquarters is Father Patrick J. McPolin, 47, chaplain of the Chicago Police Department.

Father Pat, a member of the Claretian Missionary Fathers, was appointed director of the police branch of St. Jude's league shortly after his ordination in 1943 and was assigned to police work.

As police chaplain, Father Pat frequently visits policemen in district stations, hospitals, and their homes.

MINISTER TO DYING OFFICERS

Of the 42 officers killed in the line of duty since 1944, Father Pat ministered to 20 in their dying moments. It frequently was his task to inform widows of their husbands' deaths and to offer spiritual and material help.

Further Pat is on call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and he never knows when the phone will ring in the early morning hours. It was one of these mornings, September 11, that he was awakened by an emergency call from the police communications center. The call told of a policeman dying of burns after his squad car crashed during a chase and exploded into flame. An hour later Father Pat received another call that an off-duty police officer was fatally wounded while making an arrest.

A TRAGIC MEMORY

Father Pat has answered many such emergency calls, and yet the one that is imbedded most deeply in his mind was when he spent more than 36 hours helping identify more than 90 young bodies, children who had died in the fire of the Lady of Angeles Grammar School.

Father Pat averages about 500 sick calls and attends at least 400 wakes during a year.

With the revamping of the police training program in 1962 he now spends 6 semester hours at the police academy instructing recruits in the ethics and morals of their future work as policemen during their 13-week training.

He has written numerous articles for Catholic publications, on police ethics, a policeman's role in public service, and tributes to police officers. He also lectures to civic groups and fraternal organizations.

PLAYS LIAISON ROLE

"I feel that I have been performing a liaison duty between the police department and the public, of bringing a better understanding of the dedication and the responsibilities of a policeman to the citizens that he serves," said Father Pat. He often borrows a quote from the late President Kennedy about police:

"God and not the policeman, all men adore. In time of danger and not before. When the danger is past and all things righted, God is forgotten and the policeman is slighted."

Father Pat has enlisted the clergy of all faiths to attend stricken members of the department. The chaplaincy of the Chicago Police Department is now shared with two prominent clergymen, Rabbi Bernard D. Perlow and the Reverend Robert A. Holderby. They have offices on the 12th floor in the central police headquarters building, 1121 South State Street.

As director of the police branch of St. Jude's League, Father Pat has spiritual responsibility for more than 9,000 members.

AIDS STUDENTS OF PRIESTHOOD

The charitable aim of St. Jude's League is to aid the education of young men studying for the priesthood. St. Jude's Seminary at Momence, was started through financial help from the league.

The monthly meetings are a social gathering place for the members and their wives. After business sessions, the members are entertained by prominent show people who are in the city at the time. Danny Thomas, a friend of St. Jude's League since 1945 and a very close friend to Father Pat, makes a point to stop at the league's hall whenever he is in town.

The police branch of St. Jude's League was founded in February 1932.

St. Jude, one of the 12 apostles, has been known as the patron of difficult and impossible cases. In view of their many desperations in the line of duty, the policemen chose him as their heavenly intercessor.

Young Democrats Reject Embalming of State Legislative Bodies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the Young Democratic Clubs of Maryland recently passed a resolution endorsing the one-man, one-vote principle laid down in the Supreme Court's famous reapportionment decision. I am proud of their position and wish to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

DISTRICT HEIGHTS, MD.,
September 17, 1964.

Hon. CARLTON R. SICKLES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARLTON: Enclosed herewith is a resolution passed at the annual convention of the Young Democratic Clubs of Maryland on September 12, 1964.

As their newly elected president, I have been directed by our convention to convey to you our deep felt commitment to the principle recently enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States of one man, one vote. We are greatly concerned over recent efforts on the part of many groups, as well as the Congress, to lessen or negate the impact of this historic decision.

I would urge you, as I know you are doing, to take whatever action is necessary to insure timely consideration of all reapportionment cases by the courts of our land.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

STENY H. HOYER,
President, Young Democratic Clubs of Maryland.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF MARYLAND, SEPTEMBER 12, 1964, IN CONVENTION ASSEMBLED

This convention gives its strong endorsement to the principle of one person, one vote in electing all State legislators. We urge the defeat of any proposed constitutional amendment that would dilute this principle in any State. We also oppose any attempt in the U.S. Congress to delay or to limit orderly action by the courts in reapportionment cases. We believe that such attempts are not only an unwarranted attack on the traditional separation of powers between the branches of Government, but also that they would tend to prolong and even perpetuate malaportioned legislative bodies which already have been declared unconstitutional in composition.

The Weapons Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, U.S. News & World Report, a magazine with a widespread reputation for objectivity in its news columns, has recently performed a valuable service for the American people. In an article entitled, "A-Bomb in Politics—Who's Right, Who's Wrong?" the magazine presents a careful six-point analysis of the current controversy over this Nation's nuclear defense policy.

This policy has now become a presidential campaign issue and it is clear, Mr. Speaker, that a great deal of confusion has resulted. Much of this confusion is clarified by this U.S. News & World Report article, which appears on page 49 of the issue dated September 28, 1964.

I, of course, have my own views on this subject, but I need not add them here. The facts speak for themselves in this report and, because I believe these facts should be brought to the attention of Congress, I wish to insert the article, "A-Bomb in Politics," at this point in the RECORD:

A-BOMB IN POLITICS

Defense policy of the United States is suddenly at the center of a heated and growing debate in the 1964 political campaign.

Complex issues of nuclear warfare are involved—problems that are difficult for many voters to understand under the best of circumstances.

Concern now is felt by many that Americans are being further confused, getting official information from civilian officials in the Pentagon that only increases bewilderment.

Some military authorities say that facts given in rebuttal to Senator GOLDWATER, the Republican candidate, are highly selective and presented not so much to clarify as to make political points for Democrats.

The result, they say, is this: Americans, already grappling with highly technical problems, tend to become more and more confused.

At this time, issue is being taken with a half dozen points made by the administration in the defense debate. Those points are as follows:

Point 1: Only the President of the United States can ever be entrusted with authority to order the use of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe.

About this point, some military sources say that the administration itself was considering a move away from that position before it became a domestic political issue. It is reported that intensive studies were under way in Washington about relaxing the U.S. veto over use of certain nuclear weapons now shared by allies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The United States has more than 1,000 tactical nuclear weapons in Europe—in Greece, Turkey, England, Italy, and Germany.

Reversal of the administration attitude on this issue came, it is said, only after Senator GOLDWATER suggested giving authority over smaller atomic weapons to the supreme commander of NATO.

Even now, the understanding is widespread among NATO allies that U.S. commanders in Europe already have orders, issued in advance, to use nuclear weapons in certain emergencies with no further instructions from Washington.

Some military men say that, when the campaign is over, it will be found that the administration and Senator GOLDWATER were actually not far apart at the time the issue was first brought up in the campaign.

Point 2: The average tactical weapon in Europe has the explosive equivalent of 100,000 tons of TNT, or five times that of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima. That kind of power reinforces the argument that only the President should control it.

Military men say they are dismayed by this kind of fact produced by political appointees in the Pentagon. They emphasize that soldiers do not assess their arsenal in terms of average bombs. They do not fight wars with average bombs. They use specific weapons for specific missions.

One tactical weapon in Europe, for example, fires a projectile with a yield equal to 50 tons of TNT, not the 100,000 tons presented by the Pentagon as an average. Some other arms now operational in Europe—the 155-millimeter howitzer and the 8-inch howitzer, for example—are vastly less powerful than the 100,000-ton average.

What the administration has done—military men assert—is to strike an average that not only confuses, but frightens people. They say the high figure was reached by including the biggest of the nuclear weapons in Europe along with the smallest. Says one officer:

"When you start including the warhead yield of a two-stage ballistic tactical missile such as Pershing—or such as the atomic bombs carried by tactical fighter planes stationed in Germany, you are going to come up with an astronomical average.

"The range in size and power of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe is truly spectacular—and so to talk about an average, only begs the issue and adds to the general bewilderment about the matter."

Point 3: The smallest nuclear weapon in Europe, the Davy Crockett, is tens of times more powerful than the biggest conventional blockbuster of World War II.

"It was just last week," one senior military man reports, "that Davy Crockett was being lumped by the administration with the A-bomb that leveled Hiroshima. Now, the comparison has been scaled down, but still doesn't tell the whole story."

The Davy Crockett, in one version, is an atomic bazooka that can be hand-carried and set up by two men in the field. Its power is rated at 40 tons of TNT, well below the tens of times comparison with the 5-ton blockbusters of the last world war. In any case, military men stress the point that a 40-ton bomb does not have eight times the destructive power of a 5-ton bomb. The laws of nature involved bring the scale of destruction down sharply.

What military men object to chiefly is the implication that Davy Crockett is in the same class as the Hiroshima-type bomb. The A-bomb over Hiroshima carried an explosive equivalent of not 40 tons of TNT, but 20,000 tons.

This point is said to be overlooked by Goldwater critics: He has spoken out for development of even smaller tactical nuclear weapons—of 5 and 10 tons of firepower. The United States has been on the threshold of such finely tailored battlefield weapons for years, but their development has not been pushed as hard as many military men would have liked. The Army is rapidly losing its conventional battlefield artillery, but promises of a diversified nuclear arsenal to replace it have not fully materialized.

Point 4: Senator GOLDWATER claims that deliverable nuclear capacity may be cut by 90 percent in the next decade under present policy. The Pentagon says this is "false," and the point is added by others that Air Force Chief Gen. Curtis E. LeMay provided accurate figures on this problem which Senator GOLDWATER chose to ignore.

Military officials know of no record in the Pentagon that General LeMay ever provided Senator GOLDWATER with precise "top secret" figures that would have altered his estimate. In fact, it is pointed out, General LeMay has decried some military cutbacks more than Senator GOLDWATER and testified this year before a House Armed Services subcommittee that he believes Russia has already narrowed the gap of U.S. nuclear superiority.

Senator GOLDWATER's argument is that by far the bulk of U.S. strategic power is now carried by bombers. He says that the switch, in the next decade, from a mixed force of bombers and missiles to an all-missile force will account for a 90 percent reduction in the explosive power that can be carried. That is because missiles carry only a fraction of what bombers can carry. He provides these figures: Deliverable explosive power by bombers and missiles now totals 28,570 megatons—the megaton being the equivalent of a million tons of TNT—but will plummet to 1,656 megatons in 1970, assuming an all-missile force.

Those figures are conceded by Senator GOLDWATER to be inexact, because he did not use secret Pentagon details. Backers of the Senator make this point: During the Senate debate last year over the nuclear test-ban treaty, Senator GOLDWATER cited his 90-percent figure to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. Mr. McNamara said it was a bit high but that 75 percent would be a fair approximation.

Now, in rebutting Senator GOLDWATER as being totally without foundation in fact, the Pentagon ignores future explosive power and argues instead that the United States will have 2½ times more warheads than it had in 1961. Military men say that numbers of warheads bear no direct relation to overall explosive power—Mr. GOLDWATER's point. The result, they say, is figured juggling and more confusion.

Point 5: To take up the bomber slack, the administration has added more than 200 Atlas and Titan missiles, more than 600 Minutemen and 14 Polaris submarines with 16 missiles each.

This claim peeves some military men, who say that the Democrats are thus assuming the entire credit for someone else's foresight and work.

The facts, as borne out by the record: The funding and development of the entire Atlas missile force were carried out almost entirely by the Eisenhower administration. Titan was also well along before Mr. McNamara took office, and one of his first acts was to cut back the Titan II force by two squadrons.

Both Minutemen and Polaris were initiated by the Eisenhower administration, and many were already on order. Mr. McNamara, when he assumed office, increased the pace and numbers of these two programs.

Point 6: The important thing about the nuclear arsenal of the United States is not that it is declining, as Senator GOLDWATER asserts, but that it is piling up at a fantastic rate long after there already is enough to destroy the world several times over.

This kind of sweeping statement not only dismays, but angers military men with access to the facts.

It now is accepted that atomic weapons are, on a cost effectiveness basis—initiated by Mr. McNamara himself—what the Pentagon calls the "biggest bang for the buck" that the Nation has ever had. The point is made that nuclear weapons are a bargain—cheap to build and maintain, when compared with any other strategic system.

Then, military men ask this question: How much is enough nuclear power With breakthroughs being sought in antimissile missiles, and other developments coming, no one really knows. "You don't just shut down your arsenal because you have enough today," one officer emphasizes. He adds:

"For us, it is not how big our stockpile is, but whether we will be able to take a surprise attack and still be able to devastate the enemy with what is left. In other words, always to maintain a 'balance of terror.' In a country that is committed to absorb the first strike, as we are, our own retaliatory arsenal must keep pace with the enemy's offensive power. The more he can throw at you, the more you must have in reserve.

"It is not Americans who dictate the size of our nuclear arsenal. It is the Russians. The more they pile up, the more we must have. It is not only confusing, but dangerous, to play around with issues like these in a political campaign."

The Time Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy, referring to the civil rights movement, stated:

What we're talking about is a problem that involves 180 million people.

Because of the continued and burning interest of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL–CIO, in seeing that no one within its ranks is deprived of his civil rights, a booklet, beautifully illustrated has been prepared and circulated. Its title of "The Time Is Now" illustrates the real need to recognize our responsibilities as a whole people and not defer to another day the demand of such a large part of our population.

Segregation is such a 20th century problem that many leaders have advanced to suggest answers. Most of the articulate ones such as the Reverend Martin Luther King and the leaders of the NAACP recommend moderation in approach.

But, as "The Time Is Now" so aptly states:

There comes a time when the cup of endurance runs over, and men are no longer willing to be plunged into an abyss of injustice where they experience the bleakness of corroding despair.

It is impossible to capture the impact of this mostly pictorial position of this progressive union which has prepared this review without an examination personally of the brochure.

I commend it to my colleagues and suggest that all those, and I hope there will be many, ask for such copies as would be put to good use, by writing to Patrick E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutter & Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL–CIO, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.

Gov. John Connally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial that appeared September 20, 1964, in the Longview Morning News, Longview, Tex., concerning the attainments of the people of Texas under the administration of Hon. John Connally and other officials who work with him. We Texans take pride in these attainments:

[From the Longview Morning Journal, Sept. 20, 1964]

TEXAS PROGRESS

That Texas is enjoying almost unprecedented prosperity and progress is apparent to almost everyone, both inside and outside the State. This kind of progress does not just happen, even when the Nation is prosperous—some States today are experiencing economic conditions that range from weak to poor.

Good State government, we believe, is the basis for much of our current Texas progress. Government either clears the atmosphere of doubt and confusion which hamper economic development, or it clouds the atmosphere with problems and threats which discourage and delay business and industrial expansion and growth and the development of jobs.

Thanks to able and dedicated John Connally, Texas has had both progressive and responsible government. Under the leadership of Governor Connally—and with the help of an able team of State officials which includes Lt. Gov. Preston Smith, Attorney General Waggoner Carr, along with Speaker Byron Tunnell—Texas government has gained new strength and purpose.

A number of nagging problems, some of them rooted far back in the years, have been solved. Instead of drift and indecision, State government now is marching ahead with new goals and high purpose—thanks to the vision and the understanding of State needs shown by Governor Connally, and his initiative and follow through in planning and working toward goals.

The Connally administration and the legislature, early in his current term, attacked several old problems. One of these was weak State finances and threatening deficits. As a result of action taken, the Governor was able to report to the recent State Democratic convention in Dallas that Texas gave $43 million more support to higher education, and more support to such worthwhile causes as mental health, research, good roads, and the prison system, and yet came up with an unprecedented $73 million balance in the treasury.

As we said nearly 3 years ago—when we were the first newspaper in Texas to announce our support of John Connally after he revealed late in 1961 he would resign as Secretary of the Navy to return to Texas and run for the governorship—here is a native son with the ability and the capacity to bring harmony and unity of purpose and direction to Texas government. Under the strong and wise leadership of Connally as Governor, Texas today enjoys harmony of historic proportion. The credit in large measure must go to the moderate and prudent views, the progressive leadership, and the unifying spirit of this son of Texas.

Setting the State's finances in order was basic. This had to come first, and it was put first in order. Then Governor Connally launched out in a major program designed to upgrade higher education and bring new industry to the State. He saw that these two goals complement each other, and must be worked out together. Real progress is being made—a fact which lends strength to all facets of the Texas economy today. It is this area of State leadership—good education for all, and new industry providing jobs for people and payrolls to support business—that the Connally administration has centered its work.

In John Connolly, Texas has a great Governor. Come what may, he knows how to give Texas his first attention and to center his activities on meeting Texas' needs and opportunities. He has plans and purposes and goals for Texas which will assure our State's continued growth and progress in ways that will benefit all our people.

It is for these reasons that we unhesitatingly recommend and strongly urge his reelection in November to the Governor's office. He should ge given a strong mandate from the people to carry on his vigorous but unfinished program for Texas progress.—Carl L. Estra.

The Founding Fathers' Advice on the Reapportionment Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to Mrs. Melvin Paul, of Long Beach, Calif., for her following letter, which contains messages from our Founding Fathers of great pertinency to all of us today:

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
September 12, 1694.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER: In the current debate on the apportionment of State legislatures, the philosophical arguments are really not as powerful as those presented in 1776–1814. The following are some historical references with an excerpt to show you what I mean:

Jefferson, Notes on Virginia, 1776:

"The senate is, by its constitution, too homogeneous with the house of delegates. The purpose of establishing different houses of legislation is to introduce the influence of different interests or different principles."

John Adams, "A Defense of the Constitutions of Government in the U.S.A.," 1787:

"In every form of government, we have seen a senate, or little council, a composition generally of those officers of State who have the most experience and power * * *. We have seen, in every instance, another and a larger assembly, composed of the body of the people * * * to control them from rushing into those exorbitances to which they are most addicted." * * * "It will be found necessary to give negatives to the Governors, to defend the executives against the influences of this body, as well as the senate and representatives in their several States. The necessity of a negative in the house of representatives will be called in question by nobody * * *." "To expect self-denial from men, when they have a majority in their favor, and consequently power to gratify themselves, is to disbelieve all history and universal experience * * *. There is, in short, no possible way of defending the minority * * * from the tyranny of the majority, but by giving the former a negative on the latter * * *. The passions and desires of the majority of the representatives in an assembly being in their nature unsatiable and unlimited by anything within their own breasts, and having nothing to control them without, will crave more and more indulgence, and, as they have the power, they will have the gratification * * *."

John Adams, "Knowledge Will Forever Be a Cause of Aristocracy," 1814:

"The moment you give knowledge to a Democrat you make him an aristocrat. If you give more than a share in the sovereignty to the Democrats, that is, if you give them the command or preponderance in the sovereignty, that is, the legislature, they will vote all property out of the hands of your aristocrats."

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) MARIE E. PAUL.

The Jones Act Examined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, log exports and the competition of Canadian mills continue to loom as real problems to lumbermen of the Pacific Northwest, including those in my district, the Second Congressional District of Washington State. As I have pointed out many times, the lumber industry is vital to the economy of this area and, for this reason, is of great interest to me.

There appears to be no quick and easy answer to the log export problem, although I am happy to report that a number of "save our logs" committees and other groups are helping myself and others to work toward a solution. Answers acceptable to both lumbering and longshoring interests are yet to be found, but these answers are being sought.

Meanwhile, there is almost general agreement that American mills could better meet Canadian competition if they were freed of restrictions in the Merchant Marine Act, the so-called Jones Act, which now forbids the shipment of American lumber in foreign-bottom vessels when U.S. flagships are unavailable.

As I am sure you are aware, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 7961, to repeal these restrictions. While such legislation was endorsed more than a year ago by the late President Kennedy, the present administration has been unwilling to act, despite the fact that it professes a wish to create jobs.

Recently, the Everett Herald, a daily newspaper in my district, carried a letter to the editor from Mr. Gene Talbut, secretary of Lumber & Sawmill Workers' Local No. 2655 in Everett, Wash. Mr. Talbut comments on the log export problem, but he also goes on to note that the repeal of these Jones Act restrictions would definitely increase American lumber shipments. Because I think his letter will be of real interest to all those Members of Congress who sincerely want to create jobs, the letter follows:

DEAR EDITOR: As secretary of local No. 2655 of the Lumber & Sawmill Workers' Union, I would like to answer some of the questions that Donald Gilchrest, secretary of International Longshoremens' Union of Local No. 32 of Everett, brought up in his recent letter to the editor.

Apparently, Mr. Gilchrest has had some incorrect information as to the availability of timber in this area. He feels that there is an unlimited supply, when in fact there is "not enough public timber available to meet all requirements." This is a quotation from a letter written by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, signed by Edward P. Cliff, chief, dated August 10.

The estimate of the 6,200 primary jobs which will be lost in this area is computed from the Department of Commerce statistics and is the best information we have.

Mr. Gilchrest mentions the longshoremen's payroll for the last year in Everett alone amounted to $321,000. This is not very impressive—the loss of one shift at Three Rivers Plywood alone would amount to over $400,000. Besides this example, the lost time suffered at other plants would amount to a great deal more. I very much share Mr. Gilchrest's concern for the prosperity of the smaller ports.

The sawmills in this area used to ship lumber competitively to the domestic east coast, and moved a good volume; however, 72 percent of that trade has now gone to British Columbia mills because industry in this area is limited to using noncompetitive U.S. ships under the Jones Act. A repeal of this provision would definitely increase these shipments.

GENE TALBUT,
Secretary, Local 2655, Lumber & Sawmill Workers, Everett.

Mr. John Joseph Courtney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have lost a devoted and dear friend, and America has lost one of its most dedicated and able public servants.

Mr. John Joseph Courtney, former counsel of the Armed Services Committee's Investigating Subcommittee, died suddenly here in Washington on Wednesday, the 9th of September 1964.

He was buried at Arlington National Cemetery with appropriate military honors on the 14th day of September 1964.

Most of the distinguished Members of this body have had, at one time or another, occasion to seek and heed the good counsel and advice of Mr. John Courtney during the 12 years he had served as counsel for the Armed Services Committee.

Most of us, therefore, know and appreciate the significant and professional influence that he had exerted in assisting this body in insuring the military might and security of our Nation.

Most of us also know and remember his professional competence and objectivity. However, though John Courtney was without peer as a dedicated and able public servant, he was much more than that.

Msgr. Patrick J. Ryan, former Chief of Chaplains, U.S. Army, and now a retired major general in the U.S. Army, knew the whole John Courtney. The brief remarks made by Monsignor Ryan at the burial service at St. Thomas Apostle Roman Catholic Church therefore reflected in a beautiful manner the terrible sense of loss his friends and family experienced with his untimely death:

REMARKS OF MSGR. PATRICK J. RYAN AT THE BURIAL SERVICE OF MR. JOHN J. COURTNEY

It is difficult for me to speak on this occasion. I am speaking about a lifelong friend and a friendship that goes back to our early school days. Through the years our paths lay close together. So it would be difficult for me to give a eulogy—and I think it is quite unnecessary.

No eulogy would be adequate to do proper honor to John Courtney. Those of us present—his friends, who knew him well, know what a true, loyal, devoted friend he was. However, I feel I would be remiss were I not to express briefly and perhaps, haltingly, what is in my heart and in your hearts this morning.

The character of our friend was well rounded—spiritually, morally, and intellectually. He had the natural and the supernatural virtues in high degree.

We knew him in many ways. We knew him as a conscientious public servant who gave many years of his life to the Navy Department. And completing this, some 13 years to the Armed Services Committee of the Congress.

His service was marked with honesty, integrity, intelligence, and judgment—seasoned with a fine sense of humor. His loyalty and devotion to his superiors were without compare.

We, his friends, also knew him as a dutiful husband, a loving father, intensely proud of his family. But particularly, we knew him as a true friend.

A grateful country conferred upon him its highest award, the Distinguished Civilian Service Award for outstanding service to his country.

And there is no doubt in my mind that when he appeared before the great Commander in Chief, the Supreme Master of all, whom he served so well, that he received the accolade eternal—"Well done, good and faithful servant."

So, in my own behalf and in your name, I bid our friend, farewell.

In the same breath, I express our deep sympathy and condolences to Mrs. Courtney and the family. We will help you bear your burden of sorrow.

His departure makes us all poorer. But our faith tells us that we should not lament and grieve now that he has gone to his eternal reward—into the presence of God, the beatific vision.

He has joined that long line of distinguished Americans who served their God and their country well.

He served his God and his country with his whole heart, with his whole mind, with all his ability and with his whole soul. He also loved his neighbor as himself.

In the Sunday gospel just yesterday, our Lord said these were the two great Commandments—"Keep these and thou shalt live."

And so, John, as you swing into step with that long column of good and illustrious Americans, the prayer of your friends who remain behind is that God will grant you peace and rest and quiet in this your eternal bivouac.

A Well-Deserved Tribute to Milwaukee's Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the life of a law-enforcement officer is not an easy one. It takes its toll on him and his family. More often than not, it involves long hours of work, many inconveniences, even physical danger. At times, the rewards of such a career—measured in terms of compensation, community respect, and appreciation—are not always commensurate with the responsibilities and hardships entailed.

It is a welcome occasion, therefore, when a voice is raised publicly, calling attention to the accomplishments of our law-enforcement officers.

We have heard such a voice through the columns of an article which appeared in the September 28 issue of the weekly magazine, U.S. News & World Report.

The article is entitled "How One City Keeps Its Streets Safe" and it focuses the spotlight of national attention on my hometown, the city of Milwaukee. It tells how, in these times of growing crime rates and mounting civil disorders, our city has maintained its fine reputation for civil peace and order, for efficiency and honesty in public administration.

Even more welcome than this "pat on the back" for our city, is the article's open tribute to Milwaukee's great police force. It is a tribute well-deserved, and it should warm the hearts of all our law enforcement officers from the recruit in training to the chief of police.

Mr. Speaker, the joys and sorrows, the hardships and the rewards, of every police officer are shared by his family—his wife and children, his parents, and his relatives. It is these families that are in no small part responsible for the fine performance of our Milwaukee police force. I know that this article will be of deep interest to them.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HOW ONE CITY KEEPS ITS STREETS SAFE

(NOTE.—In Milwaukee, you're safer on the streets than in any other big city of its size. Violence is rare, police efficient, criminals uncoddled. How does Milwaukee do it? This report gives some clues.)

MILWAUKEE, WIS.—What makes a city law-abiding?

Come to Milwaukee, one of the most law-abiding cities in the United States, and you find it takes more than a good police department, tough prosecutors and honest judges.

It also takes solid citizens.

Public officials agree that it is the whole civic climate in Milwaukee that keeps crime down.

There is a saying here that every Miwlaukee policeman has a thousand pairs of eyes.

At a time when crimes of violence are increasing all over the country, this saying goes a long way to explain why this city continues to be one of the safest places in which to live.

The extra "eyes" are those of the people here—men, women, and children who have come to be accepted as an arm of law enforcement.

THE CITY'S TRADITION

"In Milwaukee," says Mayor Henry W. Maier, "we are lucky to have a unique combination of a fine police force and a settled and stable population, largely of German and Polish descent.

"The Milwaukee tradition is that when you see a strange car or a strange man in your neighborhood you call the cops. And if it's a false alarm, the cops don't make you look foolish."

"People in this town," says Police Inspector Raymond A. Dahl, "are willing to give information to the police, willing to be witnesses.

"We've got to have this kind of cooperation if we are going to make arrests and get convictions.

In many cities of this country, unfortunately, people are afraid to help the police."

Last year, although it had a 16 percent increase in serious crimes, Milwaukee could still lay claim to being the most crime-free city in the 700,000-to-800,000 population group.

Among the six cities in this class, Milwaukee was lowest in incidence of murder, rape, assault, robbery, burglary, and auto theft.

It is safe to walk the streets at night in Milwaukee.

Although the Negro population is sizable, there have been no serious racial disturbances.

Public officials attribute this good record to many factors of Milwaukee life besides efficient policemen and cooperative citizens. Among them are: alert newspapers; good schools; hardworking social services; an absence of tenement-type slums; a comprehensive system of parks and playgrounds; swift and sure justice for offenders in the courts.

"I think Milwaukee, as a community, probably devotes more of its resources to the prevention of crime than do other cities," Mayor Maier said.

CONVICTIONS: 95 PERCENT

Almost all criminal cases in Milwaukee are prosecuted by the district attorney's office, headed by William McCauley, whose top assistant is Hugh R. O'Connell.

"We get fine cooperation from our people and the courts," Mr. O'Connell said.

"Trials in Milwaukee are not delayed to the point where witnesses are silenced or forget.

"I would estimate that we get convictions in 95 percent of the cases in which 'not guilty' pleas are entered.

"Don't forget, the same solid citizen who helps us with police work also serves on our juries."

Mr. O'Connell was asked whether anything like the Kitty Genovese case could happen in Milwaukee. Miss Genovese was stabbed to death on a New York street one night last March. Thirty-eight people saw or heard some part of the attack, yet none of them came to the girl's help or called police.

"I doubt very much if that could happen here," Mr. O'Connel said. "I don't think people in Milwaukee have reached that degree of apathy.

"I recall the case of a girl who was seized in the neighborhood of 33d and Lisbon about 1 a.m. one night. She was dragged into an alley, where her assailant tried to rape her. Four or five men in a tavern heard her screams, rushed out, grabbed the man and held him until police arrived."

LOCAL JUSTICE

In Milwaukee courts, there is no coddling of criminals.

"That doesn't mean we don't give a man a chance," said Circuit Judge John L. Coffey.

"A first offender always has a chance of probation if the crime is not too serious. He seldom gets a second chance, however.

"I think the fact that we don't have capital punishment in Wisconsin is a deterrent to crime, particularly among repeaters. I think a man who has been in prison and is going again often would prefer death to life imprisonment."

The court calendar in Milwaukee is in good shape, Judge Coffey reported. Cases come to trial quickly.

"I tried a first-degree murder case during the last week in July," the judge said. "The offense occurred during the last week in May.

"That's about the way our calendar has been running. In Chicago, it sometimes takes 2 or 3 years to get a case to trial."

TRIALS IN 24 HOURS

Police Inspector Dahl had praise for the pace of justice in the city's courts.

"I can recall several occasions in the early 1930's when major criminals were on their way to Waupun, the State penitentiary, on the same day they committed their crimes," he said.

"It happened in cases where they were arrested on the spot, waived preliminary hearings, pleaded guilty, and took their medicine.

"Those were the days when we were working hard to keep out the gangsters from Chicago, Detroit, and New York.

"The legal process here is slower today. But it is just as sure."

CITIZEN COOPERATION

As an example of how citizens help to catch criminals, Inspector Dahl told about a bank robbery that occurred 5 years ago.

"It was the first bank robbery in Milwaukee in 19 years. Three men and a woman were in on the job. A mailman got the license number of one of their cars. Through that, we traced the whole gang and sent them to jail."

Regularly, the police department issues certificates of merit to citizens who aid in law enforcement.

Joseph Budin got an award for apprehending an armed gunman who tried to rob him.

Mr. and Mrs. Roland Schmidt got one for reporting a burglary and following the suspects until they were arrested.

Ronald Brady got another for helping to catch a purse snatcher.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

In its continuing war on crime, Milwaukee expects to get a good deal of help from its new social development commission, a task force organized by Mayor Maier.

"The commission has three main functions," the mayor said—"to oversee a program of culturization, that is, to get immigrants used to our city; to combat juvenile delinquency; and to improve the lot of old people.

"You have to treat the causes of crime," Mayor Maier said.

"I believe this country is going to have to think seriously about spending more on urban areas. The ratio of farm to urban spending by the Federal Government is 13 to 1. The ratio of spending on space to urban spending is 3 to 1. One rocket now costs as much as a whole urban-renewal program.

"This struggle against crime and the degradation caused by narcotics, prostitution, and gambling is almost a war.

"We didn't think of the cost of defending the country after Pearl Harbor was attacked. We shouldn't be reluctant to spend to defend our cities against criminals."

Mayor Maier said Milwaukee has two current crime problems.

One is the persistent effort of out-of-State "syndicates" to get a foothold in the city, organize gambling and prostitution, and prey on merchants.

The other is a heavy in-migration of Negroes, white people from the Appalachian region, and Puerto Ricans.

"These people are not accustomed to doing things our way," the mayor said. "They have to be taught the Milwaukee tradition. This is a job for the schools and welfare agencies as well as for the police."

Since 1950, Milwaukee County has had an in-migration of more than 26,000 nonwhites. The Negro population of the city, concentrated mostly in the sixth ward, is now approaching 10 percent.

Basically, however, Milwaukee remains about four times as German as the average urban area and more than twice as Polish.

THE POLICE SYSTEM

Milwaukee's police department, headed by Chief Harold A. Breier, has a complement of 1,942, including clerks, janitors, etc.

Personnel with police powers total 1,720, which officials say is below average for a city of Milwaukee's size. Chief Breier is asking for 300 more men this year.

In 1963, the department operated at a net cost to the city of $11,288,604.

In 1962, the latest year for which figures are available, Milwaukee had 2.40 officers per 1,000 inhabitants, compared with an average of 2.24 for the 16 largest cities in the United States.

Per capita expenditures for police services in the same year totaled $17.65, compared with $16.23 for the 16 largest cities.

A lot of money is spent on motorized equipment in Milwaukee—half its fleet of squad cars is traded in every year—but the biggest deterrent to crime, according to Inspector Dahl, is the policeman on foot.

"We like to have an omnipresent force of policemen on the streets," the inspector said. "We can't afford to be just an answering service, getting there after it happens. We want to be on the spot to prevent crime.

"A policeman walking his beat is the answer to juvenile delinquency and to traffic enforcement. It's really the answer to crime prevention.

"This is expensive, but every city is going to get the kind of law enforcement and safety climate that it is willing to pay for.

"Ideally, we would like to have 25 percent of our men on foot. The best we can do right now is between 15 and 18 percent, including traffic officers."

Milwaukee has no police dogs. The city's aldermen wanted to have a study made of the feasibility of a canine corps, but Mayor Maier vetoed it.

"I thought it was untimely and that it would be tremendously provocative," the mayor said. "I just didn't think it would square with my feelings about Milwaukee and its traditions."

TRAINING POLICEMEN

In-service training has been in effect in the Milwaukee Police Department since 1922. Under this program, officers spend 30 hours a year studying current police problems in the city, new criminal techniques, and similar subjects.

"We now have 1,600 officers studying in 16 classes," Inspector Dahl said. "A man can be with us 35 years, and he still goes to school.

"A police recruit goes through a long course of schooling before he goes on the street. The recruit stays in the training division for 13 weeks, and after that he's on probation for 1 year.

"To join the force," Inspector Dahl said, "a man must be between 21 and 31, stand 5 foot 9 inches in his stocking feet, and be not taller than 6 foot 4. An applicant must be a perfect physical specimen.

"It's not easy to get good men. We're competing with industry, remember, and also with the armed services. We recruit on a statewide basis, and hold exams three or four times a year. At the State fair this year, we put up a recruiting booth and tried to sell young men on a career in law enforcement."

POLICE CADETS

In 1951, Milwaukee started a police-cadet program that is now being copied all over the country.

"We take in boys 17, 18, and 19 who have finished high school and are recommended by their principals," Inspector Dahl explained. "We have 52 positions listed for these boys in our table of organization.

"They take the same type of tests that an adult recruit does, and we hire from 15 to 17 a year.

"Cadets go to school in the morning, studying shorthand, typing, business English, and a little psychology. In the afternoon, they work in police stations. They're rotated in their jobs every 6 months so that they get a rounded police education.

"Starting pay is $3,745 a year, and cadets can work up to $5,079.

"You understand, we wouldn't get very many of these boys if we waited until they were 21. By then they would be in the armed services or in factory jobs, earning more than we could pay them as beginners."

POLICE SCANDAL

While the Milwaukee police department is widely admired and imitated, local people will point out to you that it isn't perfect.

This was demonstrated in May of 1962, when the attorney general of Wisconsin launched a grandjury type of investigation of police misconduct and laxity in Milwaukee.

Thirty-five policemen and deputy sheriffs, some of them senior officers, retired or resigned during the course of the investigation. The vice squad got a thorough housecleaning.

A local newspaper called it the worst police scandal in Milwaukee in 75 years.

Forty-two warrants were issued, about half a dozen against police officers and deputy sheriffs. Charges included bribery, fixing of speeding tickets, and evasion of State income taxes.

The probe was supervised by Circuit Judge Coffee, who said it could not be taken as an indictment of the entire police force, "in which there are many fine and dedicated men."

Le Roy L. Dalton, an assistant State attorney general, handled the investigative side of the proceedings.

"We found that the police department, jealous of its reputation, had a tendency to sweep some things under the rug," Mr. Dalton said.

"We got the story of what was going on from policemen themselves, officers who were disgusted with the situation."

THE JUVENILE PROBLEM

Teenage crime, like other crime, is increasing in Milwaukee, despite everything that is being done about it.

One way the city attacks its teenage crime problem is through its vocational and technical schools.

These institutions are headed by Dr. George A. Parkinson, who said:

"A kid who's not in school or not employed is a natural for trouble—and not just Negro kids, either."

In Milwaukee, high-school dropouts have to go to Dr. Parkinson's "continuation" school until they are 18. There they get special training to fit them for jobs and life in the community.

Dr. Parkinson gave this description of the typical continuation-school student at the time he begins his special studies:

"He has a high hostility index. He holds himself in low esteem. He can't read or write properly, and can't do arithmetic. He comes from a troubled home.

"So you see he needs a lot of working on," Dr. Parkinson added.

"We find teenagers want a girl, a car, and a job or money, in that order," the educator said.

"If they can't get money, they get a car to get a girl. When they get the girl, they need money to spend on her. It's a natural drift to crime if they are out of school and out of a job."

Milwaukee is now spending $4 million on a new continuation school.

Taxpayers consider it another good investment in their fight to keep the city lawabiding.

One Man, One Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the Prince Georges County commissioners recently passed a resolution endorsing the one-man, one-vote principle laid down in the Supreme Court's famous reapportionment decision. I am proud of their position and wish to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1964.

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES,
Congressman-at-Large,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SICKLES: As chairman of the board of county commissioners, may I respectfully submit for your consideration the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted by this board:

"Whereas throughout the United States citizens of urban and suburban areas, among them the citizens of Prince Georges County, have been partially disenfranchised by reason of underrepresentation in their legislatures; and

"Whereas it has been declared by the Supreme Court that this practice is undemocratic and shall not be continued; and

"Whereas there are now in Congress proposals which would deny the Court's jurisdiction over reapportionment cases and would delay the effects of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling: Now be it

"*Resolved*, That the Prince Georges County Board of Commissioners urges the President of the United States, Prince Georges representatives in both Houses of Congress and the other major officeholders and officeseekers to make every effort to see that no delaying legislation is enacted so that at the earliest practicable date reapportionment may be accomplished under the duly reached decisions of the courts."

Sincerely,

FRANK J. LASTNER,
Chairman, Board of County Commissioners.

The Constituents Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, my mail continues to form one of the most effective links I have between myself and the people I represent. I am always happy to receive letters and to consider the views which they present.

While it would be impossible for me to share all of the letters I receive, two which I believe are particularly worth noting, have come to me in recent weeks.

The first, written by Mr. Ron Geuin, of Everett, Wash., a city in my district, discusses the administration's poverty bill. In my opinion, few people have said so much about this bill in so few words.

The other letter comes from Mr. Robert Lundvall, a rancher in the Everett area, who discusses his view on the beef import problem. This letter, too, makes some worthwhile points, and was certainly in my mind when I voted in favor of H.R. 1839 to permit meat import quotas.

Mr. Speaker, I believe both of these letters will be of interest to Members of Congress:

DEAR MR. WESTLAND: L.B.J.'s war on poverty is a real fine program—I'm for it 100 percent—providing he uses his own money and not mine. I've got a real war on poverty going right here and the $600 or $700 I pay in taxes would strike a mighty blow in my behalf if I were allowed to keep it. Those people should fight their battle against poverty the same as I do—10, 12, 14 hours a day and do without—and be darned proud of what little they do have because they earned it.

Sincerely,

RON GEUIN.

DEAR MR. WESTLAND: As a producer of several hundred head of beef cattle, I am tremendouly interested in the present import tax and quotas that have glutted our American markets and caused immense loss to many of our cattlemen. The situation is manifestly unfair and makes it difficult for us to pay heavy taxes to local and Federal Government.

The November election will doubtless reveal the disapproval of all stockmen as well as informed citizens toward the massive importation of beef with an unfair advantage over American cattle producers.

It is hard to understand how any legislator would favor keeping our present low tariff and large quotas on beef importation which are more favorable to virtually all other countries than our own. For this reason, I would respectfully request that you advise me of your past and prospective action on this matter.

With appreciation of your interest and with all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

ROBERT LUNDVALL.

Address by Bud Wilkinson, of Oklahoma, Before the National Press Club in Washington, on September 18, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following speech made by Bud Wilkinson, of Oklahoma, to the National Press Club here in Washington, on September 18, 1964, after being introduced by Allan Cromley, Washington correspondent for the Daily Oklahoman and Oklahoma City Times, and also a member of the board of the National Press Club:

While I am certainly grateful for Al's kind introduction, I believe he may have "Texanized" the facts to a certain degree. And I know you all understand the meaning of the word "Texanized."

I would be less than honest, though, if I didn't recognize why I was invited to speak to this distinguished group.

I realize that I am here as a candidate but also as a former football coach and obviously not in that order.

However, this is an important day for Oklahoma in our Nation's Capitol. Our great football team is in town a team led by one of the country's great coaches Gomer Jones.

And a former Oklahoma coach has been asked to speak here at the Press Club one of the truly distinguished opinionmaking forums in the world.

Needless to say, I hope both of us have success.

I know there is probably an element of curiosity in your attendance and that most of you came to look at the man who jumped from the frying pan into the fire.

I have already learned this much from my experience in politics; being a football coach is the second hardest way anyone can make a living.

I have always been impressed with the ability of reporters to analyze any situation. A few years ago, when we had a great winning streak going, a reporter asked me almost every week and with persistence at the end of each season, when are you going to quit coaching?

Well, in 1961 we lost our first five games, and this same reporter asked me if I ever intended to get back into coaching again.

Well, lady luck was with us, and we won our next five games. The same reporter displayed another characteristic that has always impressed me in writers; he took full credit for our winning streak.

Now that I am involved in politics, I intend to do the best job of which I am capable and, during a campaign as you well know this means run as hard as you can.

Frankly, I am a firm believer in the competitive process. In my experience, without question it is the best way to breed excellence.

I am quite certain you ladies and gentlemen recognize this fact because you know the personal qualities that make for success. You have practiced them yoursevles or you would not have reached the pinnacle of your profession.

The qualities that make an individual great are, obviously, the same qualities that make a football team great.

The qualities that make any team great are the same qualities that can help make a nation great.

What are these qualities? You know them—

Men must be dedicated to their cause, they must have ambition, they must be self-reliant, they must possess self-discipline, they must be prepared to sacrifice even personal interests for the good of the cause, and at all times they must give the best they have no matter how often they fail.

They must learn that victory comes through strength, that strength comes through preparedness, and that preparedness results only from hard work and extra effort.

This quality of extra effort is perhaps best explained by a story they tell about John Wanamaker, who was perhaps the greatest merchant who ever lived. He made a fabulous success with a single phrase:

"The part of the blanket
That keeps you warm
Is the part of the
Blanket that hangs over."

And it is just that little extra, the part of the blanket that hangs over, that is the difference between success and failure.

In spite of the self-evident truth of what I have just said we tend to ignore the lessons of history.

Instead of relying upon individual initiative, we put more and more dependence upon government and we put less and less reliance on self-help and the dignity of the individual man.

What does this have to do with government. Government actually is like football teams—its strength is only the collective strength of the individuals.

In America we think we are a pretty good team, and I must admit, we look good on paper. But if and when tested, our strength will rest on the human factor—on people. If we suceed, it will be on the basis of better individual performance.

We have the equipment and the tools—but do we have the initiative and the desire?

We must ask ourselves some pretty basic questions. How much liberty can we afford to pay for so-called security? Will bureaucracy destroy the incentive and the efficiency in production—which alone create economic wealth.

Sometimes I wonder if the welfare state isn't a place where it costs far too much to get something for nothing.

As you and I know, from the perspective of Washington one may get a rather distorted view of the feelings of our citizens.

Here you have the special interest groups, the lobyists and the indignant delegations. Besieged as you are by the avalanche of news—in a world of modern communications—your own time factor makes it difficult to determine accurately what the majority of our people are thinking.

I cannot speak for a majority of Americans, but I can speak for Oklahoma.

In Oklahoma there is a rebellion against big government. This rebellion is in the cause of individual freedom.

We Oklahomans feel the impact of the Federal Government in a personal way. We feel the high hand of big government intervention in our wheatfields, in our cattle pastures, and on our oil rigs.

Our wheat farmers, the farmers of Oklahoma, joined with farmers throughout the Nation in rejecting last year's ill conceived wheat proposal, the proposal which meant a further extension of big government control.

The voice of Oklahoma was clear. But when Oklahoma farmers saw almost the same bill, a bill which they had overwhelmingly rejected, pass Congress, and be signed into law, they learned again the same harsh lesson.

They know what this administration actually said was, "You farmers do not know what is good for you. You do not know how to manage your own affairs. Big government will tell you what to do.

Our cattle ranchers deeply resent it when the State Department consistently ignores the interests of our cattle industry by opening the flood gates to foreign beef.

Our independent oil producers resent it when foreign oil imports become great enough to threaten their ability to survive. In this regard Oklahomans are very much aware that HUBERT HUMPHREY has voted consistently against the 27½-percent depletion allowance which is vital to the survival of our domestic industry.

In the area of foreign affairs, Oklahomans resent the continuing loss of prestige of our great Nation—we do not accept the platitude that—all is well—that the cold war has ended.

Oklahomans recognize that when the American flag is hauled down and trampled in distant lands, that when consulates are burned, stoned, and looted, our Nation has lost the respect of much of the world. And we cannot agree that our interests must constantly be adjusted to favor the positions of those who oppose us.

We Oklahomans believe our foreign policy has lost momentum, direction, and meaning. The message of American foreign policy has become blurred. We have no clear cut, well-defined policy—a policy which is understood by both our friends and our foes. Platitudes will no longer suffice. Oklahomans demand to know what is our foreign policy?

We Oklahomans do not believe any basic problem is too complex to be understood by our citizens.

The relations of nations, like those among individuals, boil down to simple choices—choices of what is "right" and what is "wrong."

There is little real question actually in our minds as to definition in this area—and I question if there is in yours. Most of us do agree in our hearts about what is "right conduct"—and we know in our conscience—what is "wrong conduct." The eternal human problem remains.

Do we as individuals—do we as a nation—have the courage to make the hard choice which we know to be right?

The crisis in the world, which we call the cold war, presents a constant series of life and death challenges to our great system of self-government and its institutions.

Our responses to these challenges, in the opinion of Oklahomans * * * have been inadequate. We believe the United States has failed to lead. We believe the United States has failed to further its true goals of achieving liberty and freedom for all mankind.

I do not mean, of course, that the United States should use force to achieve its goals. The unregulated use of force to secure goals is unjust and therefore self-defeating.

What I do mean is that we must, if we are to regain * * * the respect of the world, utilize our great material strength, supplemented by our spiritual strength to define, defend, and extend out beliefs.

In a positive sense, we Oklahomans believe the Marshall plan was a success. We had hard and fast evidence that this aid program was carefully conceived and conscientiously managed in the best interests of both the giver and the receiver.

But what we Oklahomans demand is proof that our tax dollars spent for foreign aid have positive results * * * results designed to further our own objectives.

Too often we have been outplanned in the blackmail pressures of the foreign aid game. Oklahomans are clearly frustrated by the knowledge that over $113 billion of American tax money has gone across the seas to over 100 nations.

We are more deeply concerned, in fact we cannot accept any reason why 5 billion of America's tax dollars have been given to eight Communist countries. We do not believe the Communists have surrendered their goal of conquering the world. On the contrary, they continue their subversive and propaganda activities in every country of the free world constantly seeking to add to their power and territory. Today the Communists operate on every continent in their effort to rob free people of their liberty in Laos and Vietnam, in the Congo and Zanzibar, and in the heart of the Americas.

By aiding the Communists in any way, we Oklahomans believe this administration may well be buying for our enemies the pot in which to cook our own goose.

As a candidate for the Senate, I believe I should define my position. I will try to do so.

A friend of mine, a short time back, observed to me that he had a good job, that he paid his bills, saved for his future and the future of his children, that he hoped some day to move to a better home, that he and his wife attended church, and that he was anxious to build a better world for himself and for his children. And then he went on to say he wanted some one in Washington to really represent him.

And, I think you would agree. You see, my friend is not a member of any special interest group. He is only the kind of man who has made Oklahoma and this Nation great. I am for him. I am his candidate.

It is my hope to work to restore the principles of representative government to our State. I recognize the pressures that result from the executive branch but I believe a Senator's duty transcends party loyalty. His first obligation is to the citizens of his State, the people who have elected him, the people who have sent him to Washington to represent their interests.

I believe I know what Oklahomans want from their government. We are proud, dedicated, independent, people. We do not want handouts, we do not want alms from Washington, and we do not want rubberstamp representation.

We desire strong, effective, honest representation.

I believe I can clearly express to the Senate and the Nation the wishes of the Oklahoma farmers who want to keep Orville Freeman out of their wheatfields, the wishes of the Oklahoma beef producers who cry out for relief from reckless imports, and the wishes of the Oklahoma businessmen who want to manage their own affairs, and, above all, the wishes of the youth of Oklahoma who say only please give me the opportunity that you had, the opportunity that is my heritage.

Further, I believe I can be effective in selling the advantages of Oklahoma to industry. We have the natural resources when our important water programs are completed, as they should be by 1970, we will have access to the sea. This will unlock our vast reservoirs of natural wealth.

But more important, we have people who look to the future. Our people are God-fearing and hard working. They are talented people who bring perserverance, understanding, ability, and above all, dedication to their jobs.

It is my conviction that our workers will produce for new industries in exactly the same way our Oklahoma football players produced. In other words, if business will invest in us, merely get us in the game, we will win the championship.

To fully live as a responsible, free citizen of this, the world's greatest nation, requires dedication, participation, and full involvement in the affairs of our Republic, for the course we select will determine the future of this land.

I hold that man is a child of God, not a child of the State; that man is a spiritual being who, as Christ said, cannot live by bread alone.

Our decision, our choice in this election will determine the future.

If America is to regain its greatness, we must stop gagging at the word, spiritual. We must reaffirm our faith in those spiritual qualities on which American society has really rested since its beginning.

Peaceful Coexistence—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a further segment of "Peaceful Coexistence; A Communist Blueprint for Victory," a thought-provoking publication of the Standing Committee on Education Against Communism of the American Bar Association, as follows:

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE—III

The statement notes that the Communists will do everything possible "to prevent world war." It has been said that peaceful coexistence implies that, as far as the Communists are concerned, war has become an "impossibility." Khrushchev has stated: "Our foreign policy is peaceful coexistence, not war. It is the Communists who in general want to exclude war between states from the life of human society."[1]

But such general statements rarely go uninterpreted in the Communist camp, and the theme has been repeated and elaborated in dozens of ways. In such elaborations one is apt to find a more complete candor than is present in the public pronouncements of the leaders. From the following recent statements one can gain an appreciation of the real meaning attached to the relationship of war to peaceful coexistence: "Some try to reduce the notion of peaceful coexistence to the renunciation of war. But peace and peaceful coexistence are not one and the same thing. Peaceful coexistence does not mean a temporary and unstable armistice between two wars, but something more complex.[2]

* * * * *

"Peaceful coexistence, which is the general line of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the other Socialist counties, does not imply a temporary absence of war, or a breathing space between clashes. Not at all. Peaceful coexistence is the only positive, constructive policy which promotes economic,

---

[1] Nikita Khrushchev, radio-television speech, August 6, 1961.

[2] H. Dona, "Peaceful Coexistence: A Basic Principle of the Foreign Policy of the Rumanian People's Republic" (Bucharest: State Publishing House, 1963), p. 2.

social, and cultural progress all over the world."[3]

It is fairly safe to assume that the Communists do not desire a general war at this time. They fully realize that whatever benefits would accrue to them as the result of a war would be outweighed by the damage which they would suffer. Khrushchev, speaking on August 19, 1963, stressed that the "Communists want to win this struggle with the least losses."

However, it is quite a different matter to assume that because the Communists do not view war as a realistic instrument of policy at the present time, they will never employ it. It is also necessary to point out that the Communists have differentiated between the various types of wars, and have clearly delineated those which are acceptable and are to be encouraged and assisted. (See the section on "The Role of Wars," p. 53.)

Even when certain measures can be agreed upon with the "enemy" allegedly to reduce the chances of a nuclear war, as was the case with the signing of the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the Communists find it necessary to underscore the value of such agreements by reiterating their view of peaceful coexistence. Immediately in the wake of the treaty, Khrushchev said: "The essence of the policy of peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems lies precisely in compelling the big Western powers to renounce war as an instrument of their policy and to adhere to peaceful, not military, methods of settling international problems through the superiority of the peace-loving nations over the forces of militarism and aggression."[3a]

And a later article on the treaty by an Estonian Communist pointed out that "in the view of the Communists, peaceful coexistence between the two systems is certainly not a passive process in which there is some sort of parallel development of capitalism and socialism, no freezing of social relationships, or strengthening of any status quo in the relationship between the forces of socialism and capitalism * * * but an active and intense struggle, in the course of which socialism irresistibly attacks, while capitalism suffers one defeat after another."[4]

While such agreements may be of limited value to the "capitalists," by thtis view they will redound infinitely more to the benefit of the Communists. Note that Khrushchev stresses that peaceful coexistence "compels" the West to submit to the policies of the "superior" forces, i. e., the Communists, and that the latter statement emphasizes that such agreements by no means imply a status quo between Communists and non-Communists, but that "socialism" attacks and deals "capitalism" successive defeats.

The "competition" which Communists profess to pursue with the West in the name of "peaceful coexistence" likewise smacks of the language of total victory over a thoroughly vanquished enemy: "Comrades, when we speak of victory in economic competition, the point in question is not only cement or metal, but policy as well—the power of our ideas, the power of Marxist-Leninist theory, * * * the superiority of the socialist system over the capitalist system. The capitalists know the cruel laws of competition: if one firm outstrips another, the stronger one swallows the weaker one. The competition of the two systems in the economic field strikes even greater fear into the hearts of the imperialists: they see that the rapid growth of socialism is increasingly shaking the foundations of capitalism, bringing nearer the end of this system, which is doomed by history.[5]

Since communism takes an active role in "shaking the foundations of capitalism," Khrushchev certainly does not intend to operate on the "live-and-let-live" principle which dominates the Western concept of peaceful coexistence.

If it were merely a matter of straight competition between the two powers, with the winner's only prize the satisfaction that he had won and had demonstrated that his system performed in a manner superior to the loser's, then the West would have little to fear from the bumbling and centralized economy of the Communist States. The conditions of totalitarian rule have endowed the Communist countries with an inability to compete successfully with the free world in general, and with the United States in particular.

But it is not a case of "straight competition." The stakes in this novel form of "competition" are simply the freedoms which we have fought so hard and so long to defend; and, like it or not, it is the Communists, not we, who have determined that the stakes should be set so high.

It is essential to note here that while the principle of peaceful coexistence serves as an operating code for Communist behavior in the realm of relations among nations, it has never been stated that peaceful coexistence applies within the boundaries of the capitalist countries.[6] The struggle which is to take place under the conditions of peaceful coexistence can utilize, as we shall see later, any form of opposition, and can be waged with every instrument, including violence. Thus, in colonial or newly independent countries as well as in the advanced industrial countries "anything goes" and no holds are barred:

"If the class struggle within the capitalist states has internal and only internal roots, it is clear that the principle of peaceful coexistence is not applied to the relations between classes within the bourgeois countries. The class struggle of the exploited against the exploiters and the struggle of the people against reactionary regimes cannot be dissolved by international agreement. For this struggle to cease, the causes eliciting it must be eliminated, i.e., capitalism must be liquidated."[7]

In sum, this statement declares that subversion, class warfare, and the general attempt to overthrow non-Communist societies will not come to a halt until capitalism has been destroyed. Since capitalism actually causes the Communists to wage a struggle against it, capitalism must be destroyed in order to stop the struggle. This is akin to a robber telling his victim that because the latter has earned the money which he carries in his billfold, he has forced the robber to take it from him. It is because of such perverted reasoning that non-Communists so often feel at a loss either to understand or to explain the logic which communism employs.

Similar confusion is often experienced when coping with the Communist claim to universal representation of the "downtrodden masses of working people," and when, in spite of the terror and inhumanity which millions have suffered at the hands of the Communists, the claim is made that the "humane" movement of communism employs only true humanitarian methods. It taxes the imagination when claims such as this are made:

"The Communist morality is the morality of the revolutionaries who are fulfilling their historic mission of saving all people from social inequality, from all forms of persecution and exploitation, and from the horrors of war, and who are establishing a system of the greatest justice and humaneness on earth.

* * * * * *

"Peaceful coexistence is the specifically proletarian form of the class struggle conducted on an international scale. Being specifically proletarian, peaceful coexistence is at the same time also the most humane and the most rational form."[8]

Note that peaceful coexistence is reserved exclusively to the protetariat; that is to say, to the Communists themselves. It is because the Communists alone may implement this principle that it is automatically elevated to the level of "the most humane" form of struggle.

If only the Communists have a title to peaceful coexistence, then it should be clear that what the West professes to practice, i.e., its own form of "coexisting peacefully," cannot serve as a medium for improving relations with Communists or for alleviating the internal "class struggle." And herein lies the most important point: one does not practice peaceful coexistence, one wages it. Peaceful coexistence is to the Communists a unilateral strategic doctrine which is imposed upon the "inevitably doomed" adversary through the combined inherent "moral" and physical "superiority" of the Communist system, and to which the adversary may only "respond" because he is denied a creative and participating role in determining its essence and application.

From the conclusion that communism determines both the form and content of peaceful coexistence has arisen the most brazen and extensive claim yet to be made: specifically, that peaceful coexistence and international law are identical:

"Without exaggeration one can designate all contemporary generally recognized international law, as it exists today, as a code of peaceful coexistence. From this it follows that everything which is incompatible with the principle of peaceful coexistence does not exist juridically in international relations. Conversely, all the old and new principles which contribute to the development and consolidation of peaceful coexistence can with complete justification lay claim to legal validity."[9]

It is as much to say that all which is incompatible with peaceful coexistence "is illegal." Therefore, if the task of peaceful coexistence is to insure that communism triumphs over capitalism as quickly and as efficiently as possible, the resistance which the non-Communist world may put up is basically contradictory to "law," and hence is "not legal." That such is the task of this new form of "international law" is made clear by the following statement by the dean of Soviet international lawyers, Korovin:

"One of the consequences of socialism's transformation into the decisive factor of international relations is that peaceful coexistence has gradually become an accepted

---

[3] I. Glagolev and V. Larionov, "Soviet Defense Might and Peaceful Coexistence," International Affairs (Moscow), November 1963, p. 33.

[3a] N. S. Khrushchev's message to the Ninth International Conference in Hiroshima for the Banning of Atomic and Hydrogen Weapons, Aug. 19, 1963.

[4] N. Shishlin, "Nuclear Test Ban Agreement: A Leninist Coexistence Principle in Action," Sovetskaya Estoniya, Oct. 23, 1963.

[5] N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, June 21, 1963.

[6] See below, p. 63, for greater detail on the problem of "peaceful" and "violent" internal methods.

[7] Dona, "Peaceful Coexistence," p. 31.

[8] I. Kuz'minkov, "Communist Morality and General Moral Standards," Kommunist, No. 1 (January 1964), p. 32.

[9] Yevgeniy A. Korovin, "The Declaration of the Conference of Representatives of Communist and Workers Parties and the Tasks of the Science of International Law," Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta, August 1961, p. 66. Needless to say, the Communists use the conventional meaning of international law when it suits their purposes.

principle of international law. Initially it was the expression of a peaceful "breathing space," but being a specific form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism on an international scale, peaceful coexistence was filled with new content as the relation of world forces changed. Its ultimate objective at the present time is to insure the most favorable conditions for the victory of socialism in its peaceful competition with capitalism." [10]

While it has become fashionable in the West to speak of "victory" in the cold war as "meaningless," the Communists persist in employing it as an official goal. Needless to say, they have a very real appreciation that "victory" by means of nuclear war would very probably be a victory in the true sense for no one; but to exclude a single method of achieving victory as an unrealistic instrument of policy does not signify that the entire concept of victory has been relinquished.

WHAT DOES PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE ACCOMPLISH?

That Communuists envision a genuine "victory" is demonstrated by the remarks of Khrushchev in August 1963 following the signing of the partial nuclear test ban treaty."

"Today the imperialists pretend to be brave, but only in words, whereas in reality they tremble before the world of growing and strengthening socialism. And let them tremble. So much the better for us.

"If everyone acted and thought in the Communist way then there would be no antagonistic classes and communism would already be victorious everywhere. However, while there are still two systems, Socialist and capitalist, each system has its own policy, its own course, and we cannot but take into account the fact that two systems exist. A fight is in progress between these two systems, a life and death combat. But we Communists want to win this struggle with the least losses and there is no doubt whatsoever that we shall win." [11]

The recognition that two systems do in fact exist in the same world is given only grudgingly; and because there does exist in the world an alternative system to that of the Commuunists, the contest between them assumes, in Khrushchev's own words, the form of "a life and death combat." Peaceful coexistence fulfills the Communist objectives in this mortal combat by "insuring" that victory is accomplished with minimal losses.

It follows from this statement that the Communists are prepared to accept some losses in propelling the revolution forward, but nowhere is it made clear just what these losses could entail. Despite the possibility of such setbacks, however, Khrushchev emphasizes the certainty of triumph.

The specific function of peaceful coexistence is not, as we have found, the establishment of a mere period of relative calm on a worldwide scale. Rather, it is to provide conditions favorable for waging a many-pronged offensive at and within the non-Communist world. Above all, it creates a degree of flexibility hitherto unknown to the Communist movement, inasmuch as it allows for harnessing and utilizing the most disparate forces for the revolutionary cause:

"The success of our movement and the possibilities opening up before it, together with the responsibility devolving on our movement, all demand that Communists pursue a well-thought-out and well-founded policy, a policy designed to bring us victory over imperialism in the conditions of peaceful coexistence." [12]

Among these "possibilities" is the fact that "peaceful coexistence creates the most favorable conditions for the fight of the oppressed nations against their imperialist oppressors. Peaceful coexistence means the maximum support to the oppressed nations including arms." [13]

Hence wherever the Communists declare an "oppressed nation" or an "oppressed area" to exist, there weapons will be supplied to forces which serve to undermine peace and stability, and which seek to establish either a Communist regime or, at minimum, a regime favorably disposed to existing Communist States. It is remarkable that the Communists, by unilateral proclamation, have reserved to themselves the right to determine "war zones" and "peace zones," and have repeatedly emphasized the "morality," "legality," and "necessity" for universal recognition of the "inherent justice" contained in such proclamations.

Confident that to them belongs the initiative in dictating the essense of the tasks which peaceful coexistence will accomplish, Communist leaders have labored to create the impression that time is on their side:

"The policy of peaceful coexistence meets the basic interests of all peoples, of all who want no new cruel wars and seek durable peace. This policy strengthens the positions of socialism, enhances the prestige and influence of the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries. Peace is a loyal ally of socialism, for time is working for socialism against capitalism." [14]

And again:

"Peace and socialism are indivisible—this Marxist formula has a profound meaning. In an atmosphere of peaceful coexistence, time works on the side of socialism, which is why the imperialist ideologists have such a dread of the very concept of peaceful coexistence." [15]

In providing conditions favorable to the diverse forms of "struggle," peaceful coexistence acts as an accelerator of the "world revolutionary process." By not concentrating all the resources of the movement in any one direction for the support of any single objective, the Communists seek to implement the entire spectrum of techniques designed to overthrow established governments by allowing a maximum degree of "leeway" in selecting the weapons of struggle to be used at a given place and time.

In a later discussion of the forms of "transition from capitalism to socialism" this "flexibility" is examined in greater detail.

[10] Yevgeniy A. Korovin, "An Old and Futile Demand," International Affairs, April 1963, p. 100.

[11] N. S. Khrushchev, "Speech at the Soviet-Hungarian Meeting, Aug. 19, 1963," Current Soviet documents, Aug. 19, 1963.

[12] L. Sharkey, "Creative Marxism Is the Basis for Revolutionary Practice," World Marxist Review, October 1963, p. 10. Sharkey is general secretary of the Communist Party of Australia.

[13] Kjeld Oesterling and Norman Freed, "Peace, Freedom and You" (Prague: Peace and Socialism Publishers, 1963), p. 15.

[14] Statement of the 81 Communist Parties in Moscow, U.S.S.R., December 1960, p. 16.

[15] V. P. Kalugin, "The Magnetic Force of the Leninist Ideals of Peaceful Coexistence," International Affairs, No. 8 (August 1963), p. 24.

My Silent Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a prayer written by Mr. Fletcher Newell, of Phoenix, Ariz., during the time he was a patient in the Phoenix Veterans' Administration Hospital. Mr. Newell is a veteran of World Wars I and II, and a life member of the American Legion, to which he has given unstinting service. He is a member of Luke-Greenway Post 1 in Phoenix, where he serves both his country and that post with continued devotion.

The above-mentioned follows:

MY SILENT PRAYER

(By Fletcher Newell)

Let me do my work each day, and if the darkened hours of despair overcome me, may I not forget the strength that comforted me in the desolation of other times. May I still remember the bright hours that found me walking over the silent hills of my childhood, or dreaming on the margin of the quiet river when a light glowed within me, and I promised God to have courage amid the tempest of the changing years.

Spare me the bitterness and sharp passions of unguarded moments. May I not forget that poverty and riches are of the spirit. Though the world know me not, may my thoughts and actions be such as shall keep me friendly with myself.

Lift my eyes from the earth and let me not forget the uses of the stars. Forbid that I should judge others lest I condemn myself. Let me not follow the clamor of the world, but walk humbly in my path. Give me a few friends who will love me for what I am, and keep ever burning before me my vagrant footsteps, the kindly light of hope.

And though age and infirmity overtake me, and I come not in sight of the castle of my dreams, teach me to be thankful for life and for time's olden memories that are good and sweet, and may the evening twilight find me gentle still.

Superior Athletes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I am pleased to include a column by my old friend, Bob Johnson, sports editor of the Spokane Chronicle. Bob is one of the very best in the sportswriting field. His column, "My Nickel's Worth," makes real good reading. Here he pays his respects to three outstanding athletes from the Fifth District, which it is my privilege to represent in the House of Representatives. They are: J. Jerry Lindgren, the distance runner who has meteored across the track heavens this past year; Phil Shinnick, crack broad jumper, who starred for Gonzaga Prep of Spokane. Both will represent the United States in Tokyo. Bob also hails the prowess of Spokane's own Peggy Conley, winner of 2 matches in the 9-to-6 success of America over England in the Curtis Cup Golf Tourney in far-off South Wales in the British Isles.

We can add to these whom Bob Johnson mentions the name of Dennis Van Valkenbergh, of Arlington, Va. Dennis

will go to Tokyo to represent the United States in the canoe singles. This stalwart athlete has his roots in Wenatchee, Wash., where his father, Bob Van Valkenburgh, was born and raised and where the Van Valkenburgh family still lives. Dennis captured his event all 3 days of the Olympic trials held recently at the Orchard Beach Lagoon in the Bronx, N.Y.:

The article follows:

MY NICKEL'S WORTH

(By Bob Johnson)

ONE, TWO, THREE

They laughed last winter when we sat down to the typewriter and suggested that Spokane, which had only had one Olympic representatives in all of the past games, might have as many as three in 1964 in Tokyo.

It did seem a little farfetched, we admit, but as we said at the time, it certainly wasn't impossible.

In December young Gerry Lindgren had just shown that he not only could run with the best in the Pacific Northwest but that he was a young man capable of competing with class performers with his indoor win in a schoolboys' mile race in San Francisco.

Up north in Portland, Toby Gibson had just opened his bid for an Oympic berth by winning the Portland Golden Gloves tourney. And in the wings, Phil Shinnick, who astounded the track the summer before with an unrecognized 27-foot 4-inch broad jump, was simply waiting for spring and a chance to get back to work.

Today, 9 months later, they're all holding plane reservations to Tokyo, and Spokane is bursting its sports buttons with pride.

Toby, of course, made it first with his mow-'em-down performance in the National AAU and Olympic trials.

LIKE MONEY IN BANK

It seemed like money in the bank for Lindgren as early as June when he finished second in the AAU championships and qualified for the U.S.-Russian meet in late July. When he only managed a third place in the 5,000-meter finals of the first Olympic trials in New York, his prospects still looked good. Then, suddenly they simply looked wonderful when he astounded everyone with his victory at 10,000 meters against Russia.

The climax, of course, came Saturday when he won a Olympic 10,000-meter berth with ease. It was only the third time he had ever run that distance in competition. The fact that in three races he has chopped his time from 29 minutes 37.6 seconds to 29:02 makes you wonder just how much more he'll slice off that in Tokyo. Another 30 seconds and he'll break the Olympic mark of 28.32.2 set in 1960 by Russia's Pyotr Bolotnikov.

SHINNICK TOOK LONGER

Shinnick had been the biggest question mark all the way. After his 27-foot 4-inch effort at Modesto, Calif., a year ago he had been unable to approach that distance again. Injured legs and an inability to hit the takeoff board consistly were Phil's big bugaboos. Saturday, however, he came back with that 26-foot 3½-inch leap that was his best since Modesto. It won him an Olympic berth by the margin of one-half an inch.

Since he broke into headlines with his showing last summer, Phil and his parents have moved to Seattle. But he's "one of us" just the same as an ex-Gonzaga prepster.

And last weekend in far-off South Wales Perky Conley was doing all of us proud with two victories in Curtis Cup golf competition. Her effort as the team's youngest member certainly was a big help in a 9–6 victory for the U.S. forces over Great Britain.

Just mark 1964 down as a year Spokane produced its supersports stars. And they're not through yet.

The New Administration's Natural Resources Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an able address by the Honorable Elmer B. Staats entitled "The New Administration's Natural Resources Budget." This outstanding address was delivered June 5, 1964, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at its annual meeting in Washington. Mr. Staats is Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget and is an outstanding public servant.

The address follows:

THE NEW ADMINISTRATION'S NATURAL RESOURCES BUDGET

(Address by Elmer B. Staats, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, June 5, 1964)

It is a pleasure for me to be here this morning and again to have the opportunity, as I have had several times in the past, to discuss with you the President's budget program and its implications for the natural resources and water resources activities of the Federal Government.

President Johnson's 1965 budget proposals to the Congress were made within the framework of a reduced overall Federal budget. If it was not clear at the time that the budget was sent to the Congress, the President has made it amply clear since then that the expects maximum results from the executive branch of the Government in getting a dollar's value for each dollar of Government expenditures.

BUDGET PROPOSALS, 1965

The President's budget recommendation for fiscal year 1965 provided for total administrative budget expenditures of $97.9 billion, $500 million less than estimated for the fiscal year 1964. Budgetary and fiscal policies on which the 1965 budget was based took into account several major considerations: (1) The American economy is still operating below its comfortable capacity—5.4 percent of the civilian labor force is still unemployed; (2) the budget expenditure and tax proposals should be designed to help spur the expansion of the economy and narrow the gap between actual and potential output and employment; and (3) the necessary expansionary stimulus for the economy should come primarily from the side of private investment for consumption rather than from increased Federal expenditures.

One of the principal means of achieving the objective of stimulating the private economy was the proposed tax reduction and reform measures. The tax legislation was, as you know, enacted early this year and we are now beginning to feel the benefits of increased stimulation of private investment and consumption.

Within the framework of the reduced overall Federal budget, the President made provision for essential program increases for health, education, training and welfare programs; for resource development, for the attack on poverty and the initiation of the special program for Appalachia; and for necessary increases in the space program and in interest on the public debt. These increases in the Federal budget were offset by decreases in expenditures for national defense and by various other program reductions and economies.

CURRENT BUDGET OUTLOOK

Since the budget was presented to the Congress, there have necessarily been some changes in the Government's program. First, with reference to fiscal 1964—the current fiscal year—it is now estimated that total administrative budget expenditures will be about $98.3 billion, about $100 million less than estimated in January. This small reduction in the current fiscal year reflects various upward and downward adjustments in major program activities.

It is, of course, too soon to attempt any definitive reestimate of fiscal 1965 expenditures since no appropriation has yet been enacted for 1965. Any revision at this time, therefore, of the January estimate for 1965 would be highly conjectural. Based, however, on developments which have occurred, it now appears that 1965 expenditures will be some $600 million less than estimated in the January budget. Our present judgment is that the 1965 defense procurement rate will result in lower expenditures by the Department of Defense than estimated in the budget. On the other hand, the Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures will probably run higher than estimated in January because of upward revision in crop yield estimates and a somewhat more costly cotton program than had been anticipated in the budget. Also to be taken into account are the probable appropriation and legislative actions in the present session of the Congress and the pressure being exerted by the President on all Government agencies to hold down and reduce their expenditures and employment below the budget estimates.

NATURAL RESOURCES BUDGET

The 1965 budget decisions for natural resources programs, which include most of the water resource activities, were made within the context of the President's decision to hold down total Federal budget expenditures and in recognition of the fact that these programs, like other Federal programs, must be managed efficiently and economically. Nevertheless, administrative budget expenditures for natural resources were estimated to reach $2.6 billion in 1965, $100 million greater than estimated for 1964 and more than double their level of 10 years ago. This category of Government activities includes the land and water resources programs of the Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, as well as expenditures for the conservation and development of our forest resources, our national parks and other public lands, our mineral resources, and our fish and wildlife and other recreational resources.

The largest part of expenditures on natural resources is for the development and use of water and related land resources. Total construction outlays for water resources and related developments, excluding expenditures for operation, maintenance and research, but including watershed protection projects of the Department of Agriculture and grants for waste treatment facilities by the Public Health Service, were estimated in the January budget to be $1,518 million in 1965, compared with $792 million in 1955. Construction expenditures for water resources activities have nearly doubled in the 10-year period. Budget expenditures for all natural resources programs have more than doubled in the same time, whereas the total administrative budget of the Federal Government has increased but 52 percent.

The overall level of Federal expenditures for water resources programs depends in large part on the number of new projects which have been started in prior years. Most of the expenditures in 1965 will be for work started prior to that year. In this connection, it should be noted that it will require over $4 billion of expenditures after 1965 by the Corps of Engineers to complete water

resources projects now underway and nearly $2 billion for the Bureau of Reclamation.

President Johnson's 1965 budget, however, provides for continuation of a progressive policy on initiation of new water resources projects. The new projects proposed in the January budget for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation were estimated to cost in total more than $500 million. In addition, it should be noted that there is a very substantial backlog of Corps and reclamation projects which have been authorized by susbtantive legislation but which have not been programed for construction. In the January budget the authorized reserve of Corps of Engineers' projects available for starting after 1965 was estimated at $5.1 billion, and for the Bureau of Reclamation, the estimate was $2.7 billion.

In determining his budget recommendations to the Congress, the President, taking into account his overall fiscal objectives and major national goals, must make major decisions as to the relative priorities among the major program areas. He must consider the relative importance of defense programs as compared with civil programs; he must consider objectives in health and welfare programs as contrasted with needs in the agricultural and natural resources areas; he must consider the problems of poverty in the United States in contrast to the goals of international aid programs. And within major program areas, he must consider and determine the relative priorities of water resources projects as compared with conservation and development of national forests, provision of recreational facilities in the national parks, and development of mineral resources or fish and wildlife resources.

The task of arriving at decisions on relative program priorities is not an easy one. Due consideration must be given to the impact of water resources and other natural resources programs on the economic development of the Nation and the progress in meeting the needs within major regions of the Nation. More can be accomplished, however, within the constraints of a tight fiscal policy if progress can be made in improving the efficiency of our water resources programs. The budget contained a number of legislative proposals which are designed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our water resource and related programs. I will mention a few of these.

IMPROVEMENTS PROPOSED IN WATER RESOURCES AND RELATED PROGRAMS

1. Proposed Water Resources Planning Act of 1963 (S. 1111): This legislation is a revision of the bill proposed by President Kennedy in 1961. The bill was passed by the Senate in December 1963 and is now being considered by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. It would provide for a Federal Water Resources Council, for joint Federal-State river basin planning commissions, and for grants to the States to assist them in water resources planning. The enactment of this legislation would represent a forward step in achieving comprehensive and efficient development of the Nation's water resources.

2. Federal Water Project Recreation Act (H.R. 9032): This proposed legislation, which was transmitted to the Congress in November 1963, for the first time provides uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs on Federal multipurpose water resources projects. It would also provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority for recreation development of projects under his control comparable to the general authority now available to the Department of the Army. H.R. 9032 was reported favorably with amendments by the House Interior Committee in March. This is a good bill; it will enable us to better justify significant increases in Federal investments in recreation in relation to Federal water projects; and it will not impose an undue burden on the communities involved. We want to support maximum recreation development in connection with water resources projects, but this will be more difficult to do in the absence of a reasonable cost-sharing program.

3. Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1963 (H.R. 3846): This legislation, reported by the House Interior Committee and now before the House, would establish a special fund to be financed from recreation user fees at Federal areas, proceeds from the sale of Federal surplus real property, and from the existing 4-cent tax on fuel used in pleasure boats. The fund would be used for grants to States for planning, land acquisition and development of recreation areas, and for Federal acquisition of lands. About 60 percent of the funds would be used for grants to States and about 40 percent for Federal acquisition.

4. Water resources research legislation (S. 2): To complement the research being supported by Federal agencies, the administration endorsed legislation which would authorize a new program of grants to colleges and universities to stimulate water research at these institutions, including research by contract. The program would be administered by the Secretary of the Interior. This legislation has passed the Senate and has been passed by the House in amended form.

Various other legislative proposals have been made by the administration which recognize the importance of preserving additional seashore and other areas with important recreation potential, and would authorize Federal acquisition of such areas. Legislation has also been proposed to protect our remaining wilderness areas. Special emphasis is also being given in the research program of the Department of the Interior to finding means of reducing the cost of converting saline water to fresh water. A major breakthrough in the effort to reduce the cost of converting saline water would provide a major benefit to areas of the United States facing limited water supplies, as well as providing widespread benefits in other parts of the world.

We have, of course, not reached the end of improvements in our water resources programs and policies. There remain a number of difficult problem areas on which policy decisions will need to be reached by the executive branch and by the Congress. Although President Kennedy, in May 1962, approved new policies, procedures, and standards for the formulation and review of plans for water resource projects, detailed standards for cost allocation and reimbursement and cost-sharing policies are still being developed. The proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act, which I have mentioned would deal with the question of cost-sharing in connection with recreation and fish and wildlife purposes at Federal water projects. Attention should also be given to the possibility of improving our cost-sharing standards for other purposes of water development such as flood control and water pollution abatement.

The budget for 1965 repeated a recomendation made by President Kennedy for a 2-cent tax on fuels used in inland navigation. This proposal was in recognition of the major investment to date amounting to more than $2 billion in Federal navigation improvements and the current annual expenditure of about $70 million for the operation and maintenance of these same waterways. A tax of 2 cents would yield less than $10 million annually. Now I recognize that this organization has gone on record as being opposed to this proposal. I sincerely urge your reappraisal of this position. The general principle of user charges is now firmly imbedded as a matter of policy of the executive and the legislative branches. The yield from the enactment of this legislation—small as it may be—would in my opinion go far toward removal of a serious point of contention with respect to future growth of inland navigation waterways system. Its acceptance could very well affect the long run public support for the continued heavy investment in this program.

In addition, more detailed criteria and standards are needed for appraising the benefits of water resource development and in determining the use of such benefits as redevelopment benefits where areas have unemployed or underemployed labor resources and in the ues of so-called secondary benefits on a national basis as against secondary benefits which are of importance only within the region or area. Much effort will be required to reach agreement on some of these complex and difficult issues.

In conclusion, I believe a close examination of President Johnson's budget for natural resources programs and his legislative proposals reveals a clear support for the efficient and effective development and use of the Nation's natural resources—while at the same time the President is not losing sight of the need to develop our human resources. The challenge which the President faces in arriving at budget decisions is one of providing for the most pressing needs of our complex and growing society within the limitations imposed by the need to restrain the overall level of Government expenditures. I believe this challenge can be effectively met, but it wil require the efforts not ony of those directly working on the budget but the sincere and cooperative help of many others as well—such as the important group assembled here today—to identify needs, weigh their merits, accord relative priorities, and promote increasing efficiency and effectiveness in Government operations.

Mississippi Crusade, Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, during the past summer several hundred courageous citizens volunteered to aid in the struggle for equality in Mississippi. We all know the violence to which they were subjected and which continues to this very day. In order to increase our understanding of the situation in Mississippi, I call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent article entitled "Crusade in Mississippi" by Alex Poinsett which appeared in the September 1964 issue of Ebony magazine. At this time I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first part of this article:

CRUSADE IN MISSISSIPPI: COUNCIL OF FEDERATED ORGANIZATIONS CONDUCTS SUMMERLONG, FREEDOM PROJECT

(By Alex Poinsett)

In an airplane hurrying out of Mississippi, a veteran reporter hides his tears from a stewardess. He has been thinking about a true story related to him earlier, a story already 34 years old but still painful, a story telling of an elderly, white plantation owner found hanging in his bedroom. Had he committed suicide or had he been murdered? The dead man's grandson is certain a murderer hides among his Negro sharecroppers.

Unable to find him, he arbitrarily picks a family of three and ties them to stakes. Then, while he and other white men force the remaining Negroes on his plantation to watch, he burns the helpless family alive. Then * * * and the reporter cries.

Black human beings no longer burn at stakes in Mississippi. Thirty-four years have produced refinements. They are beaten now with ax handles and clubs. They are teargassed, shotgunned, and blasted with dynamite. They are anchored in rivers and planted in shallow graves. Ask a Mississippi judge whether he thinks the 1959 lynchers of Mack Parker ever will be apprehended. He says "No." "Besides," he explains, "three of them are already dead." And so a Vicksburg Negro understandably decides: "I can't be a part of a nonviolent movement. When they send the butt-kicking gang down here, I want to be president."

The angry man's sister is committed to an organization which believes the philosophy of nonvioleence will one day save Mississippi and America. A coalition of civil rights groups (primarily SNCC, but including CORE, NAACP, and SCLC), the Council of Federated Organizations (COFO) is spearheading a crusade across the length and breadth of Mississippi with blessings of the National Council of Churches. COFO's Mississippi summer project is a massive 10-week effort to increase Negro voter registration, raise the educational levels of Negro high school students, reduce illiteracy, increase skills in arts and crafts, and promote a slate of Negro Democrats to challenge the seating of the State's white Democrats at the party's national convention.

COFO workers are little Davids in a land of Goliaths. Armed only with idealism, tenacity of purpose and courage, some 525 volunteers (mainly white students from northern and western colleges) and 100 hard-nosed COFO staffers are assaulting a way of life stoutly defended with bullets and bombs. Fanning out across the State, they do not drive at night except in emergencies and then only after removing the dome lights of their cars to avoid presenting an easy sniper target when they get out. Death and rumors of death have taught them to be cautious. They have been arrested on bogus charges, beaten, and murdered. The risks they take are matched only by those taken by Negro families who house and feed them and refuse to accept their offers of money for reasons summed up by one man—"We should be paying you to be here."

"The threat of a bombing hangs like an atomic bomb over our heads," admits COFO volunteer Emily Shrader, 22, at her Jackson headquarters post. "We don't know when it's going to happen, but we believe it will." She gestures at plywood sheets boarding up the office plate glass windows smashed by white hoodlums. "At night we work in three or four shifts," she continues. "It's like a game of Russian roulette. You don't know whether you'll be 'it' when the shot comes."

Emily's stoicism in the face of death mirrors the attitude of most COFO workers grieving the late June murders of colleagues Michael Schwerner, 24, James Chaney, 22, and Andrew Goodman, 20, near Philadelphia, Miss. You hear it in the softness of a voice, see it flickering in bonfired eyes, feel it in the air. The attitude—where is the adjective to describe it?—tumbles out of Joyce Brown, 21, a researcher in COFO's Hattiesburg office where the drop of a pin is somctimes an explosion. "I'm scared," Joyce whispers, "but my fear is not as great as my duty. I've got to do it."

The compulsion, the compassion, the willingness to suffer so that the suffering of others might be abetted has long since been a categorical imperative for Bob Moses, 29, the brooding, bespectacled Harvard M.A. (in philosophy) who directs COFO's project and promises to dent if not break Mississippi this summer. He had given up the security of New York private schoolteaching to devote his full time to civil rights, to seek solutions to America's problem more in action than in thought. "We ourselves have been working in Mississippi and have been subjected to being killed for the last 3 years," he says. "So we have asked people to come in and share that risk." By so doing COFO hopes to engage the Nation's interest and its will to act. COFO leaders, says Moses, are "very bitter" at what they take to be the lesson of the past 3 years: "The country, unfortunately, moves only in response to acts of violence."

In the vortex of violence, COFO labors for the 915,722 black humans who are 42 percent of Mississippi's 2.3 million population. A few grim facts merely hint at their misery in a State described by one local cynic as so bad "a white man will chunk a bomb in your coffin to make sure you're dead." A newly born Negro baby has about twice as many chances of dying in the first years as a white child in Mississippi, according to the U.S. Children's Bureau. If he survives, he will probably receive only 6 years of schooling compared with 11 years for whites—a gap of academic importance only since Mississippi considers a white idiot automatically superior to a Negro genius. If he lives in the Delta—Mississippi's flat, fertile, Northwest reservation for plantation workers earning $2.50 a day—he attends school on the "cotton cycle." That is, 2 months of his schooling comes during the heat of July and August when there is no cotton to be planted, chopped, or picked. His education prepares him for a special "place" in the Mississippi scheme of things. Somehow he must "understand" he is biologically inferior to the white man, that his inferiority is documented by the Bible, that his aptitude suits him for menial labor only and that separation from whites is absolutely necessary for social stability. White men, in short, must forever stand 10 feet tall—majestic astride the heads of Negroes.

These white supremacy doctrines—challenged by COFO and championed by most Mississippi whites—undergird the near-hopeless condition of most of the State's Negroes. Newsweek Associate Editor Frank Trippett, Mississippi-born and reared, describes the hopelessness accurately. "Depriving the Negro of education * * * left him with no skills," he writes. "* * * Shutting the Negro out of decent jobs only (made) him a veritable ward of the State—and, characteristically, white Mississippians condemn the Negro for the very welfare checks he is forced to rely upon as they damn him for drinking and fornication, among the few pleasures left to him. Consumed by the fires of its racial passions, the white electorate takes little notice that its politicians, too often if not invariably, are inept at governmental science."

Since the Negro is "inferior"—and this is really what Mississippi politicians are saying when they harangue about States rights—he must be treated so to complete a chain of illogic further "proving" his inferiority. When he steps out of the niche assigned to him, he must be punished. Thus there have been 5 murders and more than 50 floggings since January in the McComb area alone, according to the U.S. Justice Department. And so a Jackson police lieutenant explains: "I ain't got nothing against niggers as long as they know their place. But when I see them marching up and down for something they ain't got no right to I get mad."

Neither the anger of Mississippi whites nor their bestial behavior detours COFO's brave youths from their mission. The naturally nappy hair of the Negroes, the stringy hair of the whites, their general, unmiddle-class look of disheveled casualness—all are irrelevant to the cause which engulfs them. Communications Director Francis Mitchell, who as a national magazine editor had once known the comforts of home and car ownership, works now up to 20 hours a day and lives out of a suitcase. "Why don't you spend your vacation down here?" he asks an ex-journalism colleague. "We could use you in Greenville." The journalist refuses.

But the totally committed do what they must. The success of their efforts at voter registration is measured by such responses as "I've already been down," or "I'm going down," or "I'm afraid." In Hattiesburg, white Jake Plum and Negro Johnny Waters step on the rotted porch at the home of an 81-year-old Negro and introduce themselves. "Are you registered?" Johnny asks, holding out a COFO application.

"I already got two of them," the old man explains.

"But you haven't filled one out," Johnny continues. "Your neighbor over there filled it out and so did the man down the street. We'd like to sign up everybody and we'll drive you down to the courthouse to register. Do you think you're a citizen?"

"No Lord. I ain't no citizen. I sho ain't no citizen."

"Wouldn't you like to vote?"

"I'll fill it out later on," the old man replies, dodging the question. He knows if he registers his name will be printed in the local paper for 2 weeks and he will become vulnerable to all sorts of reprisals.

Jake, the white youth, speaks up for the first time. "Wouldn't you like to have your street paved?"

"Yassuh."

"Well if you register and vote," Jake continues, "you can make the city do some of the things for you it hasn't done. Do you believe that?"

"Yassuh."

Texas State Democratic Convention Keynote Speech Delivered by the Honorable John Connally, Governor of Texas

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the State Democratic Convention in Dallas last week, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD wish to include the introductory remarks of our State Democratic chairman, Mr. Frank C. Erwin, Jr., when presenting the Honorable John Connally, Governor of Texas, as the keynote speaker.

Mr. Erwin's remarks are followed by the keynote speech of Governor Connally who, in my opinion, has made one of the finest chief executives the State of Texas has had in her glorious history:

REMARKS BY FRANK C. ERWIN, JR., DEMOCRATIC STATE CHAIRMAN, IN INTRODUCING GOV. JOHN CONNALLY AS CONVENTION KEYNOTE SPEAKER

General Carr, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, once in a great while there emerges in our public life, a leader who rises above the others of his time; a leader who appeals to only the finest instincts of our people; a leader who challenges us to move forward in the forefront of progress; a leader who inspires us to strive for greatness in both our culture and our Government; and a leader who reminds us that there can be

no progress—there can be no greatness—if we do not proceed in strict accordance with those fundamental principles which have operated to make this the mightiest Nation in the history of the world.

Such a leader is the man who today serves all Texans as the Governor of this great State.

Born in humble circumstances on a small farm in Wilson County, he earned a seat on the board of directors of some of the largest corporations in this country before he was 45 years of age.

After working his way through the University of Texas, he achieved nationwide prominence in political and governmental circles before he ever offered himself for public office.

A true son of Texas, he lived up to the finest traditions of Texas fighting men when during World War II he served in the Navy in both the Atlantic and Pacific theaters of war with such distinction for heroic conduct that he was awarded both the Legion of Merit and the Bronze Star.

A Democrat from birth, he entered the Governor's office with the forces of democracy in Texas in complete disarray, but under his inspiring leadership, in the party primaries held last spring the Democrats outvoted the opposition party more than 10 to 1.

A confident of Presidents, he has never lost the common touch.

A highly successful lawyer, rancher, and businessman, he has never forgotten what it is to be poor.

A partisan officeholder, he has united the people of Texas as they have seldom been united in our history.

This, then, is the leader of the Democratic Party of Texas.

This is the man the Democratic Party has nominated for reelection as Governor of this State.

This is the man whom every poll taken in recent weeks shows to have the approval of more than 75 percent of all the citizens of Texas, regardless of their political affiliation.

It gives me great pleasure to present to you the present Governor of Texas—and the next Governor of Texas—the Honorable John B. Connally.

GOV. JOHN CONNALLY'S ADDRESS TO STATE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION, DALLAS, TEX., TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1964

My fellow Democrats, this is D-day in our campaign for Democratic victory on November 3.

This is the day for our final planning, for the marshaling of the manpower and firepower we will need in the weeks ahead, and for the renewal of our hopes and ideals for the future of the great State we are privileged to serve.

Today we fulfill two of the most important functions of the Democratic Party of Texas—the election of our party officers, and the adoption of a platform which will guide the policies of our State government during the next 2 years.

You are here because you are working Democrats who started our campaign long months ago in precincts throughout the State, organizing our party machinery and helping define our goals for the continued growth and progress of Texas.

Through the precinct and county conventions and the State convention in Houston last June, you have carried the fight for the Democratic Party in 1964.

You sent to Atlantic City a delegation pledged to the nomination of our native son, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

I am proud of our Texas delegation—of its demeanor, its conduct, its dedication and its leadership. I assure you that Texas democracy was in the forefront at Atlantic City.

We have nominated a native son as President of the United States. We have a host of other fine nominees and we will elect them decisively on November 3.

I am honored to speak to you today in several capacities:

First, as Governor of Texas and titular head of our party.

Secondly, as a working Democrat who has labored beside you for many years to build a true party of the people to guide and govern our beloved State.

And thirdly, as a partner in our all-out campaign for a smashing Democratic victory in November.

I thank you for all you have done for the Democratic Party—and for me.

I ask you to stay in the fight until we accomplish as much as we humanly can for the people of Texas.

We are asking—and I think we will receive—a clear-cut mandate from the people of Texas on November 3 to continue the stable, responsible, reasonable leadership which has brought our State to greatness under the Democratic Party for many generations.

The Democratic Party in Texas is not waiting in the trenches to defend itself, but is moving forward on all fronts with initiative and responsibility.

We face the electorate not with reluctance and apprehension, but with pride and confidence in our achievements.

We have written a record that will stand the test of time, while our critics still grope for wornout slogans and rehashed ideas, and attempt to play the discords of passion and prejudice.

Two years ago at our El Paso convention, you were reminded that an almost completely new team would be going to work in Austin the following January.

For the first time in many years, Texas had a new Governor, a new Lieutenant Governor, Preston Smith, and a new attorney general, Waggoner Carr, all entering office together. In January a fourth newcomer was added, the able speaker of the house of representatives, Byron Tunnell.

I believe we have ample proof that this new team has been a productive team.

The legislature last year gave the people of Texas a chronicle of accomplishments unparalleled in recent history. A Democratic administration and a Democratic legislature faced, and solved, some of the most challenging problems of our time.

I want to review the highlights of this stewardship.

We pledged pay-as-you-go financing and an end to deficit financing. I am pleased to report that the State government began the 1965 fiscal year 2 weeks ago with a surplus of $73 million in the general fund, and at the beginning of the next fiscal year it is predicted to be $83 million.

We called upon Texas to lift the level of excellence in education in all areas. To this end, the legislature established the Governor's committee on education beyond the high school which has just completed a yearlong study and issued a comprehensive report for massive improvement in Texas education.

Appropriations for higher education were increased by $43 million last year, and teaching salaries in our State colleges and universities have gone up an average of $500 a year.

We have started pilot projects for an all-out war on illiteracy, and set up our first special school programs for the children of migrant workers. We have strengthened compulsory school attendance requirements and begun local programs to combat the dropout problem which causes too many of our people to remain unproductive.

We called for expanded vocational education programs to meet the demands of modern-day industry. This we have begun. In the junior colleges alone, technical programs have been increased fourfold.

We called for a more effective industrial program. Last year, we provided the Texas Industrial Commission with full State financing for the first time, its program was judged first in the Nation for effectiveness in competition with all the other States.

In addition, we brought 317 new plants into Texas in 1963—second high among all the States and only 8 fewer than the leader, New York.

We called for a better tourist program, and we created the Texas Tourist Development Agency to operate an aggressive full-time campaign for the attraction of tourists. Last year we set a record of 11,700,000 out-of-State visitors. This year it should exceed 12 million.

We urged greater development of our parks. We combined the State parks board and the game and fish commission into a new parks and wildlife commission which is improving both our wildlife conservation and State parks programs with far more efficiency, economy, and effectiveness. In addition, we were instrumental in creating one of our finest potential tourist attractions, the Padre Island National Seashore.

We called for a strong program of highway construction. Today we lead every other State in completed construction on the Interstate Highway System and in mileage presently under construction. We are building these superhighways at a cost 40 percent less than the national average.

We called for an expanded historical landmarks program and for repairs to the San Jacinto Monument. These, too, have been accomplished by legislative action.

We called for a full-scale effort to eradicate the screw-worm which has plagued our livestock industry. Today, the screw-worm is virtually eradicated in Texas and we are building an effective barrier in Mexico to prevent reinfestation.

We spelled out proposals to help the needy, aged, dependent children, the blind, and the permanently and totally disabled. In response the legislature and the administration established the Texas 65 plan for low-cost health insurance for the aged, modernized and expanded the public welfare program, increased funds for the disabled, and submitted a constitutional amendment to broaden medical care for senior citizens under the Kerr-Mills program.

We urged new approaches to the critical problem of mental health. This is being done through comprehensive planning for increased research and more treatment and rehabilitation at the local level—to get us away from the outmoded concept of the human warehouse for the mentally ill and retarded child.

We have accelerated the transfer of senile patients from mental institutions to nursing homes. We have begun a new school for the retarded at Richmond and authorized additional schools at Corpus Christi and in west Texas, further increasing badly needed beds to fulfill this important State responsibility.

We called for a better election code for Texas. This was adopted and it is the strongest set of election laws we have ever had. We called for regulation of small loans to eliminate the loan shark from Texas, and this was finally achieved after 36 years of frustration and failure.

These are just some of the goals we outlined in 1962 and our successes in carrying them out. Not everything was done which should have been done, but I believe we can take justifiable pride in a good and lasting record for Texas.

We will continue that record into a second term for this administration and a new legislature in January.

But as we drive for victory in November from the courthouse to the White House, don't make the mistake of underestimating our Republican opponents.

They are organized—well organized, especially in the larger cities.

They are dedicated—and they are energetic.

They tell us that they are the party of the future, the party of youth, the party of hope and glory for Texas.

But let's not hesitate to set the record straight.

They are an uncomplicated party, because they don't really have answers for the problems of modern Texas. Everything is easy for them, because they have not worn the cloak of leadership nor carried the burden of decision.

It is always comparatively simple to let the other fellow make all of the decisions and then criticize him for what he's done.

When we do battle in the weeks ahead, remember this: The Democratic leadership of our State government has nothing to apologize for, nothing to be ashamed of, nothing to hide. On the contrary, we have built an honorable tradition of good government, of honor, of integrity, of sound progress for Texas.

Wherever we go between now and November 3, let's ask these questions:

Which party will lead our State to an educational system second to none in the Nation? The Democratic Party of Texas.

Which party has the will and the compassion to erase the stigma to illiteracy which afflicts more than 700,000 of our fellow citizens? The Democratic Party of Texas.

Which party has the heart and the desire to help those who can't help themselves—the needy, the aged, the mentally ill, the totally disabled, the retarded children? The Democratic Party of Texas.

Which party wants to improve the skills and broaden the opportunities for all Texans, so that every individual can aspire to the highest level of his ability? The Democratic Party of Texas.

Which party will find new ways to conserve and develop our water supplies and our other precious natural resources? The Democratic Party of Texas.

Which party will broaden the recreational opportunities of our families so they can lead a richer and fuller life? The Democratic Party of Texas.

Which party will seek intelligent answers to our problems of rapid growth, urbanization and automation, and help create the hundreds of thousands of new jobs we must have in the next decade? The Democratic Party of Texas.

Which party has nourished a climate in Texas for business growth and job opportunities—a climate which encourages a fair return on investment capital? The Democratic Party of Texas.

And which party can continue to meet our needs and maintain fiscal soundness and a balanced budget? The Democratic Party of Texas.

The Democratic Party of Texas is the party of solutions—the party which does not fear the 20th century. We recognize the rapid and drastic changes which are transforming our State and the society in which we live, and we face those changes with vision and determination rather than dreaming of the less complicated days of yesteryear.

We are a party big enough and broad enough to include Texans in every walk of life and economic circumstance.

We are the party of local self-government, seeking answers first in our local communities where most of the problems occur. We believe in decentralized government, in local control, and local responsibility. And we believe in strong responsible State government capable of the solutions which cannot be found at the local level.

Above all, we remain the party of Texas—in communion with the hopes and aspirations of Texas.

As individuals, our stewardship is brief. In the measure of time, our role of responsibility is fleeting indeed. But in this short period, it is our solemn obligation to do the very best we can to advance the progress of our State and its people.

Our labors here today are in keeping with this obligation. Ours is the task, and the bright opportunity, to do our part toward assuring yet another constructive step in the destiny of Texas. Together, we can do the job. Together, we will do the job—to help build a tomorrow worthy of the heritage of our yesterday.

Public Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Scarsdale Inquirer, a New York weekly newspaper, an editorial on September 17, 1964, which indicated I had voted against, among other things—commuter aid, water pollution control, the school lunch program, library assistance, aid to medical students, and minimum wage legislation.

Editors, like anybody else, are entitled to their own personal likes and dislikes—but as a matter of public policy they should state the facts as they exist, and not as they would perhaps like them to be, in order to reinforce their own personal leanings.

Although the Scarsdale Inquirer serves primarily a district other than my own, there are a number of my constituents who are among its subscribers. It is largely for their benefit, therefore, that I hereby set the record straight.

COMMUTER AID

June 22, 1961: I voted in favor of bill—H.R. 6028—which authorized the mass transportation demonstration program—providing Federal assistance to test new techniques, technology, and methods for improving commuter transportation service. Rollcall No. 96.

June 25, 1964: I voted in favor of bill—H.R. 3881, S. 6—authorizing assistance to States and localities to build or improve commuter transit systems. Rollcall No. 170.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

May 3, 1961: I voted in favor of Water Pollution Control Act Amendments—H.R. 6441—providing for a more effective program of water pollution control. Rollcall No. 48.

July 2, 1964: I voted in favor of conference report on S. 2, authorizing a more adequate national program of water research. Rollcall No. 182.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

May 3, 1961: I voted in favor of legislation—H.R. 11665—revising the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act. Rollcall No. 100.

ASSISTANCE TO MEDICAL STUDENTS

April 24, 1963: I voted in favor of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act—H.R. 12—which expanded opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel. Rollcall No. 24.

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

June 30, 1960: I voted in favor of bill—H.R. 12677—increasing the minimum wage rate and extending coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Rollcall No. 169.

March 24, 1961: I again voted in favor of bill—H.R. 3935—increasing the minimum wage rate and extending coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Rollcall No. 29.

LIBRARY ASSISTANCE

August 22, 1960: I voted in favor of bill—S. 2830—extending for 5 years, until 1966, the Library Services Act. Passed by unanimous consent under suspension of rules.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The editorial also incorrectly inferred that the food stamp program, which I did indeed oppose, made use of only surplus foods.

The food stamp program covers all foods for human use with very few exceptions, including luxury items, and it competes with the long-established direct distribution program which is limited to surplus foods and which I support.

It is a known fact that the controversial food stamp program would never have gotten through the House had it not been brought up on the same day as the equally controversial cotton-wheat bill. April 8, 1964, marked the biggest vote-trading day in the 88th Congress. Members of Congress from the Farm Belt voted for the stamp program in exchange for city votes for the cotton-wheat bill. Neither measure would have gotten through on its own merits, and I, therefore, opposed both of them.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

The same editorial also correctly stated that I voted against the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs. It neglected to mention, however, that the applicable reorganization plan was sponsored by a Democrat President and soundly defeated by a Democrat-controlled Congress. If it were such a great idea, I am sure the President would have been more successful in obtaining necessary support from members of his own party in Congress.

There are many valid arguments against the creation of any more departments in the Federal bureaucracy which has already become unwieldy. We have a number of existing departments and agencies which according to their own particular jurisdictions, devote specialized attention to the various aspects of urban affairs—likewise for suburban and rural affairs. There is no need to duplicate the work of these departments and agencies, or to superimpose a bureaucratic czar over them.

The district I represent is composed of urban, suburban, and rural areas, each with its own characteristics and problems. Who is to say the affairs of one type of area are more important than the others? By supporting the creation of a Department or Urban Affairs, the editor of the Scarsdale Inquirer is saying in effect: first, that the problems of his own area, which is suburban in nature, are secondary to the problems of

the big city; and second, that he is in favor of subjugating suburban areas to nearby cities which would result in a loss of local control and community identity.

National Association of Government Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, two very good friends of mine, Mr. Ted Moody and Mr. Clyde Emmons have along with approximately 75 other engineers formed a new association known as the National Association of Government Engineers. Mr. Moody is the president and for many years was the assistant to the director of public works for the city of Dallas before joining the Federal Government. Mr. Emmons was both city engineer and then city manager for the cities of Paris and McKinney, Tex., before joining the Federal Government.

The September 3 edition of the Engineering News Record carried an article on the formation of this organization and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I should like to include several excerpts from this article:

Engineers working for government agencies have launched a national organization to represent fellow professionals on the payrolls of public bodies throughout the United States. Incorporated in the District of Columbia with 75 charter members, the National Association of Government Engineers (NAGE) aims to provide special service and a potent voice for engineering employees of Federal, State, and local governments.

Ted Moody, president of NAGE and former secretary of NSPE's government-engineer section, states the case for his new society: Government engineers comprise only 27 percent of the NSPE membership. Representing all categories of engineering practice, with heaviest enrollment among engineers in industry, NSPE cannot concentrate undivided attention on the needs and interests of government engineers.

Years of effort tested and proved his point, says Mr. Moody, who is general engineer of the Agency for International Development. NSPE's government-employed members turned to a separate organization as the only feasible means of getting full-time, on-target representation, he says. To assure contact with Congressmen and officials in the executive branch of the Government, the new association engaged a Washington lobbyist, Roy E. Riddle, as executive director.

NAGE sees a potential of 61,000 engineers on the rolls of Federal agencies alone, with another 85,000 or so employed by States, counties, municipalities, and other political entities. Charter membership has been extended to next December 31. By that time, President Moody and his colleagues look for 400 or 500 members.

Dues are set at $15 a year, with the initiation fee included in the first year's dues. Requests for application forms are welcomed at NAGE headquarters in Mr. Riddle's office, 200 Maryland Avenue NE, Washington, D.C.

ACCION 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the work being done by a small group of private American citizens who have joined with a like-minded group of Venezuelans in a unique binational program of urban community development known as ACCION.

The founders of ACCION—Americans for Community Cooperation in Other Nations—describe their function as that of a catalyst. This is to say that the success of the program's self-help approach rests upon the eagerness with which the idea of self-improvement has been grapsed by the people with whom ACCION volunteers have worked.

ACCION was founded in early 1960. In its purposes and methods it parallels the Peace Corps in many respects, one of which is that ACCION volunteers live and work with the poor people of Venezuela's cities, sharing their lives as fully as possible. The volunteers receive only their basic living expenses during their period of service in Venezuela.

Although the organization is now made up of about an equal number of Americans and Venezuelans, it is hoped that in time the American participation will diminish to the point where the entire program will be operated on a permanent basis by Venezuelans alone.

In a special report, "ACCION 1964," the program's founder and executive director, Joseph H. Blatchford, points to the need for, and importance of, this sort of program. This letter, and an article from Time magazine describing ACCION's accomplishments, tell the story of what I believe is a unique effort of private initiative and dedication in our hemisphere. I ask unanimous consent to insert these two items in the RECORD, along with personal appraisals of the work of ACCION by Romulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela from 1959 to 1964, C. Allan Stewart, U.S. Ambassador to Venezuela, and Eugenio Mendoza, a leading Venezuelan industrialist.

The texts follow:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH H. BLATCHFORD

The seeds of revolution have been planted in Latin America. Millions of people, once resigned to accepting a life of abject poverty and following the submissiveness of their ancestors, now realize that change is possible within their lifetime and that it has been slow in coming by the old ways. In the last decade rural villages have been uprooted and thousands swarm daily to the urban centers looking for a better life.

In Caracas alone, 300,000 people, almost totally unprepared for city life, live in hillside shacks of cardboard and tin. Sanitation, water supply, roads, schools, housing, medical care are almost nonexistent. To compound the problem, the dispossessed are conditioned to wait for all succor to come from above and to depend on others for their every need.

Painfully aware of the comforts of modern life, the people of Latin America are demanding solutions. The seeds of ferment may grow with those who preach class warfare and totalitarianism. Or the seeds can grow in a system of grass roots community action in which the community organizes itself and pools resources and creative energies for the improvement of community life on all fronts.

This is the revolution that places the individual above the state and makes him an active participant in the affairs of his community and his nation. This is the challenge facing the whole idea of democracy—it is the challenge to which ACCION is wholly committed and dedicated.

We have seen, in the last 3 years, the power of this idea. The people are receptive and willing. The ACCION workers are the needed catalytic agents. With ACCION's guidance the people of the barrios have built water mains, schools, community centers, and brought many other improvements. Hundreds share in the decisionmaking process and organize their own educational and social activities. Citizens learn to deal effectively with their government and to obtain needed technical and material help. Success is infectious and as a result of the spirit and pride sparked by a touch of progress, neighboring settlements have initiated grassroots movements and called on ACCION volunteers to aid and guide the effort.

We believe that the collective initiative of hundreds of such communities can bring progress without bloodshed, and champion the most revolutionary idea of all—the dignity of the individual human being.

ARTICLE FROM TIME MAGAZINE

NOT ALMS BUT ACCION

The fetid slums that choke Latin American cities breed disease, crime, and a numbing sense of helplessness. For most slum dwellers, there is seemingly no escape from misery, and little incentive to try. Yet in less than 3 years since it was founded, a small but dedicated group called ACCION (Americans for Community Cooperation in Other Nations) has shown that Venezuelan slum dwellers can be helped to help themselves. In Venezuela, it is a sort of private Peace Corps.

Bucket brigades

The founder of ACCION is Joseph H. Blatchford, 29, an intense, athletic law graduate of the University of California at Berkeley. Convinced of the need for more U.S. goodwill and good works in Latin America, Blatchford swung into ACCION in 1960, 6 months before the Peace Corps got underway. Today the organization has 30 Americans and 30 Venezuelans working in 25 slums in Caracas, Maracaibo, and other cities. Typically, they win slum dwellers' confidence by organizing volleyball or baseball teams, then build a recreation area and later divide the teams into bucket brigades to clean up the barrio. Soon the whole community joins in digging, hammering, and painting, installing sewers, sidewalks, water systems. ACCION workers scrounge around for bricks, pipe, and cement, also hold classes in reading and sewing. On major projects they occasionally get an assist from the Venezuelan Government and the Alliance for Progress.

ACCION's philosophy, as one leader puts it, is "not to give people alms, but to give them confidence in their own ability." At the Cañada Honda slum in Maracaibo, residents organized by ACCION volunteers recently pitched in to build a community center, proudly naming it Nuestro Esfuerzo (Our Effort). Two years ago at the notorious Barrio la Linea outside Caracas, Communists sabotaged their projects and intimidated residents, but a new sense of community pride won out. One Communist leader is now a regular volunteer worker.

Profits for progress

At least 70 percent of ACCION's current $420,000 budget comes from Venezuelan con-

tributors, and it can count on future support from the "Voluntary Dividend for the Community," a new program whereby Venezuelan corporations agree to kick in 2 to 5 percent of their profits to help fight poverty (Time, Mar. 6). Gradually, the Americans are turning over their jobs to Venezuelan volunteers and to slum leaders themselves. Says Blatchford: "That's what we want to do—work ourselves out of jobs." They may not get the chance. Already communities in Brazil, Nicaragua, Bolivia, and the Philippines are asking for ACCION.

APPRAISALS OF ACCION

Romulo Betancourt, President (1959–64), Venezuela: "I have been kept completely informed by my closest advisers of the fruitful work that ACCION en Venezuela is doing in the urban slums of Caracas and other parts of the country. As a Venezuelan I hold in the highest esteem the excellent service of guidance and assistance that ACCION is giving to our poor people in the slum areas.

"Venezuela is making a great effort to develop its social and economic resources by democratic means. We are very proud of our recent presidential elections in which our people demonstrated their support for responsible and peaceful self-government. ACCION en Venezuela is strengthening the foundations of democracy by means of community action and is contributing significantly to this democratic task in which we are engaged."

C. Allan Stewart, U.S. Ambassador to Venezuela: "ACCION has developed into a model for other areas, proving that private United States and Venezuelan enterprise can unite to carry out an important and effective development program. The effectiveness of the U.S. volunteers in the poorer barrios and communities has been notable, not only on the basis of individual assistance provided, but also because their efforts have included an increased flow of Venezuelan private and governmental assistance to the needy areas in the form of materials, services, and capital.

"Moreover, ACCION volunteers initiated a program which enlists Venezuelans to work side by side with their American counterparts in community development. In this way ACCION is leading the way in interesting Venezuelans in the problems of their own country. Their interest in the homeland is stimulated by the examples of the American volunteers."

Eugenio Mendoza, Venezuelan industrialist: "ACCION is a movement which must be expanded to every corner of our country. The work that the dedicated ACCION men and women are accomplishing is educational in a profound sense. It is creating a sense of civic responsibility and community pride among the poor and even the most indifferent people. ACCION is motivating people at every level of our society."

Let's Have Some Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, the Democrat vice-presidential candidate has accused the Republican presidential candidate of being unclear in his statements on domestic and foreign policy. The Republican presidential candidate is making it very clear to the people where he stands. It is long past the time that the Democrat vice-presidential candidate told the American people exactly where he stands.

Since the election of the Democrat ticket would put the vice-presidential candidate, the founder of Americans for Democratic Action, just a heartbeat from the Presidency, the American people surely want to know if this candidate still stands behind the positions taken by that socialistic-minded organization when he was its President. Let him clarify his position on these issues:

The ADA has stated:

We propose that no loyalty investigation be conducted by any government, State, or Federal, for any agency or position which does not clearly affect the national security.

The Communist Party agrees. Does the Democrat vice-presidential candidate still agree?

The ADA has stated:

While we recognize the right of Congress to conduct investigations, the House Un-American Activities Committee has proved itself a threat to freedom of political opinion. We, therefore, call for its obolition.

The Communist Party enthusiastically agrees. Does the Democrat vice-presidential candidate still agree?

In its resolution on disarmament the ADA called for total disarmament under the control of the U.N. In the Progressive magazine in 1950, the Democrat vice-presidential candidate echoed this stand when he said:

The United States should stand ready to turn over its stockpile of destruction to the U.N. as part of an international agreement for a police force to maintain world peace.

This would amount to turning over our Nation's stockpile of atomic weapons to the United Nations where the Soviets have a veto in the Security Council, and the United States has but 1 voice in 120 in the General Assembly. The Communist Party enthusiastically agrees. Does the Democrat vice-presidential candidate still agree?

The ADA has come out squarely in favor of admission of Red China to the United Nations. The Communist Party enthusiastically agrees. Does the Democrat vice-presidential candidate still agree?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, these are some questions that should be answered by the Democrat vice-presidential candidate prior to his calling upon the American people for their support November 3.

Of course, I do not seriously expect him to publicly tell the people his position on these questions. To do so would expose the entire fabric of the Democrat campaign.

However, for the benefit of the opposition party, I might point out that the strategy it is embarked upon is useless. Already Americans are awake to the subterfuge, and alert American editors are busy informing more voters each day as witness this editorial from the Nashville Banner of September 25, 1964. The editorial follows:

FROM DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM TO LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON—NUCLEAR WEAPONS AUTHORITY HYPOCRITICAL HOAX, FALSIFIED FLIM-FLAMMERY, DAMNABLE DECEIT

For unprincipled distortion—by misrepresentation of facts to rig a campaign issue—nothing in America's political history exceeds the Johnson team's attempted snowjob on the subject of nuclear weapons authority. That the posture assumed by these is sheer hocus-pocus—and transparently so to anyone bothering to check the facts—has not deterred them from a screaming intent to defame BARRY GOLDWATER for the suggestion that the NATO commander shares a contingent responsibility for decision.

Therewith they blew the ideological gasket—and the hustings have rung with charges of trigger-happy irresponsibility run amok.

One of two explanations applies: Either they, including the President himself, do not know the facts in the case—respecting an authority already shared—or they believe that in prevarication they have hit paydirt. Though accustomed to stupidity in high places, the American people are not inclined to charge this one up to that.

The blatant party line of subterfuge on this point did not really get going until the Democratic Convention. That was its sparkpoint.

There surfaced in sputtering array, with hearts crossed to signify that this was their moment of truth:

The colossal hypocrisy of the platform.

This hissing hysteria of keynoter JOHN PASTORE.

The habitual, unmitigated gall of HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY.

The damnable deceit and flagrant falsification of Lyndon Baines Johnson.

These since have been embellished by elaboration on their subject—as in spot TV infamies as paid political announcements depicting a little girl incinerated as she pulled petals from a daisy; all conditioned on a vote for anybody but Lyndon and HORATIO. The sickening party line therein propagandized was a new low in attempted brainwashing, but no more of a calculated deception than the words these have employed in their truth twisting to fabricate an issue.

Said the platform: "Control of the use of nuclear weapons must remain solely with the highest elected official of the country—the President of the United States."

Senator PASTORE: "As for the feuding that took place at that [other] convention on the question of whose finger should be on the trigger of the atomic bomb • • • that power today rests solely with the President."

Seeking the next-in-line role for that awesome responsibility of decision, HORATIO has joined in with the declaration that "the question before the electorate is simple, prophetic, profound. Which of these men, Lyndon Johnson or BARRY GOLDWATER, do you want to have his hand on that nuclear trigger?"

And posing almost as unctuously as the only safe arbiter of human destiny—the lone defender of little girls, otherwise facing incineration—Mr. Johnson has parroted the identical line. "No President of the United States," he said, "can give up responsibility for deciding when or if to use nuclear weapons."

The ipse dixit was of leftwing coinage—hardly with casual resemblance to fact—but reiterated on the propagandist theory that if you tell something often enough eventually it will be believed. Fortunately, truth has its own counteractive device—the despair of flimflam artists who can't extinguish it, however much they strive by "news management" and distortion to obscure and suppress it.

What are the facts regarding the matter in controversy?

Time magazine and U.S. News & World Report dispel the fog and supply the answer. Says Time, in its current issue: "GOLDWATER insists that the President should delegate such authority. President Johnson lets on that he can't and won't. The fact is that

he already does, as President's Eisenhower and Kennedy before him.

"In 1957, the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy received written notification that plans were being developed to give NATO's supreme commander in Europe the right to use nuclear weapons in certain contingencies—such as the incapacity of the President or the breakdown of communications between Europe and the United States. Those plans are now in operation. All are classified as top secret, but they apply not only to NATO's commander, but to the commander of the North American air defense."

U.S. News & World Report says that the administration was considering modifying its veto on nuclear weapon use "before it became a political issue." Then, "Even now the understanding is widespread among NATO allies that U.S. commanders in Europe already have orders issued in advance to use nuclear weapons in certain emergencies with no further instructions from Washington."

Thus agreed on the facts—by individual research and presentation—are the Nation's foremost liberal news magazine and its major conservative news magazine. They are one on where that power rests under the Johnson administration and where it has rested under the two previous administrations.

The official rebuttal rushed out yesterday by the Defense Department answered nothing. It was in the Pentagon's and politicos' evasive terms, which have been a part of the customary policy of news management.

The contingency power recognized by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy as a necessity is even more imperative now. Conceivably the emergency could arise with the President not instantly reachable, maybe driving across Texas at 90 miles per hour, with his trigger finger around a beer can; or elsewhere engaged with communications disrupted. Or with military advisers, decoding equipment, etc., trailing somewhere in another plane, as occurred on the Labor Day weekend. On that occasion he took along a certain labor tycoon, being in pursuit of votes, rather than the complement of communications equipment and people so necessary to security in event of any national emergency that might have occurred.

The point of the whole business is that L.B.J. and company have been totally misrepresenting the case. They have done that, deliberately, maliciously, and venomously, with one purpose only: To justify by callous disregard for fact their campaign pitch, seeking to depict BARRY GOLDWATER as a trigger-happy man, a "warmonger," proposing to gamble recklessly with nuclear holocaust.

Who is it that is reckless with the truth?

Who is it that is "irresponsible"?

Who is it with a sensitive finger for the panic button?

Who is it that is willfully bent on misleading the American people, with every line and syllable of a fright message—alternating the pitch only to pontificate for party bows as the pathfinder to, the guardian and lawgiver of, the great society's promised land?

The questions answer themselves. The name is Lyndon Baines Johnson.

There recur, in continuing campaign doses since the launching of last month:

The colossal hypocrisy of the platform.

The hissing hysteria of JOHN PASTORE.

The habitual, unmitigated gall of HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY.

The damnable deceit and flagrant falsification of L.B.J.

America is in a sober mood. It is listening to sober voices—for sober counsel. Din from the extremist left, in behalf of its own ticket, is striving to drown out these. But in contrast to that pandemonium of political H.H.H.—standing this time for hypocrisy, hysteria, and hokum—the Nation hears something else; the calm summary of reason's case.

That was Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's analysis of the issues, plural. Sitting with Senator GOLDWATER in conference Tuesday, he branded for what it was the leftwing's falsehood which has called the Republican nominee a "warmonger" who would plunge the Nation into nuclear disaster.

Said Ike, "BARRY, that is tommyrot. That is just crazy."

Commandments for Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the Appendix of the RECORD my own compilation of congressional commandments that I have sent back to the newspapers of my congressional district this week for publication. I would hope that they might prove to be applicable to all of us, including myself, who are now serving our great country in the U.S. Congress. This compilation is as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman EUGENE SILER)

So far as I know there has never been compiled a set of commandments for Congressmen. It seems to me that a 10 commandments for Congressmen is something that might be long overdue and so I now publish such a decalog and would hope that many Congressmen could see fit to take them unto themselves. The Congressman's commandments, as conceived by me and publicized for your consideration, are as follows:

1. Thou shalt always be saturated with Americanism, preferring Americans to all others, remembering the Holy Writ, "If any provide not for his own, and especially those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

2. Thou shalt have constant compassion for the poor because, "He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord."

3. Thou shalt balance the budget and reduce the public debt, beginning by terminating the annual outpouring of taxpayer billions for foreign aid.

4. Thou shalt not undertake to police the whole world, especially the faraway spots like Vietnam, 7,000 miles from our shores.

5. Thou shalt act and look like a Congressman, remembering thy position of leadership and high honor at the hands of the people.

6. Thou shalt not worship mammon by raising thine own salary, at least not until the budget is in balance and one or two reductions have been made in the national debt.

7. Thou shalt encourage private enterprise by taking the Government out of many of its current operations such as shipbuilding and dozens of other fields of endeavor.

8. Thou shalt revere the Constitution and adhere to it, turning a deaf ear to all those who claim it is very ancient, for so also is the Lord's Prayer.

9. Thou shalt not take junkets at the expense of the taxpayer, living high on champagne and staying at luxury hotels while many of thy people are struggling to make ends meet.

10. Thou shalt not put thy son or wife or daughter on thy payroll while he or she never darkens the door of thy office to render a public service to the people.

There they are. What do you think of them? If I did not think they could be used to produce a better America, then I would not even bring up the subject at all.

Center for the Study of the American Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that last week, Friday, September 25, Marquette University announced the establishment of a center for the study of the American press. The announcement was made by the Very Rev. William F. Kelley, S.J., Marquette president, and Donald McDonald, dean of the college of journalism. Director of the center is Dean McDonald.

The new interdisciplinary center will be concerned primarily with the quality of the news-editorial performance of the American press—newspapers, magazines, radio, and television broadcasters.

The staff for the center includes the 10 full-time members of the college of journalism faculty, 9 consultants drawn from other departments and colleges of Marquette University, 3 professional consultants, and 3 graduate student research assistants.

Father Kelley noted that in recent years the Marquette College of Journalism has been urged and encouraged by journalism educators in other schools to make qualitative studies of the American press in the light of the college's traditional teaching of and commitment to the personal and social responsibility of reporters, editors, publishers, and broadcasters.

Father Kelley said:

With the establishment of this center, Marquette hopes to make a unique contribution to an understanding, evaluation and consequent strengthening of the press in our society. Our teaching researchers will not be timid about making value judgments of the performance of the press. But their judgment will be based on explained principles, sound analysis, and adequate evidence.

Father Kelley added that, although Marquette is initially supporting the center, efforts will be made to attract the support of private and governmental foundations, individuals and professional associations concerned with the work of the press.

The campus consultants include: Dr. John Hirschboeck, dean and vice president of the Marquette School of Medicine; Dr. Norbert Wiley, sociology; Rev. Bernard Cooke, S. J., chairman of the department of theology; Dr. Thomas Bennett, political science; Dr. Marc Griesbach, philosophy; Dr. William Miller, history; Dr. James Barrett, science; Prof. Brooks Smeeton, business and economics; and Dr. R. S. Gawkoski, statistics.

Professional consultants include: Irwin Maier, president and publisher of the Milwaukee Journal; Arville Schaleben,

executive editor of the Journal; and J. L. O'Sullivan, professor and dean emeritus of the Marquette College of Journalism.

Journalism faculty members who will conduct the research include, in addition to Dean McDonald and Professors Bovee and Berdes, Profs. David Host, Clifford Helbert, Louis Belden, James Arnold, Donald Ross, Lucas Staudacher, Patrick Horan, and Albion Ross.

Marquette's College of Journalism, founded 54 years ago, is the second oldest college of journalism in the country—only the University of Missouri's school is older—and it is the only accredited Catholic college of journalism in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Marquette University on the establishment of the new center. This development is fully in keeping with the fine traditions of this great American university.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD at this point the statement of Dean McDonald, the director of the Center for the Study of the American Press.

The statement follows:

COMPLETE STATEMENT BY DEAN DONALD MCDONALD ON THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF THE AMERICAN PRESS

This center will be concerned with studies of the performance of the American press—newspapers, radio, television, magazines.

It will be concerned also with developing ways of improving education for journalism.

It will be concerned with bringing together periodically teachers and professionals for meaningful discussion of both the principles and practices of journalism.

It will be concerned with the future character of American journalism as that character can be discerned from present trends.

Finally, it will publish and distribute the results of its studies to owners and operators of the mass communications media, as well as to schools of journalism and to citizens who share an abiding interest in the press.

A basic conviction, or motivation, behind the establishment of this center is that only through an ever-deepening understanding of the American press—its nature, its function, its indispensable social role in our life—can it be steadily strengthened by those who operate it and can it be more efficiently used by those for whom it is intended, the American people.

Support for the center's work will be sought from a number of sources—both foundations an individuals.

Because of the diverse nature of the center's studies, different foundations and individuals will find particular projects more attractive than others. Multiple sponsorship is therefore desirable and will be actively and continuously sought. Such sponsorship will also insure that the interests of no single patron will dominate the work of the center.

The center will publish the results of its studies as they are completed, or as major phases of individual studies are completed. It will also give serious consideration to the feasibility and desirability of issuing bulletins at regular intervals—say annually or semiannually—reporting on work in progress and publishing individual papers by members of the center's staff on one or another problem or achievement of the contemporary press.

The center will also undertake to sponsor, singly or in collaboration with others (e.g., Johnson Foundation at Racine, or with particular newspapers or broadcasters), annual institutes or conferences bringing together professional journalists and teachers of journalism so that they may explore, in the benign atmosphere of relative seclusion, major problems and opportunities that affect—at its center—the well-being of American journalism.

Since it will make the results of its research freely known to both the press and the schools of journalism, the center will also make lavish use of the findings of other schools of journalism doing research in other areas of the mass communications field. The center will continually seek for the integrating and cohering elements in the various research efforts. It conceives as one of its most important potential functions the relating of diverse research studies to the practical good of the journalistic profession. While recognizing that the value of a great deal of research lies in the realm of the theoretical, the center will strive to mediate the theoretical and the actual, the speculative and the practical, wherever such mediation is possible.

We are hopeful that the work of the center will have both direct and immediate usefulness for the communications industry and long-range value to both the industry and the schools of journalism.

It lies in neither the purpose nor spirit of the Center for the Study of the American Press to find fault or to play the role of the carping critic or gadfly. It is the purpose of the center to find facts, not faults. And if some of the facts it finds happen also to be faults, the center will not obscure its findings, just as it will not obscure its findings when they are virtues and strengths.

Indeed, one of the principal continuing projects of the center will be to broadcast far and wide the examples of superior journalism that it gathers and analyzes.

Many of the remarks made about the American press are unsubstantiated generalizations of both a positive and negative nature. Schools of journalism, as Alan Barth has remarked, have a critical function to perform vis-a-vis the American press. But the criticism, if it is to be helpful and constructive, must be informed. There is no substitute for facts. All the rhetoric in the world will not compensate for the absence of knowledge of the relevant facts.

The center will seek facts with rigorous and dispassionate objectivity. It welcomes the press itself as an ally in this undertaking because it believes the press, no less than the schools, is dedicated to striving for the highest standards of professional competence. In this connection, it will seek close ties with the projected Research Center of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, Associated Press Managing Editors, and others, which is designed to be a clearinghouse of research information rather than an operational research center in itself.

The center welcomes, too, the support that foundations, individuals, and governmental bodies can give to its work, since so much of that work coincides with their own social, cultural, political, economic, and educational concerns.

A number of the studies and projects the center plans to carry out have been done on a limited basis, with limited samples, by individual members of the college of journalism faculty. The time is now ripe to broaden and deepen these studies through collaboration with other disciplines on the university campus, through integration of hitherto isolated inquiries, through steady and intense concentration of effort and energies on the problems undertaken, and through the financial support needed to establish and sustain these vitally important research activities.

Reapportionment and the Tuck Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, appearing in the Hastings Press is a strong editorial purporting to relate a vote in favor of the Tuck bill as a position in opposition to reapportionment of State legislatures, in opposition to reapportionment within county governments and an effort to reverse the "one man, one vote" formula.

In the interest of public policy, I would like to clarify these points:

The basic controversy between the Tuck bill and the Baker against Carr decision lies solely in the matter of jurisdiction over legislative reapportionment. The Baker against Carr deicsion of the Supreme Court in 1962 reversed all court precedent and established Supreme Court and lower Federal court jurisdiction over State legislative reapportionment matters. The Tuck bill merely removes the Supreme Court and lower Federal courts from involvement in this matter in which the Supreme Court itself has refused to intercede throughout its history until 1962. The Tuck bill in effect would place State reapportionment matters back in the hands of the State legislatures and State courts.

A vote for the Tuck bill does not signify in any way opposition to the principle of reapportionment. Although I voted for the Tuck bill, I am decidedly in favor of reapportionment of legislatures when it becomes evident that inequities in representation exist. Again, I would like to stress that the controversy is one of jurisdiction and its effects, not of opposition to the principle.

Passage of the Tuck bill would leave untouched the "one man, one vote" decision handed down in Reynolds against Sims in June of this year. A constitutional amendment would be necessary to reverse this decision since Reynolds against Sims establishes a constitutional right to "one man, one vote."

Local county reapportionment is not affected by recent Supreme Court decisions, nor is Westchester County awaiting a Supreme Court decision on reapportionment of its board of supervisors. At no time up to the present has the Supreme Court established jurisdiction over county government reapportionment matters.

Those who would like to pin a "liberal" versus "conservative" lebal on each side of the agument—terms which are misnomers anyway and which tend to obscure the actual issues—would be interested to look back at the dissent in the Baker against Carr decision. Two apostles of judicial restraint, Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Mr. Justice Harlan, dissented against the Baker against Carr decision on the basis that no matter how desirable reapportionment may be in it-

self, the use of the judiciary for such political reforms reflects a mistaken view of the function of the Federal courts.

A Mississippi Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 17, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, this summer Albert Sayer, the chairman of New York Americans for Democratic Action, and Mrs. Sayer taught in a freedom school in Mississippi. Mr. Sayer's account of his experience has been published in the September 1964 edition of the ADA World. His firsthand report is a vivid description of the courageous activities of those who are fighting for equality in Mississippi. I urge all my colleagues to read the article which follows:

FEAR WAS RAMPANT IN MISSISSIPPI

(By Albert Sayer)

It was a muggy July afternoon when my wife and I stepped off the bus which had brought us from Meridian to Holly Springs in Mississippi.

The day we arrived there was Freedom Day. Forty-five Negroes were applying for registration as voters at the county courthouse; that was why the normal complement of 10 policemen had been swelled with several dozen deputies and highway patrolmen.

Yet Freedom Day was highly successful in Holly Springs, because it had been so carefully organized. All of the 45 Negroes were registered. It would take another 2 weeks, of course, to learn how many of the registrants had been passed. There was also the possibility that some might be coerced into withdrawing their applications, since the Mississippi law requires that the names of the applicants be published in the newspapers for 2 weeks.

FEAR PREVALENT

For the most characteristic feature of the Mississippians is fear. There are two sets of fears—the Negroes' fear of the white people, and the whites' fear of one another. That Saturday night, in Holly Springs, we had a vivid example of the Negroes' fear. A tall, husky Negro stood on the porch of the COFO headquarters, sweating and afraid. He had literally run from his shack on a plantation a few miles away, because the plantation owner had threatened to kill him. Why? Because the plantation owner had learned that the tenant's brother was involved in the voter registration activities. Now the tenant was in a quandary; he was safe at the COFO headquarters, but his family was still at the plantation. It was finally arranged that two COFO workers would return with him and stay temporarily at the shack as a guard.

In Meridian we had witnessed the white man's fear. We stayed there with a courageous Negro family, which was actively involved in the voter registration work. Our landlady received a call one day from the white man for whom she worked as a housekeeper; she had raised his three children. (The standard pay there for a housekeeper, 6 full days a week, is $18.) Her employer told her that he had heard from a relative about her keeping white people—obviously northern agitators—at her home. She told him that this was her right, and she offered to quit her job. No, he told her, his family needed her; but, if his friends learned that he was employing a Negro who was keeping white people in her home, he would lose his job in the post office, and his wife would lose her job, too. So he pleaded with her to be discreet, and he would pretend that he knew nothing about what she was doing. What was significant was that he was much more afraid than she was.

Were we afraid? We certainly were. We left for Mississippi just a week after the Schwerner, Chaney, and Goodman boys had disappeared. And, during our orientation in Memphis, the dangers were emphasized and reemphasized, to weed out those who might later weaken and become a problem. Our stay in Mississippi proved, however, to be a peaceful one. It was apparent that the Mississippi authorities, to the extent that they could control the situation, were determined to keep the lid on for the summer. Too many of the "invaders"—students, ministers, lawyers—had connections up North, and the shadow of Federal intervention hung over the State. This must be understood, of course, in relative terms There have been dozens of incidents—threats and beatings; arrests on charges of trespass and traffic violations; tampering with the gasoline tanks and motors of COFO cars; and the burning of churches. Yet, in a State where everybody has a gun, and violence is an accepted part of the way of life, the summer has been more peaceful than was expected.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

What troubled many of us, as we analyzed the situation, was the question of what would happen after the summer, when the summer volunteers had returned to their schools and jobs. We had boundless admiration for the courage of the permanent COFO workers, both Negro and white, who knew that they would have to take the brunt of the white people's bottled-up fury when the summer was over.

Yes, we were afraid; but our fear had one positive influence. As one Negro woman, in my adult class, put it, "When we realize that you were afraid, but you came anyway, then we know that we have to overcome our fears and work for freedom now."

Before we had left New York, TV and radio reporters had asked repeatedly, "What do you expect to accomplish?" It's too bad that the reporters could not have visited the freedom schools. There were no educational miracles. Just hundreds of Negro boys and girls coming each day, neatly dressed, to hastily improvised classrooms, mostly in church basements, where they were accepted as equals by white teachers. They could speak and write freely about the meaning of freedom and about their aspirations. They could laugh and banter and argue and sing and dance with white people—without being afraid. They could, under our guidance, discuss the significance of "All men are created equal," the 14th amendment, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. These topics are not discussed in their public schools.

The most important factor in the freedom schools, however, was the impact that the volunteers and the Mississippi Negroes had upon each other. We shared in their poverty and their fears and their hopes. We were warmed by their friendliness and their eagerness to learn. We were moved by their courage and their hopefulness. On the other hand, they learned that there are other kinds of white people besides the typical white of the Mississippi region, and that the Negroes have many friends in their struggle for equality.

For the first time Mississippi Negroes came into contact with Jews. Many were startled to find that there was no noticeable difference between the Jewish and Christian volunteers. One lady, in my adult group, finally asked me, "Mr. Sayer, you've mentioned that you are Jewish. What is the difference between Jews and Christians?" I explained that Jews, as well as Moslems, Hindus, and other groups, do not accept the divinity of Christ. She closed the discussion by remarking, "Well, you may be Jewish, but you're a real Christian." How could I argue with that?

IMPACT ON EACH OTHER

Perhaps we should also note the impact of the volunteers upon one another. After all, we had left the North with the good wishes of so many people, who at the same time expressed their doubts about the wisdom of our decision. It was heartening, therefore, to meet hundreds of people who were equally impractical and stubborn. Most of them were young, undergraduates and graduates, still starry-eyed, hypercritical of the older generation, and ready to effect a social revolution in one summer. (They teased us by calling us "Mama" and "Papa.") But there were many older folks—ministers, lawyers, psychologists, medical workers, journalists—more restrained, but equally determined to do their bit, each in his own way. The discipline and morale were extraordinarily good, because each one had made his commitment on the basis of his faith in the ultimate triumph of the good.

There were so many little things, too many to recall at any one time, which made the sojourn in Mississippi worthwhile. One is the letter we got from one of the women in our Meridian group:

"I can never put in words or speech how glad I have been since I met you. I have been for 23 years trying to lead and teach people of things that really did not exist, I mean that never came to pass, only a dream or imagination. We have let the blind lead the blind and both have fallen in the ditch. We were told that we were not under slavery as our foreparents were, and the white people kept us pretty much in ignorance of what has been going on and we believed what they told us, we obeyed. If it had not been for the dream I had about washing clothes white and hearing sticks breaking and being warned to help, I would be afraid to write, afraid to attend freedom school. Now I know that we are not free and that we are still slaves, and I believe that is why you are here, to help us get freedom and to help us that our rights according to a citizen of the United States will not be violated or taken away. I believe that you who are free know what freedom means * * * you are a committee sent here to help us get freedom so we could live in the South without discrimination but in peace."

Plymouth (Ind.) Pilot News Praises Work of Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the text of a fine editorial from the Plymouth (Ind.) Pilot News concerning the outstanding work of the Peace Corps with special reference to the September 1964, issue of the National Geographic Magazine, which contains an article by the Director of the Peace Corps, Sargent Shriver.

The editorial follows:

WORK OF PEACE CORPS

The September issue of the National Geographic has a splendid article about our Peace Corps, written by Sargent Shriver, who has headed the plan since its beginning. With help he planned what it was to be, how it should be made up and what its work was to be in foreign lands.

Some people in our country opposed the plan and foreign nations thought that Americans, who lived such an easy and comfortable life would never go among poor, ignorant, and dirty foreigners and live with them. The Peace Corps workers have proved all of these prophets wrong.

Since 1960, 10,000 Peace Corps members have worked in 46 nations and there are calls for thousands more. There are many men and women of 50 years of age and over who are some of the most desirable members, for they have the experience.

Mr. Shriver tells of the experience of the first crew of 55 who went to Ghana. There was a big crowd to meet them when they got off the boat and to the great surprise of that crowd the Peace Corps members sang one of the popular native songs in the native language. The Ghanians could hardly believe their ears but were so pleased that they broke into cheers.

If we keep this work of the Peace Corps going and increasing, we think it will eventually do more good than the spending of our billions in foreign aid.

No Peace Corps persons are sent to any nation unless asked for, and there have always been nations calling for them. Those where the Peace Corps members have gone usually call for more and more, so well are they liked and so much help they give to the people where they go.

If you are retired and have nothing much to occupy your time, think seriously of joining the Peace Corps. They want more elderly people. If a young person is attracted to such a life for 2 years and wants to go, you will get a thorough education before you depart. This includes one or more foreign languages.

Peaceful Coexistence—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an addition to the material I offered earlier today from the book, "Peaceful Coexistence: A Communist Blueprint for Victory," published by the Standing Committee on Education Against Communism of the American Bar Association, as follows:

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE—IV

THE VICTORIES OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Despite the relative newsness of peaceful coexistence as the "strategic line" of the majority of the Communist movement, the Communists have begun to consider as "victories" for their policies agreements which the West has entered into for the purpose of relaxing international tensions:

"The ideas of peaceful coexistence are penetrating deeper and deeper into the consciousness of the masses of people. The policy of peaceful coexistence has scored great successes. One was the Moscow test ban treaty. Another was the resolution of the U.N. General Assembly urging all states to refrain from launching space vehicles with nuclear weapons into orbit. The forces of peace and the desire for peace are growing. We believe that the will of the people will triumph—that the policy of peaceful coexistence will emerge victorious." [1]

Particular emphasis has been placed on the ratification of the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963 by the great majority of the nations of the world:

"The conclusion of a treaty on this matter after 5 years of exhaustive talks was the result of the consistent position adopted by the Soviet Union and the growing pressure from the peoples of the world." [2]

A statement by a Latin American Communist Party goes into greater detail:

"The treaty signed by the Soviet Union, the United States, and Britain in Moscow is a partial concession on the part of imperialism to the Soviet Union and the other peoples who have long fought for the termination of nuclear tests. It shows that the imperialist states can be compelled to enter into certain compromises in the matter of peaceful coexistence with the socialist states. A new blow has been struck at the more aggressive imperialist quarters, specifically the Pentagon. The fact that the treaty was signed in Moscow makes it clear to all in whose favor the scales have been tipped in the nuclear competition. The Moscow Treaty creates better conditions for the struggle for disarmament and lasting peace; it strengthens the people's faith in the possibility of tangible gains in the struggle against imperialism. And thereby it contributes to the popular revolutionary struggle in the capitalist and oppressed countries." [3]

Such a satement reflects the optimism which Khrushchev seemed to exude in his speech of January 6, 1961:

"The policy of actively struggling for peace has imparted dynamic force to the foreign policy acts of the Socialist countries. In recent years, the initiative in the international arena has been in the hands of the Soviet Union, the Socialist countries, while the imperialist states and their governments defend themselves with their backs to the wall, their prestige and foreign political stock have never been so low." [4]

Another illustration of the nature of Communist "victory" statements may be found in the Soviet treatment of the events of October 1962, when the Soviet Union sought to change the balance of power radically by attempting to introduce strategic missiles into Cuba:

"There have been many tense situations threatening world peace in the years since the war. During the Caribbean crisis, for instance, the nations were brought face to face with the danger of a thermonuclear world war. In this grave situation the Soviet Union displayed a high sense of responsibility for the fate of mankind; the catastrophe was averted and peace preserved through negotiation, and, at the same time, the independence and gains of the Cuban people were safeguarded." [5]

* * * * *

"Every honest person will arrive at the conclusion that the solution of the Cuban crisis is a victory of reason over recklessness, of the policy of peaceful coexistence over the policy of gross wantonness in international relations." [6]

The bald statement that "every honest person" will conclude that the outcome of the Cuban crisis was a result of Soviet "statesmanship" is as credible as the Soviet claim that American "assistance" in World War II against Nazi Germany "was of no real value in defeating the aggressors." The world knows that it was the action of the United States which prevented the deployment of intermediate-range ballisic missiles into Cuba.

Although much of the emphasis in Communist discussion of the victories of "peaceful coexistence" is designed for purposes of propaganda, there is another side of the coin as far as Cuba is concerned: That country remains an armed Communist camp in the Western Hemisphere, and the Communists consider it to be an integral part of the expanding revolutionary process. It is therefore more difficult in this particular case to dismiss completely the claims attributed to peaceful coexistence:

"Overcoming the crisis in the Caribbean Sea area was a major victory of the policy of peace. * * * The result is known to all. The Cuban revolution has won, all the peoples have won, the cause of peace and general security has won." [7]

Thus on the third anniversary of the "Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers Parties," Pravda could declare:

"The world Socialist system as a whole has strengthened its economic and political positions on the world stage. After the victory of the revolution in Cuba, the beacon lights of communism are now shining on three continents: Europe, Asia, and America." [8]

THE CORRELATION OF FORCES

During the 19th century the principal mechanism for maintaining the peace was the "balance of power" with the British Empire as the "keeper of the balance." It is said that the application of the balance-of-power concept is responsible for the long period of peace lasting from 1815 to 1914, and that the principle became weakened only after England moved into a permanent alliance system.

Some hold that, with the rise of totalitarian powers which have goals exceeding the traditional ones known to modern history, the balance-of-power concept has be-

---

[1] Commentator Viktorov, Radio Moscow, November 11, 1963. Note that the treaty is referred to as the "Moscow Treaty." The Communists insist on this formulation for propaganda purposes.

[2] Zenon Kliszko, "Peaceful Coexistence: The General Line of the Foreign Policies of the Socialist Countries," Pravda, Aug. 9, 1963.

[3] "The Views of the Paraguayan Communist Party on the Ideological and Practical Position of the Chinese Communist Party," Information Bulletin—Documents of the Communist and Workers' Parties, No. 2 (November 1963). The Information Bulletin was begun in the fall of 1963 by Peace and Socialism Publishers in Prague, and is apparently designed to serve as a vehicle for collecting criticisms of the Chinese Communist position on strategy and tactics. It is particularly interesting to note that the insignificant Paraguayan Communist Party was chosen to make this statement, which was later widely quoted in the Soviet press as being representative of worldwide Communist opinion. It is very likely that the statement was "planted" with the Paraguayans in order to get the point across without attracting attention in the press of the free world.

[4] Nikita Khrushchev, "For New Victories of the World Communist Movement, Kommunist, p. 66. (The Jan. 6, 1961, speech referred to in note 7.)

[5] I. G. Maurer, "The Inviolable Foundations of the Unity of the International Communist Movement," World Marxist Review, November 1963, p. 13.

[6] Speech of Andrei Gromyko, Tass, Dec. 13, 1962.

[7] Speech of Presidium Member Nikolai Podgornly, Radio Moscow, Nov. 6, 1963.

[8] "For the Unity and Solidarity of the International Communist Movement," Pravda, Dec. 6, 1963.

come largely outmoded. Ideological power movements such as nazism and communism are driven not by limited aims, but by unlimited aims most accurately reflected by the quest for nothing short of worldwide domination.

Nonetheless, the term "balance of power" is still used by many to describe the operating mechanisms of international politics in the second half of the 20th century.

The basic defect of this term when applied to the free world's conflict with communism is that it is not sufficiently inclusive, for modern scientific and technological progress has brought about the utilization of warfare techniques which do not fit into the category of "military power." And it has been noted more than once that democracies experience great difficulty in thinking of strategy as being anything more than merely military.

The Communists have officially rejected the "balance-of-power" concept, and have substituted for it a new concept: "the correlation of forces." This term allows them to identify the present era as one in which the forces of communism are, on balance, outstripping the forces of "imperialism," and in which "socialism" becomes the "decisive force" in determining the course of world events:

"Today it is the world socialist system and the forces fighting against imperialism for a socialist transformation of society that determine the main content, main trend, and main features of the historical development of society. Whatever efforts imperialism makes, it cannot stop the advance of history. A reliable basis has been provided for further decisive victories for socialism. The complete triumph of socialism in inveitable." [9]

It is this new condition that allows the Communists to "get the upper hand" in the struggle with imperialism:

"The tables have been turned in the relations between the two main world forces. Socialism is the force that is now on the offensive on all fronts. Capitalism has lost its old domination for good. It is being attacked by world socialism, by the forces of the revolutionary movements in the capitalist countries, and the national liberation revolutions. Under these concentrated attacks, capitalism is losing one position after another. A real possibility is being created of finally overthrowing the last system of exploitation in a short historical period and opening a road on a world scale to the society on whose banners are inscribed these sacred principles: Peace, labor, freedom, equality, brotherhood, and happiness for all.

"But this possibility still has to be transformed into reality. Final victory is drawing near but it still has to be won, and it has to be won in a struggle with a very strong enemy." [10]

While the Communists admit that their strength may in some specific areas be inferior to that of the adversary, in the final analysis they insist that their forces are stronger, because they combine all the growing physical power in the world with all the growing political and moral power:

"The Soviet Union occupies the vanguard position not only because of her accumulated experience, but because of the accumulation of strength, which is the greatest in the world Socialist system and in the world Communist movement. Strength is here meant in all its aspects: economic strength, international political influence and prestige, technological and scientific superiority, military defense, preparedness, and so forth. As is known to all, * * * the Soviet Union places all its strength at the service of the revolutionary liberation factors in the world, at the service of the interests of the international proletariat." [11]

This understanding of strength reflects the view of Khrushchev that, for any group to win in the nuclear age, it is vital to utilize anything with the potential of assisting in the broad-ranging struggle with the opponent, and that it is necessary to utilize them with only an offensive purpose in mind. That is to say, each factor of strength is to be thrown into the arena not only to build up the general power of the movement, but also to be used individually when necessary to bring about the downfall of the enemy.

All the elements of strength are never possessed exclusively by the Communists; rather, they may simply seek to utilize existing factors for their own ends:

"The nature and meaning of the world revolutionary process in our times are determined by merging into a single stream the struggle against imperialism on the part of the peoples building socialism and communism, the revolutionary movements of the workers' class in the capitalist countries, the national liberation struggles of oppressed peoples, and the general democratic movements.[12]

"Note that the various movements mentioned will not of their own accord spontaneously merge into a single stream, but that they are to be merged. The difference would appear at first glance to be slight, but is in fact important: it is the Communists who are to do the merging, and, having achieved that, will proceed to determine the course of the single stream."

Perhaps the clearest summation of the relationship of peaceful coexistence to the correlation of forces in Communist jargon is that of Nikita Khrushchev in June 1963:

"Life has fully confirmed the correctness of the policy of peaceful coexistence. The camp of imperialism, too, has to recognize this. Take, for example, Dulles. He could not even utter these words.

"When I was in America, Britain, and France, lengthy explanations were required during the negotiations on what was meant by peaceful coexistence. During the discussions in the United States with President Eisenhower it was clear that he, just as Secretary of State Herter, could not utter the words 'peaceful coexistence.'

"Now what has happened? The words are the same and their meaning has not changed. What has changed is the correlation of forces in the international arena.[13]

In short, Khrushchev contends that whereas formerly the United States and its allies refused to use the Communist term "peaceful coexistence," today they have been compelled to accept it, and that what has compelled them to accept it is the shift in the "correlation of forces" in favor of the Communists.

The Communists reject the concept of balancing the forces of "socialism" and "capitalism," and claim that, no matter what in desperation it tries to do, capitalism will be destroyed.

CAN CAPITALISM AND COMMUNISM RECONCILE THEIR DIFFERENCES?

When major differences and tensions between nations exist, there is a likelihood that under certain circumstances armed conflict will break out if one nation attempts to impose a solution upon the other. A more desirable method of resolving differences is to attempt, by peaceful means, to reconcile the objectives of each, or, barring that, to achieve a tacit recognition on the part of each that despite their divergence on objectives, they must live together without trying to undermine each other.

In its conflict with communism, the West is dedicated to the peaceful resolution of outstanding differences, and utilizes each and every opportunity to proclaim its desire to settle those differences by negotiations and other peaceful methods.

Because the meaning of the term "peaceful coexistence" is so often misunderstood in the West, many come to the conclusion that, because the Communists understand that peaceful coexistence means, for the time being, the exclusion of war as a means to achieve victory, relatively little importance should be attached to the Communists' insistence that, short of general war, "anything goes." The misunderstanding is frequently expanded to the assumption that, because the Communists have stated their preference to avoid war to defeat the West, they have given up their objective of accomplishing such a defeat.

"Many of those in the West who in principle accept peaceful coexistence between capitalist and Socialist countries interpret it in a different way from Marxist-Leninists. Representatives of different outlooks often give different readings to such questions as the relation between the peaceful coexistence of the State of interstate relations and the development of social contradictions inside the capitalist world, between the peace movement and the working class struggle for socialism.

"Many bourgeois and Social-Democratic ideologists take peaceful coexistence to mean a reconciliation of the two warring, irreconcilable classes, the proletariat, and the bourgeoisie, and say that it leads to a "fade-out" of the struggle between the antagonistic class ideologies, the Socialist, and bourgeois.

"Marxist-Leninists cannot accept this distorted * * * interpretation of the policy of peaceful coexistence which slurs over its class substance and direction and ignores the irreconcilable antagonistic social contradictions of the modern world.

"The Communist Party has always acted on the assumption that the peaceful coexistence of the two systems does not exclude but, on the contrary, implies a further development of the working people's class struggle. * * * The contemporary * * * general line of the international Communist movement does not freeze the initiative of the people, but, on the contrary, mobilizes them to a greater extent. It opens up before all revolutionary forces of our day new prospects for successful advance." [14]

The Communists clearly recognize, then, that the West fundamentally misunderstands or misinterprets "peaceful coexistence" as a welcome alleviation of the "class struggle." The "class struggle" denotes in reality the unrelenting battle against non-Communist society everywhere, and therefore to alleviate the class struggle is to slacken the effort to overthrow free governments. Such a slackening is hotly denied:

"It is as impossible to reconcile opposing classes or eliminate the antagonisms between them as it is to have peaceful coexistence of clashing ideologies which reflect the basic interests of these classes. The struggle to win the hearts and minds of the people and their loyalty is inherently adamant and uncompromising."

---

[9] Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers Parties in Moscow, U.S.S.R., December 1960, p. 2.

[10] V. G. Korionov, "Proletarian Internationalism—Our Victorious Weapon," International Affairs, No. 8 (Aug. 1963), p. 12.

[11] Mosheh Sneh, "Chinese Errors," Kol Haam (Voice of the People, Israel), October 4, 1963.

[12] "The Soviet Position vis-à-vis Peiping," Kommunist, No. 11 (July 1963).

[13] N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Plenary Meeting, June 21, 1963.

[14] T. T. Timofeyev, "Against Distortions of the Class Nature of the Leninist Policy of Peaceful Coexistence," International Affairs, No. 8 (August 1963), pp. 18–19.

Let's Knock Out the Dropout Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a fine gentleman living in my northern Virginia district, Mr. Anthony J. DelPopolo, has recently sent me a copy of a speech he delivered before a toastmasters meeting, on the subject of the dropout, which is of grave interest to all concerned citizens of our Nation. Mr. Anthony J. DelPopolo, the gentleman to whom I refer, is the Assistant Superintendent at the District of Columbia Youth Center at Lorton, and I believe he is eminently qualified to talk on this subject in view of the many young people with whom he works daily whose problems resulted from irregular family life and failure to attend school with regularity.

I am pleased to insert Mr. DelPopolo's speech in full in the RECORD, so that all may benefit from his comments:

LET'S KNOCK OUT THE DROPOUT PROBLEM

(A speech delivered at a meeting of the Knights of Columbus Toastmasters Club No. 1273, in Arlington, Va., on September 9, 1964, by Anthony J. DelPopolo, club president)

Mr. Chairman, fellow toastmasters, honored guests, I would like to ask each of you a serious question: Suppose, after you arrived home from this meeting tonight, your 16-year-old son or daughter met you at the door and spoke these works to you: "Dad, I want to quit school and go to work." What would be your reaction? This is the dilemma faced by the parents of over a million boys and girls who leave high school each year before graduation. This is the 20th century American tragedy. This is what is known as the dropout problem.

INTRODUCTION

The challenges facing our young people in school today are many. We are deeply concerned with one of them this evening—namely, the important question of deciding how much education is enough. The choice for our young Americans is a difficult one to make, especially for those who find no pleasure in school or classwork. Many see no present or future value in what they are studying today. They fail to understand the relationship between more schooling now and their own improved chance for lifelong success.

Those million boys and girls who, each year make the wrong decision doom themselves for life. How can these maltrained and maleducated dropouts expect to find work among the already dwindling market of unskilled workers. It is obvious that they are the last to be hired, the ones to receive the lowest pay, and the first to be laid off. It won't be long before automation takes over these jobs too.

Recent studies have shown that the trend of the dropout problem is such that by 1970 over 6½ million more will be added to the already staggering number of Americans who are academically and vocationally ill-equipped for the ever-changing and challenging space age.

Would you believe that one out of every three in the fifth grade today will drop out of school before high school graduation? We must do everything within our power to prevent this overgrowing curse from taking its toll each year. Are these youngsters destined to become noncontributing parasites of our American society?

WHO ARE THE DROPOUTS?

Let us look more closely at this dropout problem. Now, just who are these young people called "dropouts." For the record I would like to state that there is no such thing as the typical dropout.

Some current surveys reveal that slightly more than half of all the school dropouts are male. Compulsory school age in most States is 16. Because of this we find that the largest number of boys and girls who do not finish high school leave soon after this age, usually when they are in grade 10.

Many of these dropouts are seriously retarded in basic school subjects, such as reading and arithmetic. They are usually failures in one or more subjects. They are not at all active in athletics or in extracurricular activities. However, some research has shown them to have a sufficient I.Q. to succeed in school to graduation, if they only would continue.

It was also found that a majority of the high school dropouts came from families where attendance at school or academic achievements were of little or no importance.

Another study made in our neighboring State of Maryland indicated that a substantial majority of the mothers and fathers of dropouts had been early dropouts themselves. This research further revealed that their parents usually had the type of job that required only physical energy and were known to suffer frequent periods of unemployment.

WHY DO THEY DROP OUT?

Many of us may know one or two reasons why some boys and girls select to withdraw from high school before they graduate. The most frequent reason dropouts themselves give is simply a lack of interest in school. What does this actually mean? He or she probably was discouraged over their academic progress. They disliked a certain subject or teacher; they could not project the worth of their studies to future application. Moreover, it could mean that they felt ostracized from the social life of the school.

Whether a sound reason or not, discredit should not be given to him who withdraws from school to help with the care of his family or to add to the family income.

The decision to drop out of school is often made because the student hasn't yet acquired a real goal in life. He is probably unaware of the probable consequences of his foolish action.

I know for sure that "idleness is the Devil's workshop." A substantial majority of the young men confined in the correctional institution of which I am assistant superintendent are former school dropouts.

The Bureau of Guidance of the New York State Department of Education conducted a comprehensive research project on the dropout in that State's schools. In one phase of this study the school counselors found that dropouts withdrew from school, (in order of frequency) because of parental attitude, lack of success, low ability, indifference, and marriage.

WHAT HAPPENS TO THE DROPOUT?

Whatever happens to the dropout when he drops out of school? If the dropout finds work he does so for a short period of time. He then feels he is accomplishing something worthwhile. It is true that he gets a paycheck—more money to spend on clothes and entertainment than many of those who remain in school. But to the dropout's disappointment this is usually temporary.

HOW DO WE SAVE THE DROPOUT?

However, our present and deepest concern appears to be: "What can be done to save the dropouts?"

The schools are playing a most vital role in combating the dropout problem. Guidance programs, which have been strengthened in most schools in recent years, can and do provide the needed leadership with their specialized training and experienced counselors.

Solving the problem of school retention is not the task of the schools alone. It takes the close cooperation of parents, schools, and the individuals and organizations of the community—employers, civic groups, service clubs, labor unions, church groups, and social agencies.

A recent U.S. Health, Education, and Welfare report shows that cities like Detroit, New York City, San Francisco, Kansas City, Racine (Wis.), Philadelphia, St. Louis (Mo.), and numerous urban and rural communities of the Nation are providing situations to interest young people in work which will, while restoring their self-respect now, also reveal to them the value of school.

A 7-year holding power project completed recently by the Bureau of Guidance of the New York State Department of Education mentioned before revealed 21 factors known to be associated with dropping out of school. From this study was drawn a composite image of the dropout.

The researchers went on to say, "The implications in the light of this study are that schools can improve retention rates if they focus their attention upon potential dropouts. If they use the checklist of characteristics which "put the finger" on the dropout a whole year before he does drop out.

The problem of the dropout seems to yield only long-term effort by the majority of those who work with each individual potential dropout.

I have first-hand knowledge of the fact that two radio broadcasting stations, KXLW in St. Louis, Mo., and WWDC in Washington, D.C., have editorialized the perils of school withdrawal to its young listeners. And there may be many more.

WHAT DO WE SAY TO THE POTENTIAL DROPOUT?

What word of caution can we say to the student who is planning to drop out? These are just a few:

1. Stay in school and you will be in a better position to compete for worthwhile, better paying jobs.

2. You will be better suited for promotion if and when the opportunity may present itself.

3. You will be able to train yourself for the really good job you may decide upon 5 or 25 years from now.

4. Do you know that:

(a) The fastest growing labor source in America is technical and professional—requiring at least 16 years of formal education.

(b) In the last decade jobs for high school graduates rose 30 percent, while jobs for those with less than high school decreased 25 percent.

(c) The difference in earning prospect in a lifetime of a high school graduate beginning at the age of 18 years is $46,000 more than a high school dropout and $76,000 more than a grade school graduate.

And this is a final warning. Don't be a high school dropout. There's no advantage in neglecting your education when it is so vital to your future success. Don't let the immediate money and material gains be your only goal in life. In this complex society we live in the need for a good education is vital to every young man and woman who wants equal opportunity, a satisfying career, and a place as a responsible informed member of society. Without enough education, it will be difficult to attain these goals. If you leave school too soon, you'll regret it for the rest of your life—just ask your fellow student who dropped out last year.

LET'S KNOCK OUT THE DROPOUT PROBLEM

As you now see we are faced with a fierce battle against the dropout problem. This is a fight to the finish. We cannot win it with kid gloves. We must accept the challenge. We must rid this blemish upon our democratic society. The future of America's young men and women and of America itself are at stake. Let's punch into oblivion this problem of the dropout with a technical knockout.

Appendix

Women's Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES B. PEARSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short article entitled "The Ballot of My Fair Lady." It was published in the October 1964, issue of Coronet magazine.

This article, written by Bula Lemert, wife of former State Senator Merl Lemert, of Sedan, Kans., appeals to the female voters for maximum participation in election activities. This is a subject on which Mrs. Lemert is well qualified to write, inasmuch as she has been a first-hand observer and an active participant in election activity.

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

[From Coronet Magazine, October 1964]

THE BALLOT OF MY FAIR LADY

(By Bula Lemert)

The next President of the United States will owe his victory to the ladies. They will put him in office because they voted for him or because they allowed him to be elected by not voting at all.

Women hold such a substantial majority of votes in this country that they outnumber men voters in 40 States. Four million more women than men are eligible to vote in November, and by 1970 Census Bureau forecasts indicate that the female majority will reach 5 million.

By voting in a bloc, women would have a weapon powerful enough to elect any candidate, adopt any issue, promote any reform or produce a complete social revolution. Their majority of ballots, either cast or not, remains a force strong enough to influence history.

Women, however, seem oddly reluctant to exercise their suffrage rights. Although many U.S. citizens are curiously indifferent to voting, women are downright nonchalant. Even though they have eagerly seized equal opportunities for employment and property rights, women seem hesitant to make full use of their power at the polls.

The 1960 presidential election had one of the highest vote turnouts on record. Figures show that of the potential men voters, 66 percent took part, but of the potential women voters, only 60 percent cast ballots. In terms of numbers, this means that 17 million men didn't vote for President, but neither did 22 million women. The difference in the popular vote between the two presidential candidates was 17 hundredths of 1 percent. If every woman who took the family wash to a coin-operated laundry on election day also had gone to the polls, the balance of votes could have swung widely to either side.

Idaho ranked first in voting participation among the 50 States in the 1960 election; more than 80 percent of its electorate went to the polls. Significantly, it is one of the 10 States where women voters do not outnumber men. North and South Dakota, also with more men voters, ranked fourth and fifth respectively. New York State, with half a million more women voters, scored 32d.

New York, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Ohio are considered big "swing" States because of their 119 electoral votes. Eligible women voters in these States outnumber the men by 1,192,000—a formidable strength in any election. The effect of this majority as an active political force is still referred to as "potential," however, because there appears to be a significant difference between eligible voters and actual voters.

A small percentage of women are dedicated political workers, a larger group votes but does not actively participate and an even greater number does neither.

That women deliberately disenfranchise themselves seems incredible in view of the 80-year-long struggle made by a valiant few to secure the mere right to vote.

Suffragettes of the past sacrificed, marched, lectured, picketed, and even went to jail to call attention to voting discrimination. In 1913, militant women marched in New York carrying a banner that read, "New York State Denies the Vote to Criminals, Lunatics, Idiots, and Women."

Today's suburban housewife occupied with children, laundry, marketing, PTA, Scouts, and fund drives might find it difficult to realize that her counterpart of a few generations ago had a legal status comparable to that of a quarry slave.

In the early days of the 19th century, a married woman who had property found it was controlled entirely by her husband. He could also collect and spend any wages she might earn. If he chose to discipline her with a beating, there was no law to prevent such brutality. If she ran away, her husband could not only compel her to return, but he could also sue and collect damages from anyone who harbored her in her flight. Obviously, to consider giving women the privilege of voting was as unthinkable as electing the family cow to the legislature.

Rebellion against this absurd position initiated the long struggle for equal rights for women, foremost of which were equal voting rights.

Carrie Chapman Catt, ardent suffragist, spoke eloquently concerning the women's crusade: "Millions of dollars were raised, mostly in small sums, and spent with economic care. Hundreds of women gave the accumulated possibilities of an entire lifetime. Thousands gave years of their lives; hundreds gave constant interest and attention and such aid as they could. It was a continuous, seemingly endless chain of activity. Young suffragists who helped forge the last links of that chain were not born when it began. Old suffragists who helped forge the first links were dead when it ended."

Equal voting rights for women evolved gradually, each advancement made at considerable cost. Now, on the 44th anniversary of that triumph, thousands who have fallen heir painlessly to this hard-won privilege will, incredibly, ignore it, neglect it, or use it carelessly.

Anyone delving into the recesses of the female conscience might discover an assortment of reasons why women, even those who clamor loudly for equal rights, are conspicuously absent from the voting places on election day.

A young housewife in Wichita, Kans., did not vote in the last election because, she says, it is hard to find a sitter for five children even for an hour.

Two women under hair dryers in a Midwest beauty shop said that politics is an unsavory business they didn't want to get mixed up in, so they didn't bother to vote.

An active member of a Tulsa, Okla., bowling team voted in the last election but admitted she marked only one name—that of the candidate for water commissioner who lived across the street.

"I'll fight until I bleed," said one young mother, "to vote for a better school board. But don't ask me for an opinion on anybody out of town."

Some experts believe that the shadowy past when women were subservient to men still lingers in the female subconscious. The enthusiasm for equal voting rights often seems to languish in favor of the cliche, "It's a man's world." Having made that pronouncement, many ladies turn with obvious relief to bargain sales, trading stamps, and household chores. It gives them an easy way out.

A study made by the University of Michigan Research Center regarding the voting of both men and women in recent elections indicates there are still many women too absorbed in household duties to take part in political activities. The researchers conclude: "The suffragette's desired role for emancipated womanhood is still neither realized nor wanted by many women.

"My vote wouldn't make any difference anyway," some potential women voters declare. Yet history is replete with instances of the potency of a single expression of opinion.

One vote cost King Charles I of England his head in 1649. A single vote won the Presidency of the United States for John Quincy Adams and Rutherford B. Hayes. In 1868, one vote spared President Andrew Johnson from a conviction after he was impeached by the U.S. Senate. In another notable instance, two candidates for nomination to Congress in California, received exactly the same number of votes. In accordance with the State constitution, the contenders drew lots in the presence of the secretary of state. The incumbent Congressman lost the draw and the right to his party's nomination. He consequently sank into political oblivion—because his secretary was too busy with office work to cast her ballot on primary election day.

Do women voters select candidates for their personalities or their platforms? The "little boy look," the "father image," and other appeals are supposed to make female hearts quicken and ultimately influence the tally at the polls. Some politicians believe that women will vote for a candidate with personal charm, although his political record may be suspect and his platform as sturdy as milk toast.

This interesting reasoning cannot be confined to women, however. Politicians have always been aware of the importance of their public image. They grew beards or shaved them off. They chose their attire, particularly hats and vests, with great care. They acquired "spellbinding" speech skills.

Theodore Roosevelt declared himself as strong as a bull moose and thus provided the motif for the Bull Moose Party, designed to

attract virile men. James G. Blaine happily adopted the cognomen of "a plumed knight" given him by Robert G. Ingersoll, agreeing that he was going forth into the campaign like an armed warrior. These and innumerable other similar tactics were not to influence the vote of emotional women; they were for the purpose of swaying men who alone had the vote at that time.

In the past, a belief had existed that women voted as their husbands dictated. Perhaps in the earliest day of equal suffrage, when women proceeded slowly with their newly acquired rights, this was true. A University of Michigan report on the mores of voting says, "most husbands and wives are in complete agreement." Mrs. Clare Williams, assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee, points out that it is likely the wife—who has more time to read, listen to broadcasts, and attend political meetings—ultimately determines the family's vote.

Political leaders are well aware of the untapped strength of the women's vote. The 1960 presidential campaign saw an unprecedented play for the favor of voting women; the 1964 campaign has intensified that effort. Coffee hours, afternoon teas, telephone campaigns, block parties, "chain listening" to political broadcasts, all used in connection with intriguing slogans and catchy program ideas, are designed to interest women. Promises to appoint women to more governmental positions are plums dangled by many candidates before aspiring feminine eyes.

Voting is a right with particular responsibilities attached. It is not a ritual to be performed without thinking. "Don't vote at all," advise political leaders, "unless you can give informed, careful consideration to the performance."

"Voting is a judicious weighing of knowledge and facts," says a Federal judge. "The ballot is a significant political instrument."

To learn how to use this instrument, women are urged to take part in political activity.

"This does not necessarily involve stumping the country, waving banners, and screaming campaign slogans at political gatherings," says one Midwest county chairman. "The serious, interested woman working in small groups within her own block, precinct or ward may be far more influential."

The Commission on Registration and Voting Participation appointed by President Kennedy in 1961, agreed that "stirring people up is the best tradition of American politics and we commend the practice of well-organized, comprehensive register-and-vote campaigns."

To make the greatest use of their vote potential, women must vote in a bloc, something they have not yet done. No single proposal has ever been proved to be entirely a woman's issue. Then, too, many women resent the suggestion of a women's bloc, protesting that women are as individual in their thinking as men and should not be lumped as a statistical mass.

The women who do not vote at all, who give no consideration to this facet of their citizenship, who close their ears and eyes to all things political, do make up a women's bloc whether they realize it or not. And if in sufficient numbers, they may permit a candidate to be elected by just not voting.

In Australia, eligible citizens can be fined for failing to vote. Americans have only their consciences to get them to the polls.

"The privilege of the vote for women was earned by a noble group of heroic women fighting surprising odds," says Mrs. Dorothy A. Elston, president of the National Federation of Republican Women. "The least we can do is keep the torch of liberty alight. We owe it to ourselves and them to vote."

Today, when women outnumber men, live longer, own more property, and handle more money, they also share a great responsibility in Government, a responsibility that must be fulfilled at the polls.

A Bill To Amend Public Law 874, Federal Impact Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of this session we leave some very important unfinished business.

One of the laws needing serious study and amendment is the so-called Federal impact aid bill, which pays Federal funds to school districts impacted by Federal peoples and properties.

In this regard I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following news release on H.R. 12670 as well as the full text of this proposed act for the information of the membership of the House.

With 306 out of 435 Members of this House representing districts receiving this type of aid it is imperative that all of us understand the proposals fully.

The material follows:

Congressman JOHN H. DENT, Democrat of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education of the U.S. House of Representatives, introduced a new bill, H.R. 12670, for the purpose of amending Public Law 874, commonly known as the Federal impacted aid law.

This legislation as now written extends Federal aid presumably to those areas injured taxwise by the activities of Federal installations and the excessive influx of Federal employees' families into school districts.

Congressman DENT, after a series of hearings and extensive studies on the Federal impact problems, believes that in a substantial number of areas the impacted conditions caused by Federal activities benefit the total economy of the communities involved rather than injure them.

Impact payments under the present law are based on the loss of taxes from real property which has been removed from local tax rolls due to Federal activities. Based on this formula, many of the school districts which have excellent financial positions are receiving this assistance while a much larger number of needy school districts are unable to qualify for these funds. This new proposal of the Congressman will not injure any school district presently receiving Federal impact assistance but will simply permit school districts, which are impacted as a result of the presence of certain federally connected needy children, to qualify for this aid.

In his new bill, H.R. 12670, Congressman DENT seeks to broaden the base of Public Law 874 to include new categories for elementary and secondary schools. The Congressman proposes to further schedule a series of "grassroots" hearings in a selected number of areas in order to fully crystallize the subcommittee's opinion on this important issue.

In recent hearings on this problem in Los Angeles, Calif., the subcommittee found that due to one of the inequities in the present law, Los Angeles failed to qualify for approximately $10 million because Public Law 874 requires that districts of over 35,000 children in average daily attendance must be federally impacted by a minimum of 6 percent—Los Angeles was impacted by only 5.6 percent. Practically all the $300-odd million appropriated last year for the impact program has been paid to small districts which under the present law qualify with an impact of as little as 3 percent while larger communities with far more federally connected children, numerically, have been denied any assistance under the present program.

The Congressman pointed out this same type of restriction existed in the Library Services Act until he introduced a bill and successfully guided it through Congress which removed restrictive features and included all libraries on a fair and equitable basis.

Mr. DENT said that his new bill, H.R. 12670, will amend Public Law 874:

(1) To recognize the Federal connection for school district payment purposes of:

(a) Children of school age on whose behalf parents are currently receiving payments under the Aid to Dependent Children welfare program.

(b) Children of persons residing in local school districts who have exhausted their entitlement to unemployment compensation.

(c) Children of persons residing in the local school districts who received payments pursuant to titles, I, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act for a period of 6 or more months during the previous fiscal year.

(2) The bill provides that if the number of children of school age in one or more of these three new categories and the old category "B" (during the previous fiscal year) is 10 or more and amounts to 5 percent or more of the total number of children who were in daily average attendance during the fiscal year for which payment is being sought, the local educational agency would be entitled to a payment for each child equal to 25 percent of the payment made under Public Law 874 for a child whose parent both works and lives on Federal property (category "A" children).

H.R. 12670

A bill to amend Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, relating to assistance for schools in federally affected areas, to provide assistance in certain cases on account of children in needy families

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is further amended as follows:

(a) Section 3(a) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of computing the amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall determine the total number of children who were in the membership of the schools of such agency at any time during the previous fiscal year and for whom such agency provided free public education and who, while in attendance at such schools, resided on Federal property and (1) did so with a parent employed on Federal property situated in whole or in part in the same State as the school district of such agency or situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency, or (2) had a parent who was on active duty in the uniformed services (as defined in section 101 of title 37, United States Code)."

(b) Section 3(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the purpose of computing the amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall also determine the total number of children (other than children to whom subsection (a) applies) who were in the membership of the schools of such agency at any time during the previous fiscal year and for whom such agency provided free public education and who, while in attendance at such schools, either resided on Federal property, or resided with a parent employed on Federal property situated in whole or in part in the same State as such agency or situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency. A child of a parent who commenced residing in or near the school district of such agency while assigned to employment, as a member of the Armed Forces (as defined in section 101 of title 37, United States Code) on active duty, on Federal property (situated in whole or in part in the same State as the school district of such agency or within reasonable commuting distance from such school district) and who was subsequently assigned elsewhere on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces, shall continue to be considered as residing with a parent employed on such Federal property for so long as the parent is so assigned elsewhere."

(c) Paragraph (1) of section 3(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) The amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for any fiscal year shall be an amount equal to (A) the local contribution rate (determined under subsection (d)) multiplied by (B) the sum of the number of children determined under subsection (a) and one-quarter of the sum of (i) the number of children determined under subsection (b), (ii) the number of dependent children residing in the local school district for whom payments pursuant to title IV of the Social Security Act were made for a period of three or more months during the previous fiscal year, (iii) the number of children of persons residing in the local school district whose entitlement to unemployment compensation under State law or title XV of the Social Security Act was exhausted during the previous fiscal year, and (iv) the number of children of persons residing in the local school district who received public assistance grants under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act for six months or more during the previous fiscal year. In determining the number of children for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) and of this paragraph, the Commissioner may rely on a certification of the number of children to be counted by the State or local educational agency official or official administering the applicable Social Security Act program or State unemployment compensation program."

(d) Paragraph (2) of section 3(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) No local educational agency shall be entitled to receive any payment for a fiscal year with respect to a number of children determined under subsection (a) unless the number of children determined for the previous fiscal year is ten or more. No local educational agency shall be entitled to receive any payment for a fiscal year with respect to a number of children determined under subsection (b) and clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) of subsection (c) unless the number of children determined for the previous fiscal year is ten or more, amounts to 5 per centum or more of the total number of children who were in average daily attendance during the fiscal year for which payment is sought and for whom such agency provided free public education, except that such 5 per centum requirement need not be met by such agency for any period of two fiscal years which follows a fiscal year during which such agency was entitled to payment under the provisions of this section, but the payment, under the provisions of this section to such agency for the second fiscal year of any such two-year period during which such requirement is not met, shall be reduced by 50 per centum of the amount thereof. However, the Commissioner may waive the 5 per centum condition of entitlement wherever, in his judgment, exceptional circumstances exist which would make the application of such condition inequitable and would defeat the purposes of this Act."

(e) Paragraph (3) of section 3(c) is repealed.

(f) Paragraph (5) of section 3(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) No payment shall be made to a local educational agency if the Commissioner determines that for the preceding fiscal year the State has reduced its contributions to the school district of that local educational agency because of Federal contributions under this Act."

(g) Section 4(a) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) If the Commissioner determines for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1965—

"(1) that, as a direct result of activities of the United States (carried on either directly or through a contractor) an increase has occurred in the number of children who were in the membership of the schools of any local educational agency at any time during the previous fiscal year, which increase so resulting from activities of the United States is equal to at least 5 per centum of the difference between the number of children who were in the membership of the schools of such agency during the second preceding fiscal year and the number of such children whose attendance during such first previous fiscal year resulted from activities of the United States (including children who resided on Federal property or with a parent employed on Federal property);

"(2) that such activities of the United States have placed on such agency a substantial and continuing financial burden; and

"(3) that such agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance but is unable to secure sufficient funds to meet the increased educational costs involved,

then such agency shall be entitled to receive for such fiscal year an amount equal to the product of—

"(A) the number of children which the Commissioner determines to be the increase, so resulting from activities of the United States, in membership during such previous fiscal year; and

"(B) the amount which the Commissioner determines to be the current expenditures per child necessary to provide free public education to such additional children during such year, minus the amount which the Commissioner determines to be available from State, local, and Federal sources for such purpose (not counting as available for such purpose either payments under this Act or funds from local sources necessary to provide free public education to other children).

Any payment which such agency would otherwise be entitled to receive under section 3 for the next fiscal year (except where the determination under the preceding sentence has been made with respect to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965) shall be reduced by the amount of the payment under this subsection for the preceding fiscal year. The determination under clause (B) shall be made by the Commissioner after considering the current expenditures per child in providing free public education in those school districts in the State which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, are generally comparable to the school district of the local educational agency for which the computation is being made."

(h) Section 9 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(11) The membership of schools shall be determined in accordance with State law or, in the absence of State law governing such a determination, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner; except that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, where the local educational agency of the school district in which any child resides makes or contracts to make a tuition payment for the free public education of such child in a school situated in another school district, for purposes of this Act the membership of such child shall be held and considered—

"(A) if the two local educational agencies concerned so agree, and if such agreement is approved by the Commissioner, as membership of a school of the local educational agency receiving such tuition payment;

"(B) in the absence of any such approved agreement, as membership of a school of the local educational agency so making or contracting to make such tuition payment.

In any determination of membership of schools, children who are not provided free public education (as defined in paragraph (4)) shall not be counted."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect July 1, 1965.

Keynote Address by Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon, at 1964 Republican National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the keynote address delivered by the Honorable Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon, a great American and Governor, and an outstanding leader of the Republican Party, at the Republican National Convention in San Francisco, July 13, 1964.

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

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION OF 1964—KEYNOTE ADDRESS

(By Mark O. Hatfield, temporary chairman, Governor of Oregon, San Francisco, July 13, 1964)

Governor Smylie, Chairman Miller, my fellow citizens, we must meet here to nominate the next President of the United States. Our platform and our candidate will have the support of a united Republican Party. And let me say to each and every Republican we cannot afford the luxury of the handsitters in the parlor, we need laborers in the vineyard come November, and the candidate of this convention will have such laborers from every Republican throughout the United States.

We promise no miracles, but we believe that the responsibility of our Republican Party is to seek liberation of mind and body and spirit and to call up the best America has to offer.

The Republican Party is committed to a set of principles. This commitment is an act of unwavering faith in the American people in the cause of freedom, in the eternal

principles of morality, and there is a stark contrast in the record of the present administration. In place of the faith we find fear. Anxieties and tensions infect and corrupt our country. At least three fears have typified this administration: fear of the facts; fear of the future; fear of the people.

The fear of the facts is most clearly revealed by the coverup. The refusal of the Senate majority, under administration pressure, to examine fully the questionable actions of a Senate employee violates the solemn pledge of the Democratic platform of 1960. It said in a very simple sentence:

"The conflict-of-interest statutes should be revised and strengthened to assure the Federal service of maximum security against unethical practices on the part of public officials."

You cannot sweep a hi-fi set under the rug and expect the bulge not to show. The Republican Party strongly believes that America should be a land of opportunity and not a land of opportunists. But the most telling examples of this administration's fear of the facts goes back 4 years. That was when the party of fear and failure adopted a platform that consisted of 20,000 words and 261 promises, and we are still waiting for over 200 of these promises to be fulfilled. Four years ago the Democratic candidate for Vice President declared:

"A platform is drawn up for submission to the voters. If the voters approve of it, they will make their decisions known forcefully in November and it is the duty of the party to carry out the decision in the following Congresses."

Now, my friends, what we did not fully realize at that time was that the candidate for Vice President of the United States was standing with one foot on the banks of the Rio Grande and the other foot on the banks of the Potomac, and that in these two postures we find that his national foot pointed toward school integration. His State foot pointed toward school segregation. His national foot pointed and advocated the repeal of State right-to-work laws, whereas his State foot endorsed a right-to-work law as "necessary." I say to you that one cannot dance for long on two platforms without stubbing his toe. And is it any wonder that the speeches we have been hearing from the White House dancer sound as if they come from a man of two minds? We only have the record to point to. In 1960 we heard about a missile gap. The Nation was told that our advantage in missile leadership was shrinking. The fact is there was no missile gap. Today, however, there is a missile gap from Cuba to Key West, and it is 90 miles wide.

And so we say to the American people: Don't be fooled by an administration which is a master of destruction and whose snow jobs had changed the climate in Washington.

We ask you: Was it a Republican administration that presided over the fiasco at the Bay of Pigs? (Chorus of "no.")

Was it a Republican administration that neutralized Laos and so initiated the chain of events that threatens freedom throughout all of southeast Asia? (Chorus of "no.")

And I ask you: Was it a Republican administration that ignored the problem in Panama until it erupted into rioting and bloodshed? (Chorus of "no.")

Was it a Republican administration in power when the Berlin Wall was built? (Chorus of "no.")

You know and all Americans know that these things have happened under the misrule of the opposition in the past 4 years. With such a record it is not surprising that this administration fears the future. It relies on the panacea of the past, especially the midthirties; its record is one of reaction, not of progress, and more than a century ago we were warned that every progressive spirit is opposed by 1,000 men appointed to guard the past—and this administration, I say, has no progressive spirit in it. The current administration finds in automation not the elimination of drudgery and the foundation for a higher standard of living, but only the threat of unemployment and poverty. The current administration finds in the fantastic expansion of our agricultural capacity not the blessing of relief from hunger but a reactionary excuse for expanding bureaucratic regulation.

The current administration should wage a war on poverty of its own ideas. Wed as it is to the past, the administration will learn that the complexities of the present cannot be met by a simple passage of a bill in Congress or by the spending of large sums of money on ill-considered programs that deal only with the symptoms and not the causes, and by sloganeering and headline-hunting, stage-managed expeditions whose essential purpose is publicity rather than action.

Herbert Hoover, a great Republican and one of the world's greatest humanitarians—and may I always say to any Republican in an American audience, my boyhood hero 30 years ago made this very eloquent statement of the Republican Party's faith in the future when he said: "Advancing thought, science, discovery, and invention are constantly imposing new surroundings upon us. Constant reform is an essential part of the protection of liberty, and society, to be successful, must secure the effort and the initiative of its citizens." These were Hoover's words 30 years ago that are as appropriate today as they were when they were stated.

And so I say to you, this Nation cannot afford to follow the banners of retreat and reaction. This Republic needs new leadership—leadership that is unafraid of the future. We need to ponder—and seriously—what 4 more years of reluctant backing into tomorrow would do to this Nation.

We need leadership that does not evidence fear of the facts or fear of the future or fear of the people. Time and again this administration has revealed distrust of us all. Why, why do they fear telling the American people what our foreign policy is? Even when American boys are dying in a war without a name. Tragic as is a tomb for an unknown soldier, still more tragic is the fate of the unknowing soldier, whose life may be lost in a battle the purpose of which he has not been told and which he is not allowed to either win or to conclude.

On the domestic front the administration's fear of the people is demonstrated by its lack of confidence in the capacity of the individual to manage his own affairs. In its lack of faith in the capacity of State and local government to deal with State and local problems, and in the capacity of our free institutions to adapt to the challenge of change. The banner behind this podium is the answer that we Republicans make to those who would have us believe that the State should be the master instead of the servant. The Republican Party offers America a choice, a choice between fear and faith. The Republican Party with its devotion to the principles of Lincoln, with its dedication to the cause of freedom, exemplified by the service of Dwight David Eisenhower, with its century-old tradition of progress, and with the commitment to the principles of morality, we offer America a program of faith.

We have faith in the value of our open society where people of many lands, minorities all, have migrated to these shores, each has added richly to the cultural diversity that makes this the unique Nation in all the world.

We have faith as the historic party of human rights that for those minorities which do not now have equal opportunity for education, for employment, for housing, we can find the means of assuring to each of these the requirements of progress.

We have faith in our capacity to defend human rights against the forces of bigotry and hate within our own country. With the authors of the Declaration of Independence we know that the rights of men are endowed by their Creator. They are not bestowed by men. The State is not the author of freedom. The State has a duty, however, to support and defend civil rights, the political rights, the rights of opportunity that some men in defiance of the Creator would destroy.

We have faith in the forces of law and order under our Constitution. Our faith challenges any who would destroy freedom whether they wrap themselves in a false cloak of patriotism or an equally false cloak of religion. There are bigots in this Nation who spew forth their venom of hate. They parade under hundreds of labels, including the Communist Party, the Ku Klux Klan, and the John Birch Society. They must be overcome, and the Republican Party—and the Republican Party will lead the quest for victory in the struggle to change the minds and hearts of men, because it is only by such a victory that human dignity will be won and preserved.

We have faith that the American Nation and system will prevail against the Communist menace that stalks and threats to bury us and against the Fascist that lurks and threatens to capture us. We oppose both dangers in the Republican Party. And, we have the energy, the knowledge of the enemy, and the faith in freedom that will maintain our liberty against either danger.

We have faith in the Republican Party in our educational system, as the foundation of self-government, as the mainspring of economic progress, as the source of brain power for the defense of the state.

We have faith in the free enterprise system in the Republican Party. And let me remind you that capitalism in the United States has brought us to the highest standard of living in the history of the world, to the common inter-partnership of the worker, the investor, and the consumer.

We have faith in the working man and the working woman of America, their skill, and their productivity. We share their aspirations and support their right to organize and to bargain for their economic benefit.

We have faith in our ability to find the means of distribution that will assure that hunger is not the neighbor of surplus.

We have faith in the strength America draws from her natural resources. We support the programs of conservation and development, initiated in the administration of Theodore Roosevelt.

We have faith in our capacity to help those who are in their senior years to avoid the ironic hardship imposed by the bitter harvest of inflation.

We have faith in our Federal system, as in a nation as complex as ours it is a necessity, but more than this, it permits us to solve our problems in a way that no monolithic national government could do.

We have faith in our Nation's capacity for leadership of the free world and in the capacity of all free nations to find the means, including the work of the United Nations, for achieving a world that is truly free.

We have faith in the programs of assistance to other nations, if only the aid that we offer demonstrates vision, certainty of purpose and a clear understanding of our needs as well as their needs. But the most fundamental faith of the Republican Party and of all Americans must be in the strength of our religious heritage and the need for a spiritual renaissance in our country.

A decade ago a great Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, pointed to the central role of a righteous and dynamic faith. He said, "All else avails us little. The lack can-

not be compensated for by politicians, however able, by diplomats, however astute, or by scientists, however inventive, or by bombs, however powerful. Our greatest need is to regain confidence in our spiritual heritage." John Foster Dulles said this.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, government is not in the business of dispensing religion. However, government by its example shares in the setting of the moral standards of this Nation. To hold a political title does not excuse the holder from high standards of ethics and morality. If this Nation's leaders do not demonstrate integrity of ideas, integrity of action, they will surely destroy the moral standards that guard us from decay, and each political leader owes, especially to the youth of this Nation, an example of right conduct.

Every citizen is entitled to expect that his political leaders will, by their political and personal behavior, add luster to a free government. We need leaders with the certainty of faith and the commitment of purpose of the valiant few at Valley Forge who won their battle for us against overwhelming odds.

The political party assembled here tonight faces similar odds, but we have as our strength faith in the people, faith in the future, and we do not fear the facts. In the program of the Republican Party is a victory for all Americans, Republicans, Democrats, Independents, and it is to them that we present the invitation to set out again on a pilgrimage of faith. In this faith, in this commitment, in this hour of solemn rededication, this convention must display the wisdom, the progressive spirit, and the leadership that is so desperately required by all who would be free. Thank you.

Apportionment Compromise Quickly Rebuffed by Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch, that great Capital City daily of the State of Ohio, has in its lead editorial of its issue of September 27, 1964, in a clear and convincing manner set forth the result of the weak and ineffective apportionment compromise adopted in the other body last week.

How will the majority of Members of the other body, particularly the Members from States west of the Mississippi, explain and justify their votes if irrigation, reclamation, flood control, and hydroelectric power districts begin to topple and fall under the slogan of "one man, one vote."

I need not tell my Ohio colleagues, in fact I need not tell well over half my colleagues of the House that the series of Supreme Court decisions on apportionment of State legislatures is one of the major campaign issues of 1964.

Mr. Speaker, I should like for the spokesman, or spokesmen, for the majority in the other body to tell us just why he or they refuse to give the people, from whom all power finally comes, of the 50 States their duly elected representatives time to consider nullifying the Supreme Court-made law, which overturned 173 years of unquestioned State constitutional provisions for legislative apportionment by a divided court.

The editorial follows:

APPORTIONMENT COMPROMISE QUICKLY REBUFFED BY COURT

The accuracy of Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN'S charge that the weak compromise on legislative reapportionment approved Thursday by the Senate is "not worth the paper it is written on" and will have no effect whatever on the Federal courts was quickly demonstrated.

One of the special three-judge Federal panels to which the U.S. Supreme Court has delegated speedy enforcement of its highly controverted decision of last June 15 has arbitrarily ordered cancellation of a November 3 election in Connecticut for members of a new General Assembly and directed that the present general assembly reconvene after the election and as soon as posible enact a reapportionment formula acceptable to the high bench.

The compromise finally accepted by a weary Senate, anxious to adjourn, was quickly passed after Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD withdrew his support for the stronger amendment he had cosponsored with Senator DIRKSEN which would have required the courts to refrain from execution of reapportionment orders until January 1, 1966.

What the Senate did approve, by a significantly slim 44 to 38 margin, with 18 absentees, was merely a recommendation to the Supreme Court of the "sense of Congress" that it ought to allow States up to 6 months time to reapportion where this might be ordered, and to permit the next election of State legislatures to be held on the old basis.

The language of the compromise includes no stated or implied criticism of the Supreme Court, as did the first version, and is not binding in any way on the Federal judiciary.

Enactment of the compromise, which its critics have correctly called "meaningless," is a victory of sorts for the "liberal" wing of the Senate, for the Johnson administration and for a headstrong Supreme Court which obviously is bent on arrogating the functions of Congress to itself, thus upsetting the balance of authority in the tripartite government carefully prescribed by the Nation's Founding Fathers and violating the Constitution it is charged with defending as well as interpreting.

However, it was a victory achieved because of a combination of absenteeism, the pressures on the Senate to adjourn so as to allow time for electioneering in a crucial year, and the feeling on the part of Senate Democrats that action on the foreign aid bill, to which the amendment was attached as a rider, simply could not be longer delayed.

It could prove to be a hollow triumph, another instance of how it is possible to win a battle and still lose a war. It is inconceivable that the issue will not be raised again and perhaps even more strongly, in the next session of Congress in the form of action on the flood of stronger remedial bills and proposed constitutional amendments designed to stay the Supreme Court's hand.

Meantime, nevertheless the mischief which the Senate's temporary surrender can precipitate has been graphically illustrated by the flat handed the State of Connecticut on the same day that the surrender took place.

It was an act which lends further credence to the charges voiced by critics of the Supreme Court's reapportionment rulings and its almost frantic haste to enforce them, that the basic motive behind the Court's reckless course is baldly political.

Acquisition of Land by the Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, from June 1963, the time when the Tennessee Valley Authority was assigned the responsibility of developing the Between-the-Lakes recreation area in western Kentucky, many allegations have been made concerning the TVA's disposal of lands determined to be excess to the Agency's requirements. Specifically, it is charged that the TVA acquires land, under eminent domain, at a low price, and later disposes of it at a high price.

Dr. John C. Quertermous, of Murray, Ky., in a letter dated September 15 has provided me with documentary evidence of the TVA's acquisition of 24.7 acres for about $12 an acre in 1941, and the subsequent sale of 16.99 of these acres to individuals for about $326 an acre in 1946. I call this material to the attention of the Senate, in view of the generally expressed dissatisfaction with early acquisitions of land for the recreation project.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Quertermous' letter of September 15, 1964, and the affidavit of the Honorable D. W. Shoemaker, clerk of Calloway County Court, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and the affidavit were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN C. QUERTERMOUS, M.D.,
Murray, Ky., September 15, 1964.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Senator, Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORTON: These extracts from deed indicate that in 1941 TVA took 24.7 acres of land from the William Mason estate of $273.91 or a little less than $12 an acre.

In 1945 TVA started selling this land off as "surplus" and within a year had sold 16.99 acres to individuals for $5,525 or about $326 an acre.

The family it was taken from was fortunate enough to be able to buy back 3.02 acres of this land for $1,300. Other families less wealthy and less politically powerful were not able to buy their land back even at six times the rate TVA paid for it originally.

Mr. Wagner has stated in the press that TVA is not involved in real estate or speculation—this evidence, which can be re-presented hundreds of times along the shores of the Kentucky Lake, proves that TVA is not unaccustomed to dealing in real estate in a very profitable manner.

It doesn't take much intelligence to use the power of eminent domain in this way and create the appearance of shrewd management.

It would be a source of some small gratification to those forced out of the Barkley Lake "recreation" area if TVA were prevented from repeating this maneuver over there. It seems appropriate that if TVA finds it has some "surplus" property, or property it wants developed privately it be required by law to

offer it back to the original owner at the same price it was appropriated for.

Very truly yours,

JOHN C. QUERTERMOUS, M.D.

AFFIDAVIT—STATE OF KENTUCKY, COUNTY OF CALLOWAY

I, D. W. Shoemaker, clerk of Calloway County Court, being first duly sworn according to law, state:

That as clerk, I am the recorder of all deeds conveying Calloway County property.

That there is of official record in my office in Murray, Calloway County, Ky., the following deeds:

In deed book 69, at page 485, a deed from William Mason Memorial Hospital Association to United States of America (TVA) conveying 24.7 acres of land for the consideration of $273.91, that this deed is dated the 24th day of April 1941.

In deed book 81, at page 510, a deed from the United States of America (TVA) to Patricia M. Drake (who is the daughter of William Mason) conveying lot No. 42 consisting of 1.59 acres for the consideration of $300, that this deed is dated the 24th day of July 1946. The source of title for this lot is the deed from William Mason Hospital Association.

In deed book 81, at page 514, a deed from the United States of America (TVA) to Ora K. Mason (wife of William Mason), conveying lots No. 43, containing 2.02 acres and lot No. 45, containing 1.43 acres for a consideration of $1,000, and that said deed is dated the 27th day of June 1946. The source of title for this lot is the deed from William Mason Hospital Association.

In deed book 85, at page 26, a deed from the United States of America (TVA) to George Klamen conveying lot No. 32 containing 0.78 acre and lot No. 40 containing 6.05 acres for a consideration of $950, and that said deed is dated the 27th day of June 1946. The source of title for this lot is the deed from William Mason Hospital Association.

In deed book 85, at page 77, a deed from the United States of America (TVA) to Robert A. Orr conveying lot No. 48 containing 2.37 acres for a consideration of $650, and that said deed is dated the 27th day of June 1946. The source of title for this lot is a deed from Robert B. Holland and the William Mason Hospital Association.

In deed book 85, at page 73, a deed from the United States of America (TVA) to James T. Fuller conveying 2.57 acres for a consideration of $850, and that said deed is dated the 27th day of June 1946. The source of title for this lot is a deed from Robert B. Holland and from the William Mason Hospital Association.

In Deed Book 85, at page 69, a deed from the United States of America (TVA) to Albert G. Wilson conveying Lot No. 49 containing 2.18 acres for a consideration of $600, and that said deed is dated the 27th day of June 1946. The source of title for this lot is a deed from Robert B. Holland, from Aubrey T. Moore, from Lovie Sheridan, and from the William Mason Hospital Association.

In Deed Book 85, at page 262, a deed from the United States of America (TVA) to Betty Beale conveying lot No. 39 containing 0.74 acre for a consideration of $350, and that said deed is dated the 27th day of June 1946. The source of title for this lot is a deed from Carter O. Brandon and the William Mason Hospital Association.

In Deed Book 85, at page 383, a deed from the United States of America (TVA) to Christine C. Reynolds conveying lot No. 46 containing 1.36 acres for the consideration of $750, and that said deed is dated the 27th day of June 1946. The source of title for this lot is a deed from Robert B. Holland and the William Mason Hospital Association.

In Deed Book 109, at page 264, a deed from the United States of America (TVA) to Wallace H. Spradling conveying lot No. 41 containing 3.97 acres for a consideration of $275, and that said deed is dated the 27th day of June 1946. The source of title for this lot is a deed from the William Mason Hospital Association.

Further, the affiant sayeth not.

D. W. SHOEMAKER,
Clerk, Calloway County Court.

State of Kentucky, County of Calloway, ss.

I, Robert O. Miller, notary public of and for the county and State of aforesaid, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing affidavit which was duly signed and acknowledged and sworn to before me in Calloway County, Ky., this the 15th day of July 1964.

ROBERT O. MILLER,
Notary Public, Calloway County, Ky.

My commission expires the 19th day of April 1967.

Address by Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Executive Secretary, National Aeronautics and Space Council

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, recently the distinguished Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, Dr. Edward C. Welsh, gave an address in the city of Philadelphia, to help honor the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on its sixth anniversary and to preview the man-in-space exhibition.

I am pleased to insert the timely remarks of Dr. Welsh in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS BY DR. EDWARD C. WELSH, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

It is a pleasure and a privilege to be here this evening. I was honored to be invited by both your distinguished mayor and the president of the chamber of commerce of this great metropolitan area. To my way of thinking, that adds up to a very special sort of invitation. In addition, I am pleased to help honor NASA on its sixth anniversary and also to preview the man-in-space exhibition at the commercial museum.

SPACE EXHIBITION

I understand that the exhibition is impressive. I am confident that it marks a forward-looking step. It is evident that far-sighted civic leaders have realized that this great new space era is here to stay and hence they have thoughtfully planned to enlighten the community on the progress being attained. It is such a current field, however, that we must wait for part of the history to be made before the evidence can be displayed. The developments in space are so amazing that even the most active imagination has difficulty keeping ahead of the accomplishments. I want to congratulate the city of Philadelphia for its museum and particularly for this new space exhibit. I also congratulate NASA for its role in making this exhibit possible.

MISCONCEPTIONS

The space program has many mysterious aspects, not the least of which are the misconceptions created about it. It takes a certain type of ability to manufacture plausible-sounding myths, and unfortunately such ability has been working overtime regarding the space program. I would take a few minutes of your time to examine several of these confusing rumors about our space effort.

1. National security

First of all, we are told that our space activity is all directed toward going to the moon while neglecting our military competence. The facts do not support that accusation. For example, during the last 21 months, we have put more than 100 payloads into earth orbit, of which about 80 percent were put there by the Department of Defense. I hasten to add that this in no way plays down the significance of the NASA launches. It is cited merely to give a factual account of the amount of defense activity in our space program.

Moreover, less than half of our total space expenditures go to what is loosely referred to as the "lunar venture." I say "loosely" because most of what is being devoted to the lunar project would be spent to develop space competence even if there were no goal of a manned trip to the moon. Do not be misled by those who would have you believe that we are spending $20 billion just to put a man on the moon. The fact is that the $20 billion figure includes the cost of developing large rockets and sophisticated spacecraft which will have many uses, only one of which is the lunar trip. The $20 billion figure also includes the Gemini project, which is devoted to extending our experience and increasing our competence in manned space flight in earth orbit, including the rendezvous and docking of two spacecraft. These developments in rockets, spacecraft, rendezvous and docking, tracking, etc.—all contribute to a strong national security base for keeping the peace, not for aggression.

The fact is that the Department of Defense is annually spending about $1½ billion in space research and development. This includes projects in navigation, communications, observation, detection, booster development, scientific instrumentation, command and control techniques, interception, and manned and unmanned space flight. In addition, various space projects of NASA, the AEC, and the Weather Bureau contribute directly or indirectly to improving our national security.

One of the outstanding features of our national space program is the close and efficient working relationship between NASA and the Department of Defense. This interface includes the exchange of personnel, the sharing of scientific and technical knowledge, and the use by one agency of the boosters and spacecraft developed by the other. The critic who belittles what is being done in space to strengthen the Nation's defense is either ignorant, irresponsible, or both. This does not mean that I am satisfied with the rate of progress, but I do accept facts as facts. Progress of a substantial nature is being made in strengthening our national security through space competence.

2. Crash program

A second misconception which cannot stand exposure to factual analysis is the assertion that we have a "crash" program in space. Of course, anyone who knows anything about crash program would never talk that way. Crash programs have unlimited funds, unlimited overtime, and parallel approaches to the end objective. None of these aspects applies to the space program or even to the lunar project. Funds are not unlimited; overtime does not characterize the activity; and a single approach to the lunar trip is being followed. Moreover, the speed of the program is geared to getting the most progress per dollar spent rather than the most progress in the shortest period of time. Whether we should or should not have a crash program is a different question, but to assert that we do have one is to deny the facts and distort the truth.

3. Either/or philosophy

A third misconception about our space program flows from those whose reasoning is handicapped by what might be called the "either/or" philosophy. In the simplest terms, this concept is that we can have either a space program or better educational advantages, but not both; that we can have either a space program or a slum elimination program, but not both; that we can have either a space program or a program to care for the elderly and the ill, but not both. It is my belief that most people who hold such narrow views are opposed to progress in general rather than specifically opposed to space exploration. They probably would not vote more money for education or public housing even if they could curtail the space program. They might be known as the "fiscally responsible" type of individuals at whose hands this country's health has suffered before. They are the type who let us get behind the Soviets in space while at the same time we were experiencing recessions and very slow economic growth. We already know that path well enough and do not plan to travel it again.

No realist believes that this country cannot afford to invest in our national security and in technological progress just because we are not investing enough in some other phases of our economy. Actually, investments stimulate other investments; they do not deter them. This is not an either/or proposition, i.e., schools or space. Rather, the one helps the other. Both are needed and both can be afforded. What is more, decreased spending in education, for example, does not automatically increase the funds available for space exploration, or vice versa. We cannot afford to neglect any of the basic essentials, including space exploration, if we are to continue to be the world's leading peace-loving and freedom-loving nation.

4. Slowdown

A fourth misconception is that we should slow down the program and thereby save money. At first blush, this "what's the hurry?" philosophy may sound reasonable. In fact, the proposition has only two things wrong with it. First, such an approach would be of great benefit to the Soviets as it would make it easier for them to increase their lead in some aspects of space and attain the lead in others. Do not think for a moment that they are not trying hard to do just that. So far this year, the U.S.S.R. has put more than twice as many spacecraft into orbit as they had put into orbit by this time last year. In a sense, they are doubling their space effort. The second thing wrong with the slowdown approach is that it doesn't save money; it wastes it. To slow down a carefully planned project, such as Apollo, would be to increase its cost and reduce its likelihood of timely success. Key to the waste involved is the breakup of highly competent teams of scientists, engineers, and managers. Key also to the waste is the resultant idleness of facilities rather than their full use. Those who propose the stretchout or slowdown in the space program are in fact arguing for inefficiency and higher costs as well as delayed accomplishments.

SPACE RACE

Now that we have sharpened our awareness that the space program is making a major contribution to our national security; is not a crash program; is not being pursued at the expense of other primary objectives; and cannot be slowed down without raising costs and benefiting the Soviets,

I would turn your attention briefly to how we stand in the space race.

1. As regards that key feature: booster power, the Soviets are still ahead on an operational basis, although we are moving up rapidly, having attained the current weight-lifting record on a test shot by the Saturn I.

2. We have placed almost three times as many payloads into earth orbit, while they continue each year to increase their absolute lead in total weight of net payloads orbited.

3. Our numerical progress in orbiting payloads is impressive. Since January 1963, the United States has put more payloads into earth orbit than the U.S.S.R. has since Sputnik I in 1957.

4. The increased reliability of our launchings is also impressive. During the past 3 years, we placed successfully into earth orbit about 85 percent of all the payloads which we attempted to put there. The Soviet record, while not identical, is comparable.

5. The Soviet heavy Vostok class of vehicle has accumulated more than 2,500 orbits, as compared with 37 for our smaller Mercury. In flying time, even their female cosmonaut has gained more orbital experience than all our astronauts combined. Gemini, Apollo, and MOL may well correct that imbalance, but at the present we are well behind.

6. The Soviets have devoted more of their attention to deep space than we have. As a percentage of total space launching attempts, they have devoted four times as much effort to escape-missions to the moon and planets as we have. The opposite is true as to near-earth orbits, in which our emphasis has been much greater than theirs.

7. Both countries have made impressive strides in accumulating scientific data about space. We may even be ahead in this regard, but, if so, the margin is not large.

8. The United States is clearly ahead in worldwide sharing of space research in cooperative programs, and in direct application of space technology to practical use in communications, weather reporting, geodesy, and navigation. I want to emphasize that the Soviets have a strong, orderly program, with every indication that it is continuing vigorously, apparently unaffected by adverse economic factors in their country. Wishful thinking to the contrary, we dare not slow down unless we are willing to pay the exorbitant price of second place. We have made very impressive progress in the past several years. Our gains have been encouraging.

THE FUTURE

And now I would glance with you at what the space program may look like in the future. Keep firmly in mind that the program is here to stay and that its trend will be one of expansion rather than contraction.

Application of space-oriented knowledge will increase at an increasing rate. Weather prediction and possibly even weather control will save vast amounts of property and thousands of lives annually. Communication by satellites will link the nations of the world closer together and aid in the sharing of knowledge, the conducting of business, and the avoidance of international misunderstandings and disputes. New materials, new products, new processes will flow from the space program to raise our standard of living. Our national security will be enhanced as satellites contribute to our alertness to what other nations are doing, contribute to the observance of treaties, and divert competitive energies from earth-bound aggression to peaceful competition in limitless space. Our knowledge of the earth's origin will be greatly increased and our education stimulated.

As for space projects, we will explore the moon, not just visit it; we will explore the planets, not just fly by them; space laboratories will be generally accepted as extensions of laboratories here on earth; and spacecraft and space rockets will be recoverable and reusable.

It is my thesis that we are entering such a period of prosperity, technical opportunity, and social progress that our previous accomplishments will pale by comparison. The vitality of the space program will contribute immensely to this building of a greater society.

As President Johnson has said: "Seldom in its lifetime is a country fortunate enough to be confronted with such a challenge as that of the national space program. It enables our people to devote their skills, their courage, their initiative, and their resources to a continuing series of projects which dwarf their imagination while enriching their country."

Which Trend in the Election?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD David Lawrence's editorial from the September 28 issue of the U.S. News & World Report.

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

WHICH TREND?
(By David Lawrence)

Do many people really believe either of the nominees for the Presidency is the best-qualified man in the United States to preside over the destinies of the American people in this critical period in world history? Yet each candidate has an enthusiastic following.

Many voters, on the other hand, while marking their ballots for either President Johnson or Senator GOLDWATER, will not feel they are endorsing a particular personality. They will be voting in favor of or against what they believe to be a definite trend in American affairs.

The American people will really be deciding between two trends of thought. Which viewpoint will the majority, rightly or wrongly, approve in the belief that it will save the country from depression and war?

One school of thought believes in borrowing $11 billion from the people, then giving it away as a reduction in taxes, and at the same time increasing governmental expenditures. Large sums are allocated to the areas where the most votes can be garnered.

This is the school of thought which accepts "pump-priming" and deficit spending as a necessary economic stimulus, hails the result as the greatest prosperity in history, and brushes aside as inapplicable and irrelevant the futile experience of the 1930's. Yet the artificial economics of that period caused millions of persons to suffer the hardships of an unemployment crisis which lasted 10 years.

This is the school of thought which believes that racial discrimination can be remedied by law and that both the States and the Federal Government have the right to tell a storekeeper what customers he shall serve, to tell a homeowner what prospective buyer he must accept, and to compel parents to send their children to schools many blocks away from home, even though there is a school building nearby in their own neighborhood. The plan is supposed to achieve "racial balance" in the educational system.

This is the school of thought which believes in trading with our enemy—Communist imperialism—despite its worldwide aggressions.

This is the school of thought which minimizes the significance of Soviet control of

Cuba, the Communist mischief-making in Vietnam which is costing the lives of American boys, and the Communist encouragement of armed uprisings in Africa and the Middle East and of disorders in Latin America.

This is the school of thought which believes that appeasement is expedient and necessary in foreign policy and that such things as principles and convictions based on the indelible facts of history are myths or unrealities.

Then there's the opposite school of thought, which believes in maintaining a solvent government and paying off Government bonds at maturity in dollars that are worth the same as when the securities were bought. For today we are confronted with a constantly depreciating dollar.

This is the school of thought which believes in equal rights but also equal responsibilities.

This is the school of thought which doesn't believe in special privilege, whether it takes the form of labor-union power or monopolistic practices by businesses.

This is the school of thought which would like to see a real war on the poverty that comes when wage-and-price inflation devalues the pension dollar and inflicts misery on the elderly and the disabled.

This is the school of thought which fears the collapse of the private-enterprise system and the substitution of an economy dominated by a centralized government—the forerunner of state socialism.

This is the school of thought which foresees an America plunged into a major war if appeasement continues to encourage the aggressor, as he is tempted to misconstrue our passion for peace as cowardice.

Which trend does the voter want? It matters less which personality is triumphant than which philosophy of government is to be accepted as the will of the majority of the American people.

Which trend will the successful candidate himself feel he must follow? And which trend sacrifices basic principles for a temporary victory? It was Woodrow Wilson who once said:

"I would rather fail in a cause that I know some day will triumph than to triumph in a cause that I know some day will fail."

Which candidate will face up to the fact that a government which runs in the red year after year eventually loses the confidence of the public—its lenders and its investors?

Shall we continue the gambles of political hypocrisy, along with its brainwashing techniques and preachments of unsound economics? Will the Nation realize in time that economic disaster at home and a disintegrating world situation could bring on the big war that nobody wants?

Which trend?

Bridgeport's Project for the Advancement of Youth Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting in the RECORD a detailed description of a project for the advancement of youth opportunity which is being undertaken by the people of Bridgeport in my district under the initiative of the Junior League of Bridgeport. I am so impressed by the work that is being done and by the way in which it is being carried out, through the contributions of many interested citizens and business firms, that I want to present the details of the program for all other Members to see.

The project is called YOU—Youth Opportunities Unlimited. It is an excellent name for it and I expect it will serve as a valuable model for other communities in the land:

THE JUNIOR LEAGUE OF BRIDGEPORT, INC.,
Fairfield, Conn., July 20, 1964.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SIBAL: As our Representative we felt that you would want to know about the Junior League of Bridgeport's 2-year demonstration project YOU, a program of opportunity for young people.

A nursery school will be conducted at Father Panik Village (an integrated housing project), enrichment and remedial reading program at Waltersville School (public elementary school of 1,200 pupils living in the lower East Side of Bridgeport), a careers program at Waltersville School and Father Panik Village, and a parent education discussion group of those whose children are enrolled in the nursery program.

The Junior League of Bridgeport's guaranteed financial commitment is $8,000 per year for 2 years. A bank account has been opened in the name of the Junior League of Bridgeport's Project YOU, and $8,000 has been deposited for this year's operating budget.

Anticipated allocation of the $8,000 for the first year of YOU paid in full by the Junior League:

Reading coordinator—primary responsibility is the reading developmental program at Waltersville School portion of time at nursery school	$6,400
Operating budget for reading coordinator to purchase materials for program at Waltersville School	100
Materials for language developmental programs for nurseries at Father Panik Village (20 pupils) and Mall Neighborhood House Day-Care Center	500
Enrichment program for 1,200 pupils at Waltersville School (for example, to take each child on just 1 educational bus trip would cost $600; 2,000 books for the library we are establishing would cost $6,000	855
Careers—8 evening programs at Father Panik Village on educational opportunities and careers for teenagers and parents; reference books for study lounge; bus trips to local industries and colleges	80
Parent discussion group—required of mothers of children who attend the Father Panik Nursery. The course will be based on the interest and needs of the parents, but a tentative plan for the course includes: demonstrations of homemakers' skills, how and what families can do together, field trips to places of educational value, library, museums	40
Community relations—film for slides depicting YOU for illustrated talks to civic clubs. Progress reports to advisory board, Community Chest, and council, mayor, Senators	25
Total cost	8,000

Items concerned directly with the nursery school teacher's being hired.

Nursery school teacher for Father Panik Village Nursery 3 mornings a week	$1,000
Equipment (amount does not include reading and language developmental equipment which the junior league will be purchasing) such as crayons, paper, clay, etc	200
Total deficit	1,200

Project YOU is a coordinated community effort of human renewal as evidenced by the following support and cooperation:

A. The Bridgeport Board of Education has (1) supplied a large room to establish library, exhibits, etc., for enrichment program at Waltersville School; (2) supplied reading specialists office at Waltersville; (3) Miss Anna Cain and Miss Dorothy Hanley have interviewed, with a junior league committee, all reading specialist candidates; (4) consultants—Miss Conroy and Dr. Humpreyville—will set up part of reading program and Mr. Silverstone and Dr. Mayer will help careers program for eighth graders; (5) supplied for library room fluorescent lights, floor tile, has painted, provided bookshelves, bulletin boards, librarian's desk, file, 6 library tables and 40 chairs, 1 round table for exhibits, globe; (6) board of education is also supplying fluorescent lighting, bulletin boards, blackboard, bookshelves, one round table for the nursery at Father Panik Village.

B. The Housing Authority of City of Bridgeport has (1) supplied a basement room (47 by 26½) for the nursery, building 24, Father Panik Village; (2) supplied four-room apartment, building 24; (3) apartment and nursery room have been painted and tile floor installed, 2 bathrooms and sink installed, 20 wooden lockers built and lighting installed; (4) heat and electricity will be supplied free, as well as maintenance.

C. Tenant Relations Association, Father Panik Village: (1) gave a bingo party to raise money for some of the furnishings for the apartment; (2) will make curtains for apartment.

D. Hall Neighborhood House: (1) supplied 20 chairs, 6 tables, tricycles, easels, and other equipment for the nursery at Father Panik Village; (2) Mr. Newman, Mrs. Hines, and Mrs. Arrington have held meetings with Junior League to discuss recruiting, screening, and program of nursery at Father Panik Village.

The following community agencies and groups have also been asked and have agreed to help Project YOU.

Inter-Group Council, Inc.: careers.

Connecticut State Employment, Baptist office: careers.

Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce: enrichment and careers.

Mayor's Commission on Human Rights: enrichment, careers, nursery.

Bridgeport Labor Council: careers.

Boys' Club: careers.

State Welfare Department: social workers recruit for nursery and hobbies.

City Welfare Department: for enrichment.

National Council Jewish Women, Bridgeport: volunteers.

College Club of Bridgeport: volunteers.

Fairfield County Symphony: free tickets, youth concerts.

Twelve citizens have called to donate their specialized skills to YOU: psychological examiners, doctors, teachers, and social workers.

To date the following businesses have donated needed equipment:

Friedman's Furniture: furniture for living room of apartment.

Weston Woods Studio: films and records for nursery and enrichment.

Bader TV Repair: repair and installation of donated TV in library at school.

West End Lumber Co.: lumber for nursery lockers.

Whiteman, Meyers: rug for nursery.

The Junior League of Bridgeport is supplying 47 trained volunteers. Each volunteer will spend at least 3 hours per week working for YOU. Our members have already donated a great number of books, exhibits, etc.

We have sent for information from all over the country on similar programs. The enclosed bibliography represents materials that we have consulted. Thus we have concrete information on how to spend our money, and

should more money be given to Project YOU, it would be spent wisely.

Obviously the money we have could not pay for the facilities, equipment, and personnel needed unless we had received the tremendous support and interest of many, many wonderful citizens who do care and do want to participate in a coordinated effort to alleviate some of Bridgeport's problems.

We shall be holding ceremonies on Wednesday, September 30, at 10 a.m., at Father Panik Village to celebrate the opening of all phases of YOU's program. We should be greatly honored if your busy schedule would permit your participation in these ceremonies.

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely yours,

VIRGINIA D. RIDER,
Chairman, Project YOU.

FACT SHEETS: YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES UNLIMITED (YOU)

Who: YOU was voted as a 2-year demonstration project by the Junior League of Bridgeport, Inc., at a membership meeting on March 18, 1964.

What: YOU is a program of opportunity for young people. It was conceived by the Junior League of Bridgeport in cooperation with the Bridgeport Board of Education, the Connecticut State Employment Office, Hall Neighborhood House, and the Housing Authority of the City of Bridgeport. It will be financially supported by the Junior League of Bridgeport.

Where: In the Lower East Side of Bridgeport; where an integrated Federal housing project (Father Panik Village), Waltersville School, and Hall Neighborhood House are located.

When: From the fall of 1964 through the summer of 1966.

How: The program consists of three parts:

A. READING

1. A qualified reading specialist will be hired by the Junior League of Bridgeport for the 2-year period. The reading specialist, with trained volunteers, will conduct reading readiness programs for preschoolers at the nursery school being established at Father Panik Village by Hall Neighborhood House.

2. A similar program will be offered at Hall Neighborhood Day Nursery.

3. The reading specialist will offer remedial reading at Waltersville School, in cooperation with the staff at the school.

4. The reading specialist will be employed for 11 months each year, in order to prevent summer setback.

5. The reading specialist will be assisted by trained Junior League volunteers.

B. ENRICHMENT

1. Bus trips for the children of this area to the museum of art, science and industry; youth concerts; Beardsley Park Zoo; children's programs theater; the library; and other places of educational and cultural value.

2. The Junior League of Bridgeport's project, "Art Goes to School," will continue to provide art lectures to the fifth- and sixth-grade students in Bridgeport schools.

C. CAREERS

1. Career nights for teenagers at Father Panik Village's Community Center with movies, slides, speakers, and written information on job and educational opportunities. These will be planned in cooperation with the Bridgeport Inter-Group Council, the youth division of the Connecticut State Employment Office, and the Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce.

Why: To prevent school dropouts caused by reading problems, to provide educational and cultural opportunities, to demonstrate what a team approach might accomplish for our youth, to encourage other groups and individuals to work together on opportunities for youth, to give parents an opportunity to learn skills and techniques to help their children, to provide hope and incentive to young people, and to develop self-reliance among young people.

Ultimate goal: (1) To convince the city that money spent and action taken on young peoples' problems are essential to the welfare of the Greater Bridgeport area; (2) to demonstrate to the citizens the need for the city to continue YOU in this area, as well as other needed areas in Bridgeport.

Planning: YOU was planned by the project finding committee of the Junior League of Bridgeport since March 1963 with the cooperation and support of the following:

Miss Anna Cain, assistant superintendent of schools.

Margaret Driscoll, juvenile court judge.

Miss Dorothy Hanley, principal, Waltersville School.

Mrs. Jewel P. Hines, social worker, Hall Neighborhood House.

Patrick Hunter, director, intergroup council.

Francis King, president, board of education.

Ewell Newman, director, Hall Neighborhood House.

Max Nickowitz, citizens school dropout committee.

Joseph Porter, superintendent of schools.

Sam Rosoff, Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce.

Francis Shanley, director, Bridgeport Housing Authority.

Lester Silverstone, assistant superintendent of schools.

Leo Sperling, director, youth division, Connecticut State Employment Office.

Anita Vogel, board of education.

Mrs. Edward Wasserman, vice president, National Council of Jewish Women.

Retirement of Representative Eugene Siler From House of Representatives

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Louisville Courier-Journal about the Honorable EUGENE SILER, who has ably served the Fifth Congressional District in the U.S. House of Representatives for the past 10 years and who is now retiring.

I do not know a finer man. He will be greatly missed by all of us who are his constituents; and also, I know, by his colleagues in the House.

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

MANY LANDMARKS AND MEMORIES RECALLED AS SILER LEAVES CONGRESS

(By Fred W. Luigart, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—In room 209 of the House Office Building here, Representative EUGENE SILER has begun the preliminaries to winding up a 10-year career in Congress.

The Kentuckian's clerks still go about their work but the pace has slackened. There are fewer visitors to see. Each day brings fewer letters from constituents seeking help. They are writing now, instead, to thank the Williamsburg Republican for the countless favors—big and small—rendered in their behalf.

One office clerk, a resident of Washington, has already been informed her services won't be needed by SILER's successor—presumably Dr. Tim Lee Carter, of Tompkinsville. Dr. Carter won the Republican nomination in the Fifth District, which has never sent a Democrat to Congress.

HAS MANY MEMENTOS

In the week following House adjournment, mementos collected during his decade in Congress—photographs of prominent politicians, certificates of appreciation, and inexpensive gifts from friends, such as a framed copy of the 10 Commandments, a giant twist of tobacco, a Kentucky mountain hornet's nest—will be removed from the walls of SILER's office to be shipped home.

Although SILER is still at his desk—except when away for preaching engagements—his interest in congressional proceedings has obviously waned—a natural reaction for a man preparing to abandon the national political arena.

HE HAS NO REGRETS

He has no regrets about calling it quits after five terms in Washington. He could have remained here. Had he run again, he would have been reelected.

He still has no particular reason for retiring from Congress beyond a strong, personal yearning to return to his hometown.

The SILER who leaves Washington will be a man whose conservative posture has been diluted by circumstances during his five terms here.

He remains a fiscal conservative in the tradition of Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia. But in response to acute economic conditions within his own district, SILER has moderated his views on flood-control projects and Federal welfare and economic development proposals that would benefit his constituents.

SAYS CONGRESS "SELFISH"

In the past few years, he has even found himself in the company of House liberals in urging special Federal legislation for depressed areas.

While he professes to have enjoyed his years as a Congressman, SILER remains disillusioned with what he calls the "selfish attitude of Congress."

This attitude, which he sees as finding expression in the recent pay raise Congress voted itself, the new $100 million House Office Building, and legislation to increase salaries for congressional office help, sets a bad example for the Nation.

"I do think Congress, as an institution, ought to have more self-denial and more desire to set a good example for the rest of the country in matters of fiscal integrity and good conduct," he said.

SOUGHT MANY THINGS

If SILER had had his way during his years here, Congress would also have curbed nepotism, congressional junketing, liquor advertising, and approved a constitutional amendment "to permit—not compel" Bible reading in schools.

But as he concedes, quoting President Lyndon B. Johnson, "Politics is the art of the possible. Every man can't have his own way."

SILER, an active Baptist layman, battled to curb liquor advertisements his first year here. Although his fight threw a scare into congressional leaders who, since the repeal of prohibition have resisted every effort to divide Congress along wet and dry lines, SILER's bill died in committee.

NEVER TOOK JUNKET

He has never taken a congressional junket—"90 percent of them are unnecessary." Neither has any member of his family ever been on the congressional payroll.

SILER's view on his congressional career is that it has been highlighted by the help he has rendered constituents with their social security claims and veterans' benefits, and his support of flood control projects.

He is particularly proud to be returning to his native fifth district with local flood protection for Corbin now complete, and construction about to commence on the Laurel River dam.

"I haven't gotten these solely by myself, of course," he adds. "The Kentucky delegation has accomplished these things together."

PLENTY OF MEMORIES

His political associations in Washington, the funeral of President John F. Kennedy, the civil rights march on Washington, serving under three Presidents, social visits to the White House—all are incidents that stand out in SILER's memory as landmarks in his life as a Congressman.

The men in Congress who have made the deepest impression on SILER have been mostly conservatives of his own bent—BYRD, and Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, both from Virginia, and former Congressmen such as John Taber and the late Dan Reid, both of New York, and the colorful Usher Burdick, of North Dakota.

FUTURE UNDECIDED

Now 64, SILER is not overly concerned about adjusting from the demanding pace of life as a Congressman to the more casual pace of a country lawyer.

"I'll just live 1 day at a time and look for the open dooors," he says.

Although he is undecided about his political future, he is not yet ready to close any political doors on himself. If, for instance, his party should beckon him to run for Governor, that invitation is a bridge to be crossed when it is reached, SILER says.

Tonkin Gulf: What Happened?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, American foreign policy and international developments continue to be responsible for grave concern on the part of the public over the manner in which the administration is facing up to its foreign policy responsibilities.

The latest incident, the second Gulf of Tonkin action and the treatment of it by the administration, has left the press and public in the dark as to what happened. What is worse, we are given the distinct impression that the administration does not know either.

This incident was the subject of an editorial, entitled "Tonkin Gulf: What Happened?" Which appeared in the September 22 issue of the Los Angeles Times. Under leave to extend my remarks I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

TONKIN GULF: WHAT HAPPENED?

Washington's initial and continuing handling of the latest incident in the Gulf of Tonkin reflects disturbingly an attitude of confusion and a posture of awkwardness. Certainly the U.S. public has a right to expect more than this.

Defense Secretary McNamara waited 24 hours after receiving the first news of the incident before issuing a statement which did little to clarify things.

President Johnson's comments to newsmen Monday morning, nearly 72 hours after the event, indicated either that the Government still doesn't know fully what happened or else that it knows but has no intention of letting the public know.

Such an information vacuum reflects no credit on the administration, nor on U.S. policy in southeast Asia. In the absence of any clear American report on last Friday's events the explanations and charges of Hanoi, Peiping and the Soviet news agency inevitably are given prime consideration in much of the world. Regardless of what actually might have occurred the propaganda advantage has been seized by the Communists.

In view of the retaliatory attacks which followed the North Vietnamese torpedo boat assaults of August 2 and 4 there was naturally a mood of apprehension following announcement of Friday's incident. But then, for a full 24 hours, nothing more was said officially. If press and public were uncertain and confused, it was only because administration spokesmen to all appearances were equally lacking facts.

Senator GOLDWATER on Sunday quite properly raised some questions concerning this incident which was still await answers: why were details withheld for so long? what explanation is there for the apparent communications gap? how does Friday's involvement differ from those of last month, which prompted retaliation?

The President said yesterday that he could not determine the motives which apparently prompted the incident, but this comment largely ignores the real questions being raised. Indeed, it has yet to be learned from administration spokesmen even what types of ships, or whose, were fired at by the U.S. destroyers.

The administration may have valid security reasons for withholding information from the public, but given the curious way the incident has been handled this appears unlikely. What does seem likely at this time is that some embarrassing foul-up took place, somewhere, and that the administration feels the less said about it the better.

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—Introduction, I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, since the Communists seized power in Czechoslovakia by "peaceful" means in 1948, our foreign policymakers have been confronted with a new and serious problem:

How can the United States best meet the Communist challenge on the political and ideological level?

What must we do, apart from our military programs and our international economic aid and trade undertakings, in order to first, counter Communist efforts to penetrate and subvert the free world nations; second, help prevent complete communization of countries already under Communist control; and third, more effectively advance U.S. foreign policy objectives on the world scene?

These questions have concerned both our policymakers and the American public for more than 15 years. This concern has been fully justified because of the profound change which took place since the end of World War II in the conduct of international relations.

Events transpiring since 1945 have demonstrated clearly that the traditional tools of foreign policy—diplomacy, military power, and economic policy—no longer suffice to advance the legitimate objectives of a nation in its relations with the rest of the world.

The concurrent revolutions of the 20th century—in communications, science, education, and in other fields—have opened a new dimension for foreign policy operations. On a scale unmatched in the past, they brought the masses of people into direct contact with the conduct of foreign relations.

The revolution in communications has played an important role in this development. By using modern means and techniques of communication, governments can now appeal to target audiences in foreign countries over the heads of their leaders. They can inform, convince, even strive to motivate entire populations to a specific course of action. In turn, these foreign audiences exert increasing pressures on their own governments to continue, or to change, given policies.

In this new dimension of foreign policy operations, the ideological and psychological, words and ideas serve as weapons. Persuasion is the goal—and, frequently, the principal means for the attainment of political objectives.

The Communists have been quick to appreciate the potential of this new dimension of foreign policy. They adopted ideological warfare—political agitation and propaganda—as a key instrument for carrying out the strategy of Communist world revolution. Their massive effort in this field, and the political successes it has achieved, presented the governments of the free world with a serious challenge.

During the past two decades, the U.S. Government has used a variety of programs in coping with the Communist challenge on this plane. These programs range from exchanges of persons and oversea information activities to strategic psychological operations. All of them are intended to serve a single overriding purpose: to provide support broad for U.S. foreign policy by combating Communist propaganda, by countering Communist political agitation, by promoting understanding of U.S. foreign policy goals, and in other ways.

How well are these programs administered? Are they fulfilling their primary mission? Do they meet the requirements of our foreign policy? Are they effective in meeting the Communist challenge in the cold war, and advancing our foreign policy objectives?

These are legitimate questions. Unfortunately, the answers to them have not been forthcoming very readily.

The Congress, of course, periodically reviews these programs. Generally,

however, a given congressional committee will look only at those programs which come under its immediate jurisdiction. For years now, there has been no overall review of all the programs in this category, of their relationship to each other, and to our foreign policy, and of their affectiveness in coping with the threat posed by the Communist ideological offensive. The last congressional inquiry which concerned itself with such questions as they related to our oversea information programs, took place over a decade ago.

Because of this, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs decided in March 1963, to undertake a comprehensive review of all programs which operate in the fourth dimension of our foreign policy. As chairman of the subcommittee, I am taking this opportunity to report to the House of Representatives on our undertaking and on its progress during the two sessions of the 88th Congress.

In initiating this study, the subcommittee concentrated on four immediate tasks. We decided:

First, to inquire into the nature of the ideological challenge presented by the international Communist movement, and to explore different views about the best ways to meet it;

Second, to inventory all governmental programs which are neither strictly military nor strictly economic in nature, but which are intended to provide support abroad, on the ideological and psychological level, for our foreign policy;

Third, to study the relationships which exist between these programs, and to see how they are coordinated and brought to bear on the conduct of U.S. foreign policy; and

Fourth, to survey the oversea programs of private U.S. organizations which have an impact on the American image abroad and thus either directly or incidentally affect the implementation of our foreign policy.

In subsequent parts of this report I shall describe what my subcommittee did during the past 18 months in carrying out the above-described plan. In the sixth and concluding part I will comment on some of the changes which took place, partly as a result of our subcommittee's activities, in the administration of various governmental programs. I will also attempt to outline very briefly the job that remains to be done before this study can be considered successfully completed.

When Is a Statesman Not a Statesman?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, Raymond Moley, one of the contributing editors of Newsweek, has written an excellent article in the current issue, on the subject of medical care for older people under our social security program. This article sets out the facts of this issue in such a clear, understandable way, that it should enable everyone to understand the fact and fiction involved.

The facts are that low income people would pay a disproportionate share of the costs of such a program.

The fiction is that there is no medical care program for older people. The Kerr-Mills program, presented May 4, 1960, by the Eisenhower administration, and enacted later that year as a part of the Social Security Amendments of 1960, combined with the old-age assistance program to take care of all older people not financially able to provide for their own medical care, and for those not on public assistance whose income and resources were insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical service.

I commend this article to the attention of all Members:

THE GREAT DECEPTION
(By Raymond Moley)

Statesmen, from the President down, who for political advantage promote unsound legislation under false representations strike at the very roots of national morality and character. In the instance I cite, medicare attached to social security, the proposed legislation would visit grave injustice on some at the expense of others; and because it would become permanent policy if passed, future generations would also pay the penalty.

Two weeks ago I pointed out that medicare under social security would be unjust even to those who are the alleged beneficiaries. In part at least, by substituting services for a cash pension it would suggest that those who receive it are unfit to spend their own income. Now let us consider the millions of workers who will pay the cost in social security taxes.

An employee with a wife and two children and an income of $5,600, who paid an income tax of $528 in 1963 and is paying $430 in 1964, will pay $386 in 1965. Thus, through the tax cut there is an annual saving of $142 in 1965 over 1963.

But under the bill demanded by the President and passed by the Senate, this man would pay $174 in social security taxes in 1964 and $238 in 1965. Thus, his income-tax saving would be cut by almost a half in 1965. The Government giveth and the Government taketh away.

The tax cut was hailed by people with large incomes with great delight because, to those of them who pay it, the social security tax is small change. It is the poor who are soaked this time.

Other injustices to those employees who are "covered" by social security would be:

1. They would be burdened with a considerably increased tax to pay for what is called a social (or national) need—i.e., hospitalization and other services for people over 65. If this is a social need, it should be paid by all, not by some of the Nation's taxpayers.

2. Those employees would also be compelled to pay for free services for everyone over 65 when it is apparent from the voluminous statistics published by the Government that only about half of those people need the help.

3. Once this law is enacted, the tax on employees is scheduled to rise and rise over the years for an indeterminate number of beneficiaries at a totally unpredictable cost. So far as employees buying future benefits for themselves is concerned, they would be buying not a pig in a poke but a tyrannosaur.

4. For every employee who pays, the employer also pays. This employer's tax is mostly passed on in the price of his product. Thus, these employees, as well as all other consumers, would be paying the employer's tax in the products they buy.

5. But since for competitive reasons some employers cannot increase prices, there would be great pressure by employers to eliminate jobs and thus there would be an increase in unemployment.

6. This scheme is dressed up to look like insurance. But it is not insurance because it lacks the contracual character which is present in private insurance. A future Congress could reduce, change, or eliminate the benefits.

7. Another feature of the plan also discredits the claim that it is insurance. For even with the progressively heavier taxes contemplated, most of the older employees would not have paid into the so-called trust fund enough to pay for the services they could receive at the age of 65.

Chairman Wilbur Mills has quite properly resisted all efforts to attach medicare to social security. During the Eisenhower administration he and the late Senator Robert S. Kerr after great labor framed the plan which was embodied in the Kerr-Mills Act. This eliminates all or most of the inequities in the present proposal. At any time since 1961, the House committee headed by Mills could have reported and passed perfecting amendments to that act which would have met the legitimate needs of the elderly. But the Kenendy-Johnson administration has insisted upon this new, unfair, and unsound substitute.

And now, since it seems unlikely that the Senate medicare plan will prevail, Mr. Johnson will use it as a campaign issue.

Urban Renewal in Norfolk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the city of Norfolk is an acknowledged leader in the urban renewal program and is a dramatic example of how an older city can be rejuvenated. The effort to modernize Norfolk and clear out and rehabilitate its rundown areas has the broadest possible support among business and civic leaders. Those who have not seen the city for 15 or 20 years would hardly recognize the new Norfolk. Through urban renewal and other programs, and through the enlightened leadership of the city, tremendous new investment has been generated and employment and civic pride have grown apace.

This progress has been well described by Norfolk's Representative, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable PORTER HARDY, JR., in an article which appeared in the New Norfolk, published by the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce. I regret that we cannot include the illustrations which show the dramatic changes, but the gentleman from Virginia's [Mr. HARDY] words well describe the modernization of Norfolk. I hope all of my colleagues will give them careful attention:

AFTER 15 YEARS OF URBAN RENEWAL, NORFOLK SHINING EXAMPLE
(By Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR.)

The lack of decent housing for millions of Americans in slums, and the growing decay of our cities in the past, presented overwhelm-

ing problems. No individual, no private organization, nor even any local government could successfully tackle them alone.

The urban renewal program was established by Congress in 1949 during the Truman administration. It grew out of a recognition that blight in urban areas and all its attendant evils constituted problems that had to be faced. The sound growth and development of our cities was recognized as an important goal of national policy and the accomplishment of this goal required Federal encouragement and assistance.

Urban renewal has been a bipartisan program from the start, sponsored and approved by Republicans and Democrats alike. Senator Robert A. Taft was one of its original three sponsors, together with Senator Ellender of Louisiana, and Senator Wagner, of New York. During the Eisenhower administration in 1954, and again in 1956 and 1959, it was expanded and strengthened. Substantial improvements were made and additional funds were authorized by the Congress in 1961, the first year of the Kennedy administration.

Urban renewal has not been limited to any particular region of the United States, nor has it been limited to big cities. In 1963, nearly one-half of more than 700 localities actively participating in the program had populations of less than 25,000—many of them in the Southeast. Of 1,556 federally assisted urban renewal projects or activities in the Nation at the end of 1963, a total of 339 were in the Southeastern States, and 35 in Virginia. This has become truly an effective national program, serving well all sections of the country.

The Congress stipulated in its 1949 declaration of national housing policy that "private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can" in order to attain "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family, thus contributing to the development and redevelopment of communities, and to the advancement of the growth, wealth, and security of the Nation."

The primary emphasis on private enterprise has remained a basic principle of the American urban renewal program.

Through urban renewal, local governments help and support private industry to achieve what it cannot do alone. The Federal Government, pursuant to requests from the localities, provides necessary additional funds and technical know-how which local governments cannot supply from their own resources.

FOUR BILLION DOLLARS SPENT TO DATE

The total Federal expenditure authorized by the Congress for urban renewal to date is nearly $4 billion. That is a lot of money. But compared to some other Federal programs it is relatively small. Notwithstanding the few instances of mismanagement which have been identified, the results this $4 billion has achieved are tangible and truly phenomenal. Aside from helping to build the physical environment we want for ourselves and our children, it is proving to be a good investment financially.

Recent congressional hearings on urban renewal legislation have brought out the impressive fact that every dollar of Federal investment in urban renewal generates about $6 in private investment—in building construction and related activities that are of direct benefit to the growth of our national economy, and of permanent financial gain to cities and local governments.

With mushrooming increases in municipal costs and limited tax sources, local governments need money. Cities, through urban renewal, have been able to raise their revenues to realistic and responsible levels, to strengthen their economic sinews through real estate tax gains. They have increased commercial and industrial activity and achieved higher returns from land put to new and better uses and more receipts from business privilege taxes. New jobs, new markets, and business expansion have resulted from better location, improved traffic, and adequate parking. There has been considerable attraction of new enterprises—particularly distributive and wholesale firms—that do not want to be trapped in undesirable sites. Thus cities, through urban renewal, once again can stand on their own feet.

NEW BUILDINGS STRENGTHEN TAX BASE

One building in a 35-acre section of one urban renewal area in Norfolk today pays two times the taxes formerly received from the entire section. One new downtown hotel, on 5 acres of former crime- and disease-infested slum, produces 18 times the real estate tax revenue of the structures it replaced.

It is well established that city governments cannot be strong without a sound real estate tax base. I know of no public program which can do more to strengthen and reestablish American local government to its rightful place than urban renewal.

No city wants to sit and rot. Now most of them are working out of this dilemma through our national housing legislation and are voluntarily initiating their own programs of urban renewal. There is no compulsion about it. Urban renewal is planned, initiated, and executed locally. The full responsibility for carrying out the program rests with the community.

All of us are proud that Norfolk has been a pioneer in urban renewal, and proud that it was cited in congressional hearings as an outstanding example among cities that are building and rebuilding with confidence for the future. Norfolk's preurban renewal expenses for crime prevention, public health, police and fire protection, and other slum costs were tremendous. Its slum areas were a festering drain on the city's resources, a drain that could not be allowed to continue without ultimately destroying the community.

BEST IN COUNTRY

Today, after 15 years of urban renewal, Norfolk is a shining example of what urban renewal can help to achieve—a growing, thriving metropolis that is well on its way to clearing most of its slums, providing improved and more efficient locations for business and industry, and for new educational and cultural facilities. Norfolk has carried out its urban renewal and related community development activities, trade expansion projects, and transportation improvements, in fulfillment of the intent of Congress that urban renewal should be a program for the benefit of the cities and the people of the land.

The ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Housing in the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, was so impressed by Norfolk's achievements that he made the following statement on October 24, 1963, to Norfolk officials who had just finished their congressional testimony for this subcommittee headed by the Honorable ALBERT RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama:

"I certainly want to congratulate you on having what appears to be the best urban renewal program in the country.

"For some time many of us who are interested in urban renewal, have understood that you used all the tools that are necessary to make an urban renewal program work. We wish you good luck in the future.

"Keep up the good work, and I hope that you can still continue your good, sound program."

Norfolk has undergone a transformation which only those who have seen it can realize and appreciate. I am proud that my colleagues in the Congress on both sides of the aisle have been outspoken in recognition of the fact that the rest of the Nation looks to Norfolk, a bustling world seaport and naval base to maintain leadership in urban renewal.

Tax Reductions in Cleveland Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the Cleveland Press on Monday, September 21, 1964, Mr. Ray de Crane, a Press writer, submitted a very exciting story to the effect that in the Cleveland area the current U.S. income tax receipts are running at a level almost equal to last year's level despite the substantial tax reduction passed by this Congress as part of the Kennedy-Johnson tax reform program.

These reports substantiate the theory that tax cuts can be made to generate business activity as well as added personal income.

The article is as follows:

U.S. TAX TAKE HIGH DESPITE 22-PERCENT DECREASE—RECEIPTS OFF ONLY A FRACTION IN THIS AREA

(By Ray de Crane)

Release by the Treasury Department in Washington of the first comparative figures since the 22-percent income tax cut went into effect last March shows:

Almost as much is being paid in income taxes today as was being collected when the tax rate was considerably higher.

This writer made an official request of Internal Revenue Service in Cleveland for a comparison of the total withholding tax collected in April, May and June of 1963 and the same period this year.

The query, referred to Washington, was answered today. The announced figures apply only to the Cleveland IRS district which covers the northern half of the State. While national comparisons are not yet available, the report in Washington is that the experience in Cleveland is believed to be typical of the Nation.

Here are the figures:

In 1963, Ohio employers paid into the Federal Treasury in the 3-month period $507 million for withholding taxes and social security taxes that had been deducted from employees' wages. The withholding tax rate during this period was 18 percent.

This year, with the withholding tax rate reduced to 14 percent the same employers turned over $506 million in the same 3-month period.

This is a reduction of two-tenths of 1 percent in tax take despite a 22-percent tax cut.

The explanation given by Washington tax experts is that more people are employed, more money is being earned, therefore the tax collection is just as good as formerly.

It would seem, then, that the tax cut is doing exactly the job that Congress and the administration planned when it was put into effect.

When he signed the revenue measure last February 26 President Johnson said the cut—the largest in history—was "the single most important step we have taken to strengthen our economy since World War II."

The prophecy seems borne out by the facts, if this area is any yardstick.

Here employment figures are mostly reaching new highs and unemployment rates are constantly being reduced.

Last month the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce reported that employers on its job survey list had added 1,000 new workers during the month.

Nationally, auto manufacturers and makers of appliances are contributing to the boom in employment.

Adding to the glow is the knowledge that on January 1 still another income tax cut is coming.

Congress' $11-billion cut provided a two-stage reduction. Two-thirds became effective last March. The other third begins on January 1.

On that day the new rate in the lowest tax bracket will be reduced from 16 to 14 percent.

Urban Renewal Has Its Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, not too long ago, a highly respected research group, after a year-long study, reached this conclusion concerning the Federal urban renewal program:

The inequities and problems generated by the Federal public housing and urban renewal subsidy programs are very great, and a time of moratorium, with no new commitments under the existing programs, may well be needed during which reasonable new courses can be evaluated. Effective courses will be those which offer maximum opportunity for States and communities to proceed with marshaling talents, resources, and techniques without interference for the solution of their housing problems.

Several days ago another study made news here in Washington with recommendations paralleling those of the above study. This is, of course, the now famous study of the joint center for urban studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University made by Martin Anderson.

Columnist Richard Wilson in his excellent column in the Washington Evening Star of September 25 describes the findings of the study thus:

The analysis by Martin Anderson is about as critical as a professorial tract can get, describing the program as a dismal failure that stands in sorry contrast to better efforts by private enterprise guided solely by the demands of the free market rather than the esthetes of the Urban Renewal Administration.

Anderson's chief recommendation is the abandonment of the program after the completion of authorized projects.

Following is the description of the study by Richard Wilson for those Members who may have missed it:

URBAN RENEWAL HAS ITS CRITICS
(By Richard Wilson)

Everywhere that the urban renewal program has swept away square blocks of decrepit buildings people wonder what became of the former occupants. Obviously most of the former residents could not afford quarters in the modernistic high-rise apartments so typical of urban renewal projects.

It is a mystery. Washington officials don't have a very clear idea of what happened to the occupants, whether they are better or worse off than before they received eviction notices. It is clear, however, that the very poor have been evicted to make way for the better off in one of the most curious and controversial of Federal aid programs.

According to some estimates the projects now authorized, under construction or completed will have displaced about 4 million people in major cities. This is about like transferring the entire metropolitan area of Detroit somewhere else.

On the face of it urban renewal sounds like a good idea. The blighted city areas are depressing and hurt the pride of the conscientious city dweller who loves to show off his town. Some kind of order is brought into progress. Citizens look with awe and wonder at the glass, stone, and concrete buildings that have replaced the slums, and some of them. provided they can pay the high rents, move in.

For 15 years, this program has been underway. It has been examined in a very critical light in a book to be published next month under the respectable imprint of the Joint Center for Urban Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University. The analysis by Martin Anderson is about as critical as a professorial tract can get, describing the program as a dismal failure that stands in sorry contrast to better efforts by private enterprise guided solely by the demands of the free market rather than the esthetes of the Urban Renewal Administration.

Of course, urban renewal is a form of private enterprise. The Government subsidizes the razing of blighted areas for sale to private developers, who in turn develop it with Federal financial help under the direction of a local agency.

MIT and Harvard are sending the Anderson study to scores of prominent people in public life. Anderson's chief recommendation is the abandonment of the program after the completion of authorized projects.

The study is being published at a good time because it is so evident that the Federal Government has prepared the ground for new advances into the field of government and local cooperation opened up by programs like urban renewal. This has been one of the little noticed major trends initiated in the Kennedy administration and now to be carried further in the Johnson administration. President Johnson is much sold on the idea of new local-Federal cooperation.

The trend is largely an outgrowth of the changed political structure of this country, which now centers so much more strongly around cities and metropolitan areas than it did 30 or 40 years ago. One of the reasons the U.S. Senate today is so much more "liberal" than the House of Representatives is that urban political pressure can be brought more directly on the election of two Senators at large from a State than upon Representatives elected from mixed urban-rural districts or mainly rural districts.

One of the surprises of the current session of Congress was the adoption of the mass transit bill to help cities solve the agonizing problem of getting people to and from work. This bill was adopted only by intense political pressure and logrolling.

Only a short time before President Kennedy was killed, it has now been learned, he was discussing with his aids a new suburban program, which has not yet seen the light of day. The antipoverty program, which President Johnson later espoused, was under discussion concurrently and some of the President's aids thought there might be something inconsistent in an attack on poverty while at the same time programs were pushed for the more affluent suburbanites. But President Kennedy saw nothing inconsistent in the two efforts.

In fact, they are consistent in the sense that they are both part of the general trend toward attempts to solve urban problems through State, local, and Federal cooperation. This inevitably means the growth, and probably at a rapid rate, of Federal subsidization and a great increase in Federal intervention in local affairs. Setting aside the question of whether or not this is desirable on general principle, does it work? Is it effective? Is it the best way to solve the problems of the cities? The urban renewal program does not yet, in the opinion of some experts, give a favorable answer to these questions.

Social Security Approach to Medicare Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the most concise explanation in opposition to the so-called medicare plan which the conferees are presently considering is that of Dr. John L. Falls, who was chairman of the committee which worked out the Minnesota implementation of the Kerr-Mills Act. I include the following letter from Dr. John L. Falls of Red Wing, Minn., in opposition to the medicare approach to social security:

THE INTERSTATE CLINIC,
Red Wing, Minn., Sept. 18, 1964.

Hon. ALBERT QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: In the coming weeks you will undoubtedly be asked about medical care for our older citizens, and your opponent will undoubtedly espouse medicare. As chairman of the committee which worked out the Minnesota implementation of the Kerr-Mills Act, I learned a good deal about the socio-economic problems involved and the elderly population characteristics of this State. It became clear that what our older citizens fear, and rightly so, is a catastrophic illness—one requiring long hospitalization and rehabilitation, or the need to continue some medication for the rest of their lives. It is not the flareup of sinus trouble, or a bout of intestinal flu that worries them, but the prospect of a serious stroke, a bad heart attack, a fractured hip, cancer, and diseases of that magnitude. Accordingly, we drafted and passed a Kerr-Mills medical assistance to the aged which went into effect July 1, 1964. This medical assistance to the aged act pledges to any Minnesotan over 65, whose independence would be threatened by the expense of a major illness, unlimited and complete coverage of any and all health care expense after he has incurred $200 of health care expense in a 12-month period. This limits the expense to the individual to an amount that most can handle. However, when major illness strikes, it makes their individual plight a matter of legitimate public concern, and they sign no lien against their property to obtain this help. For those who cannot meet the first $200 of health care, the local board can waive this requirement. There is no time limit to the benefits, as there would be under medicare. Our concern with the patient and his illness is total and continuing—not partial and limited to 45 or 60 days. The Minnesota Kerr-Mills implementation ranks with the finest drafted by any State. It requires no apologies. It can be modified or made more flexible administratively as experience is gained under its present provisions. As other forces in our society improve the economic well-being of our retired citizen, such as more widespread purchase of private insurance during the working years, prepaid retirement payments as fringe benefits during the working years, prepaid health insurance that protects

the worker after retirement, the number of our senior citizens who need public help will surely decrease. To this extent the Kerr-Mills medical assistance to the aged does not necessarily have to remain a large and permanent fixture on the American scene. It might interest you to know that during the 14 years from 1949 through 1960, though the number of Minnesotans over 65 grew at twice the rate of the general population, the number requiring old-age asistance dropped 20 percent. Why did this drop occur? Because in our increasingly affluent society we in Minnesota are increasingly able to take care of ourselves.

The defects of the medicare proposal are these:

1. It is not medical care, as its name implies, but is limited to temporary hospital and nursing home care. It does not cover drugs, doctor or dentist bills, surgeons fees, house calls, etc. In fact, it covers only 25 to 30 percent of the health care cost of the individual. It is obviously a cruel hoax to hold this forth to the electorate as the answer to major illness expense involving our senior citizens.

2. Medicare departs completely with the traditional concept governing social security. Up until now, our workers have been subjected to this payroll tax on the basis that these dollars would be returned at a later time. It is a dangerous precedent to start taking more dollars out of the paycheck for the promise of a federally determined service at some future time.

3. Medicare would guarantee a service which the Federal Government does not have the facilities, equipment, or personnel to provide. This is dangerous to the fiscal soundness of the program. As deficits mounted, rather than raise the tax to cover the true cost, there would be mounting pressure to take over the facilities and equipment, and possibly the personnel providing this service. Do we, as a free society, really want that?

4. Medicare is not a "free" or painless solution to the problem, despite what proponents imply. It would require a hefty increase in the social security payroll tax at once, and even larger increases in the future. To begin with, it would take $70 more per year from the individual paying on the new maximum amount. Is this logical? The social security tax is a flat payroll tax. It is the most regressive tax on the books today. It is applied at a constant rate on the first part of a worker's income, and it allows no exemptions for number of dependents, for illness expense, for other taxes that have to be met—or any of the relief that makes the graduated income tax more equitable. The social security tax falls heaviest on the worker who earns the least, for it covers his entire income. Is this the tax that should be used to solve one of our society's major social problems?

5. Medicare has no provision to prevent double insurance or profitable illness. It would be tempting for many of those over 65 who now carry private insurance (60 percent of them have private hospitalization coverage) to keep up their policies and collect their insurance benefits as a reward for being sick while the social security fund picked up the tab for their hospital bill. We carefully prevented this possibility under Minnesota Kerr-Mills by stipulating that all benefits from any private insurance must be first applied to the bill before any public funds could be used.

6. Medicare would remove approximately $36 million a year from Minnesota's economy via increased social security taxes. One and one-half million people in the State pay the tax. The mean wage on which it was paid in 1961 was $2,740, but one-fourth of the people who are subject to the tax paid it on the maximum wage. By boosting the maximum wage subject to tax to $5,600, and increasing the tax one-fourth percent, the number of dollars flowing out of the State is conservatively put at $36 million per year. This goes a long way toward nullifying the expected benefits of the income tax reduction, for many of these people who would pay the big increase in social security pay little, if any, income tax in the first place.

These are the economic realities which make the medicare proposal a fiscal farce, and you can be of great service to all your constituents by protecting the younger workers from this payroll grab, and working to increase the scope and effectiveness of the Kerr-Mills Act, the only mechanism providing total care.

With kindest personal regards,

JOHN L. FALLS, M.D.

Loans to Optometry Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a bill is pending before the House which provides loans to students of optometry. I wholeheartedly support this legislation and strongly urge its passage by this body.

The bill, H.R. 8546, authorizes loans up to $2,000 a year to students of optometry and it establishes the administration of this program under the Health Professions Education Assistance Act.

This legislation is vitally needed. Today we are short on trained optometrists. It is generally recognized in the profession that we need one optometrist for every 7,000 of our citizens in order to render adequate care. However, today we have only 1 optometrist for every 10,300 people.

H.R. 8546 will help solve the problem in at least two ways by providing more money in loans to these students and by giving a 3-year grace period after graduation during which time no repayment of the loan is required.

The optometrist affects the lives of nearly every American. He performs 65 to 70 percent of all eyesight examinations in the United States. The optometrist does 75 percent of all contact lense work. He performs 80 percent of all work in orthoptics and visual training. In short about three-fourths of all persons who seek vision care turn first to an optometrist.

The optometrist renders about 85 percent of all eyesight treatment to the members of our Armed Forces in every branch: Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Statistics show that the number of optometrists in the United States is declining in proportion to the growth of our population.

H.R. 8546 certainly does not solve completely this growing shortage of optometrists. However, this program of liberalized loans to students will help considerably, and I am hopeful the bill will receive strong support in the House.

Congressman Harold R. Collier Reports to the People of the 10th District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith the report to the residents of the 10th Congressional District of Illinois covering a résumé of major legislation and my activities as their Representative in Washington.

The 2d session of the 88th Congress convened the first Tuesday in January and extended more than 9 months before its preelection adjournment. The combined 1st and 2d sessions were the longest in peacetime history. Adjournment of the 1st session did not come until Christmas Eve, leaving less than 2 weeks between sessions instead of the usual 3 or 4 months.

Several legislative programs which were instituted under the administration of the late President Kennedy became law during the first 6 months of this year.

The tax bill of 1963, which was written last year by the House Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, was adopted with few changes in the Senate and subsequently returned for final passage in late January. Following the enactment of this important legislation, the administration's civil rights bill, which had been passed out of the Judiciary Committee late last year, came to the floor and was finally passed after several days of heated debate during which time 14 amendments were adopted. It was signed into law by President Johnson on July 4.

Later in this report, I will outline other major legislative action of the second session of this Congress.

While the Federal budget announced by President Johnson was $98.6 billion, slightly higher than that of the previous year, Federal spending is actually well over $6 billion above what Congress appropriated. It is $23 billion higher than President Eisenhower's suggested 1961 fiscal budget which will carry the total spending figure to $105 billion for the current fiscal year. This exceeds the highest spending during World War II and promises a deficit of nearly $10 billion which is twice the deficit of the current fiscal year. Significant is the fact that this budget contains $6 billion in Federal agency expansion for the fiscal year which began on July 1. Whether one likes it or not, the sale of $2.3 billion in Government assets and an additional billion dollars in trick bookkeeping in the Commodity Credit Corporation were used to make the budget figure look lower. This was because CCC losses for fiscal 1964 are more than $2½ billion. Notwithstading this fact the budget asked for only $1.1 billion because the

administration cancelled out $931 million in interest of it to the Treasury by the CCC. It is interesting to note, too, that back-door spending of $1.4 billion for urban renewal will actually be paid by the taxpayers even though it does not show up in the budget. These facts are not generally known because the result will not show up until the turn of the year.

Our international monetary situation is still the source of great concern although it is quietly being tucked aside this election year of 1964. U.S. gold stocks have been reduced from $24.5 billion to a current reserve of slightly more than $15½ billion. Presently, our legal gold requirements are $14.62 billion which includes $12.7 required for our domestic fiscal needs together with borrowing from the International Monetary Fund, foreign currency borrowing by the Federal Reserve bank, and foreign currency borrowing by the Treasury. This would appear to leave $833 million but such is not the case since aggregate foreign claims of approximately $26 billion are outstanding at the present time. This year foreigners have drawn only $50 million from our gold reserve which would lead to the conclusion that the dollar which has been inconvertible at home for more than three decades has become inconvertible de facto abroad.

Perhaps the readers of this report might wonder why I am presenting this summary of our domestic and international fiscal situation in a legislative report of this nature. I do so because I do not believe we can afford to ignore this situation in evaluating the legislative actions of the Congress obviously because they are tempered—or certainly ought to be—by these fiscal facts. To suggest that there is no direct relationship would be folly. In fact, ignoring the fiscal problems of the United States either at home or abroad in legislative deliberations would merely be heading blindly toward economic and fiscal chaos.

In the presentation of this report, I shall provide a breakdown of the major legislative activities on a category basis since it would be impossible to list all important legislation in these respective areas.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

Seventeen bills including authorization and appropriation measures will probably have been signed into law by November 1 of this year. The total defense budget for fiscal 1964–65 is $39.6 billion. Of this sum, nearly $17 billion was for procurement and construction of planes, missiles, ships, and research and development. Another $5 billion has been earmarked for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for 1965 research, development, construction, and administration. This includes $2.6 billion for the Apollo man-to-moon project. The Atomic Energy Commission will draw an additional $2.6 billion and another billion and a half is earmarked for construction projects at Armed Forces bases at home and abroad.

INTERNAL AFFAIRS

The major legislation in this area was the authorization of $3.25 billion for foreign aid and a proposal to provide a $750 million increase in the lending capital of the International Development Association along with 16 other participating nations. A bill to increase U.S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank and an expansion of Peace Corps operating costs to $115 million for fiscal 1965 were approved and signed into law.

Interestingly enough was a House joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that every effort be made to obtain payment of dues of delinquent nations, including the Soviet Union, was adopted. It provides for pressing for the penalty of the voting rights in the General Assembly for those who fail to pay. However, it will be more interesting to see whether a conscientious and determined effort will be made to force the "dead beat" nations in the United Nations to pay their dues as well as special assessments since the United States has been the prime contributor since the inception of the U.N.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Never before in the history of the country has as much legislation been enacted in a single session of Congress to deal with economic programs as well as provide the means of increasing or extending revenues. A bill creating an Office of Economic Opportunity, better known as the antipoverty program, was passed in the sum of $947.5 million for fiscal 1965. An authorization to provide $1.1 billion annually for fiscal years 1966–67 as the Federal contribution to construction costs of State highways and various road projects was approved along with the extension for 3 years of aid to States and communities in the amount of $75 million for the construction of airports on a matching-fund basis. Another bill to increase from 33⅓ to 55 percent the subsidy for construction of fishing vessels was approved, including an extension program for 5 years to July 1, 1968, with authorization of $10 million annually. In the area of our domestic economy were several bills which were reported by the committee of which I am a member. Ways and Means, including the 1964 tax bill discussed previously; extension of current schedule of excise taxes on liquor, cigarettes, automobiles and parts, telephone service, and airline tickets. The committee also voted to impose taxes on the purchase of certain foreign securities as well as a 3-year proposal of $375 million in grants and loans to States and communities for mass transit facilities. Needless to say, it is again necessary to raise the national debt by $9 billion from $315 billion to $324 billion for fiscal year ending July 1, 1965. This represents an overall high in the public debt and an aggregate increase in the debt ceiling of $24 billion in 2 years' time.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the major piece of legislation in this field although 11 others were approved and signed into law, including an act to increase and adjust basic pay rates of postal and classified employees as well as officers of all three branches of the Federal Government.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND PUBLIC WELFARE

In the area of social security, both the House- and the Senate-passed bills to increase monthly payments to 19½ million old-age survivors and disability beneficiaries. It also liberalizes eligibility provisions and lowers the retirement age of widows to 60 years. This, of course, means increasing the social security tax again beginning January 1, 1965, and continuing on a rising scale thereafter to 1971. As of the time this report was written, the House and Senate conferees had not reached any agreement with regard to the medicare provisions under the bill.

In a separate item of legislation, Congress extended to June 30, 1967, authority of the HEW to provide temporary assistance to U.S. citizens returning from a foreign country under emergency hardship circumstances. Both Houses also extended to June 30, 1967, the provision of the Social Security Act permitting States to transfer dependent children from unsuitable foster homes to nonprofit institutions.

The National Defense Education Act was extended for 3 years to July 1, 1967, and increased authorization for college student loans from $135 million currently to $195 million for fiscal 1969.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Pay increases totaling $275 million monthly for all men and officers in the Armed Forces was approved and became law in midyear. The bill excepted those in the service less than 2 years, however. Approved also was a 5-year, $5 million per year program of aid to States on a matching basis for nursing home facilities and State veteran homes, and another measure which liberalizes nonservice-connected pensions for needy veterans and widows, and revising limits of permissible income without loss of pension. H.R. 2664, a bill exempting from draft induction a sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service was enacted into law. Congress also voted to raise the authorized strength of the Cadet Corps of the U.S. Air Force and Military Academies and fixing the period of obligated service now at 5 years.

AGRICULTURE

Most controversial and important of farm legislation this past session was the passage of the bill which continues cotton price support and the subsidy for exporters as well as providing a new subsidy for domestic processors. In the same bill was an authorization for a new wheat marketing program to maintain a $2-a-bushel price support domestically and a minimum of $1.55 for export. Other agricultural bills included one requiring registration of all pesticides before they can be sold to the public, extension of the food-for-peace program, and a bill to permit the purchase of process food grains by the Commodity Credit Corporation for donation under domestic welfare and foreign aid programs. Because of the sharp drop in domestic beef prices, a bill restricting importation of beef, veal, lamb, and mutton to 6.5 percent of domestic consumption was passed as a compromise to several more restrictive import bills.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Most important of the natural resource legislation was Senate bill, S. 4, establishing a national wilderness reservation system on 35 million acres closed to commercial use and retained in their preservative state. In other bipartisan supported legislation, authorization of a 10-year, $82.5 million program to finance water resource research centers in colleges and universities was approved as was a $2 billion land and water conservation fund to assist States in developing outdoor recreation programs. Senate bill, S. 1363, providing for increased payments to counties in which wildlife refuges are located became law this year, also.

Bills which I introduced during the 88th Congress were:

H.R. 1904, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exclude from gross income gain from sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer at age 60. Included as provision in Revenue Act of 1964.

H.R. 3286, Commission on Aircraft Noise.

H.R. 3927, to provide for medical and hospital care through voluntary health insurance.

H.R. 5501, for the relief of Wieslawa Marianna Borczon. Approved and signed into law July 11, 1964.

H.R. 5986, amend duty on broom corn. Passed by both the House and the Senate.

H.R. 6490, repeal excise tax on communications.

H.R. 6926, increase the amount of outside earnings under social security.

H.R. 8204, remove inequities from Federal Employees Compensation Act for survivors.

H.R. 8535, right to be represented by an attorney before Federal agencies.

H.R. 9804, amend title II of the Social Security Act. Amend benefits for a person forced to retire at 60 years.

H.R. 9805, amend Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deduct higher education expenses.

H.R. 9978, amend Internal Revenue Code relating to manufacturers excise tax on TV sets.

H.R. 10838, to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921.

H.R. 11385, establish a U.S. mint in Lake or Cook County, Ill.

H.R. 11767, amend Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

H.R. 12512, amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase widows' benefits.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Since the Congress has jurisdiction in many areas in legislation affecting the District of Columbia, it passed a dozen major items of legislation ranging from pay increases for District of Columbia teachers and Metropolitan Police and Fire Departments, to strengthening enforcement procedures against owners of unsafe structures in the District. Bills to permit suspension or dismissal of unruly school pupils, increase the number of man-dog teams authorized for the District of Columbia Police Department, and legislation permitting principals and teachers to use reasonable force in maintaining order in public schools were passed in the House but did not get through the Senate this year.

PERSONAL REPORT

The spring and summer months of 1964 were marked by the greatest influx of tourists of any of my 8 years in the Congress. The 10th Congressional District, which has the largest population of any in Illinois and is among the largest congressional districts in the country, naturally had perhaps the largest number of visitors than any district of its distance from the Nation's Capital. Families who normally spend their vacations in other sections of the country came to Washington en route to the World's Fair in New York this year in great numbers. Our guest book shows more than 500 residents of our district visited my office where members of my staff arranged for visits to the White House, Gallery passes for both the House and Senate, and tours of places of historical interest in the Nation's Capital.

Congressional mail, expected to be heavier this election year than in previous years, actually maintained a normal volume. The number of personal problems with the various agencies of Government referred to us by constituents during the course of the year increased sharply, however. These range from matters pertaining to assistance in social security, immigration, and servicemen and veterans' requests. Each of these was handled on an individual basis and every possible assistance given each inquiry.

In closing, let me state that while the 2d session of the 88th Congress was marked by certain achievements and admitted failures, we must expect to make even more difficult decisions next year. New crises in many areas of the world have cast their shadow over U.S. foreign policy and the need for changes in our posture abroad.

Although this report appears to be lengthy, it is actually but a brief and comprehensive analysis of the legislative activity of the Congress during the past year. For this reason, my office is prepared to provide detailed information on any and all bills of special interest to my constituents. Requests may be made either by writing to my Washington office, room 1026, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., or by telephoning my district office at 749–4115.

Captive Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] and the others here for taking this time to expound on a great malady which afflicts the world today. All through our history the principle of self-determination has been the essence of our development. This principle was part and parcel of the settling of America and part and parcel of the founding of this great Nation. It has figured in our history because of the very nature of our democratically governed Republic. It is the foundation of our international relations and it is the basic reason for our participation in the various conflicts throughout our history—including the Spanish-American War, two World Wars, and the Korean episode. And now, we are attempting to preserve this principle in South Vietnam.

America, as a nation, does not wish to conquer. It does not wish to encourage or to extend the principle of dictatorship. It wishes only to preserve the freedom of other peoples. In accordance with my strong belief in this fundamental concept of self-determination, I wish to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], and all others here in a reassertion of this principle and a reassurance to all of the good people now suffering within the boundaries of the captive nations.

Urge Registration, Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in this country, it is tragically true that many of our eligible citizens fail to register and vote.

My friend, Mr. W. H. Champion, editor and publisher of the Dublin, Ga., Courier-Herald, published an editorial on September 21 in which he urged the people of Laurens County, Ga., to take a greater interest by registering to vote.

His points are well taken, and I would like my colleagues in the Congress to read his fine editorial:

INTEREST IN VOTING HERE

The report by Tax Commissioner R. C. Garrard that Laurens County has now approximately 16,000 registered voters suggests that more and more we are becoming interested in the exercise of the voting privilege and duty.

We sincerely hope that this is true and that in the general election in November, and in all subsequent elections and primaries, the people of this country—and area—will take the trouble to do what they ought to do as a free people—vote.

The question was raised as to when we will reach the saturation point in registrations in Laurens County, or when will every eligible person be registered to vote?

A check into the statistics of Laurens County shows that we are not yet 100 percent registered. In fact, we have approximately two-thirds of the potentially eligible people now registered to vote in elections and primaries.

Here are some figures that may be interesting, thanks to help from the Carnegia Library and our own collection of statistics.

There were—and we say were because we know there are more now—32,313 of us in Laurens County according to the 1960 census. Of that number, 12,851 were 17 years of age

or under, and thus ineligible to register to vote.

But in 1960 there were 1,951 who were from 15 to 17 years of age and are now eligible to register to vote.

That leaves 10,900 of the underaged in 1960 who are still underage as far as voting is concerned.

By a little subtraction we can see that according to the 1960 figures there are potentially 21,431 people in Laurens County who are eligible to register and vote; but we have approximately 16,000.

The births over the past 4 years have outnumbered the deaths in the county, and the number of adults who have moved in has been more than those who moved out. So we can safely conclude, we think, that our total population is greater than the 32,313 figures of 1960, and hence we have a larger number of potential voters than the 21,413 as calculated from the 1960 census.

While we can be proud of the fact that so many people have made themselves eligible to vote, we still have a sizable number who are not. And certainly we have not reached the saturation point that no further registrations can be expected.

It remains for us to stand fast to the idea that free people should act the part of free people, and while enjoying the benefits of a free country to exercise the duties and obligations of a free people.

The increased registration here is a healthy sign, and the interest in voting when the ballot boxes are brought out is also a healthy sign. But we have not yet reached the point that we can sit back in the calm assurance that we are doing all that we should to maintain and strengthen a free America. It is a continuing battle to keep what is our heritage from our forebears who cherished freedom as something well worth fighting for.

And we can well remember that freedom is not always lost on battlefields with thundering guns and bursting shells; usually it is lost because a country's people lose their interest in working to keep what they have.

Thanksgiving Day Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, Fred Radatz is a lifelong friend and neighbor of mine who works the farm on which his pioneer father settled many years ago.

As a man of the soil, Fred Radatz has had much opportunity to reflect upon nature and to feel closer to the Almighty than do many of us.

The other day, as we spoke together, Mr. Radatz recited to me a Thanksgiving Day prayer he had composed. As a religious man he believes that food is a blessing which is given by Him to provide us with strength and energy to do our work in peace and not to destroy each other.

Mr. Radatz' prayer follows:

THANKSGIVING DAY PRAYER

We thank thee, O Lord, that Thou hast given the farmers of the United States of America the wisdom to understand some of the secrets of nature so that they can raise enough food to supply the people who live therein. And while we partake of that food we pray Thee, O Lord, that the strength, faith and energy derived therefrom shall be used for constructive and not destructive purposes. Amen.

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—The Communist Challenge, II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, what are the basic elements of the Communist strategy for winning the cold war—a strategy that employs ideological as well as military and economic weapons?

What part do the ideological elements—Communist doctrine, propaganda and political agitation—play in that strategy?

What can the U.S. Government do to counter Communist efforts on this nonmilitary plane?

What role can private initiative—business, labor, the academic community, and other private organizations—play in the struggle to win men's minds?

The answers to such questions were sought by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements during the initial part of a study which we initiated in March 1963.

To obtain the answers, the subcommittee invited a cross-section of leaders in business, industry, labor, and in communications, as well as writers, commentators, and other interested persons, to present their views in open hearings.

The hearings opened on March 28, 1963, with the testimony of Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, and continued intermittently through September 13. In the course of those 6 months, the subcommittee received testimony from 53 witnesses, as follows:

Thomas Aitken, Jr., vice president, INFOPLAN, of Interpublic, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Mrs. Mariada Arensberg, executive secretary, Cuban Freedom Committee, Washington, D.C.

Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio.

Stanley Ballard, secretary, American Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO.

Adrian Berwick, senior editor, the Reader's Digest international editions, Pleasantville, N.Y.

Theodore Bikel, actor, council member, Actors' Equity Association.

Ralf Brent, president, Radio New York Worldwide, New York, N.Y.

Edward S. Butler, Executive Vice President, Information Council of the Americas, New Orleans, La.

Leo Cherne, executive director, Research Institute of America, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Louis Cheskin, of Louis Cheskin Associates, Chicago, Ill.

James B. Conkling, president, International Educational Broadcasting Corp., Sherman Oaks, Calif.

Hon. George P. Delaney, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State and Coordinator on International Labor.

Angus Duncan, executive secretary, Actors' Equity Association.

George Englund, motion picture producer-director, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Culver City, Calif.

Lionel C. Epstein, attorney, Ginsburg & Leventhal, Washington, D.C., and member of board of trustees of the Experiment in International Living.

Hy Faine, National executive secretary, American Guild of Musical Artists.

Rudolph Faupl, U.S. Worker Representative to the International Labor Organization and international representative, International Association of Machinists.

Lloyd A. Free, president, Institute for International Social Research, Princeton, N.J.

John W. Gardner, Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Carl Harms, actor, recording secretary, Actors' Equity Association.

Miss Melissa Hayden, prima ballerina, New York City Ballet Co.

Hal Holbrook, actor, member Actors' Equity Association.

Dr. Kenneth Holland, president, Institute of International Education, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Robert T. Holt, department of political science, University of Minnesota.

Earle Hyman, actor, council member, Actors' Equity Association.

Richard A. Humphrey, Director, Commission on International Education, Washington, D.C.

Walter Joyce, managing editor, Printers' Ink, New York, N.Y.

Herman Kenin, president, American Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO.

Dan Lacy, managing director, American Book Publishers Council, New York.

John E. Lawyer, Acting Director, Office of International Organization Affairs, International Affairs Bureau, Department of Labor.

Dr. Arthur H. Litchfield, chairman of the board, Governmental Affairs Institute.

John McMullan, news director, Washington Bureau, Knight Newspapers.

Henry Mayers, president, the Mayers Co., Los Angeles, Calif., and chairman, Cold War Council.

Rosario Mazzeo, personnel manager, Boston Symphony Orchestra.

George Meaney, president, AFL–CIO.

Herbert C. Merillat, executive director, American Society of International Law.

H. Philip Mettger, president, Governmental Affairs Institute.

Dick Moore, editor, Equity magazine.

John D. J. Moore, vice president, W. R. Grace Co., and chairman, U.S. Inter-American Council.

Hon. Edward R. Murrow, Director, U.S. Information Agency.

Stanley Plesent, General Counsel and Congressional Liaison, USIA.

Stanley F. Reed, president, Reed Research Foundation, and president, Technology Audit Corp., Washington, D.C.

Hon. J. Leonard Reinsch, Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Information.

John Richardson, Jr., president, Free Europe Committee, New York, N.Y.

Hon. James Roosevelt, a Representative in Congress from the State of California.

Kermit Roosevelt, vice president, Governmental Relations Department, Gulf Oil Corp., Washington, D.C.

Robert H. School, director of public relations, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), New York.

Eric Sevareid, author, commentator, and news analyst, New York, N.Y.

Thomas C. Sorenson, Deputy Director for Policy and Plans, USIA.

Miss Blanche Thebom, concert and opera singer, Metropolitan Opera Co.

Dr. Theodore Vallance, director, Special Operations Research Office, American University, Washington, D.C.

Hon. George L-P Weaver, Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs.

Eddie Weston, actor, second vice president, Actors' Equity Association.

In addition, the subcommittee received a number of written statements which addressed themselves to the subject under study and which were prepared by civic-minded citizens, without cost, to the U.S. Government.

The testimony of witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee, together with a number of additional statements, has been printed under the title "Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—Hearings Before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, Parts I Through V." Other papers submitted to the subcommittee have also been of help to its members and were retained for possible future publication.

The five volumes of hearings mentioned above make fascinating reading and in the opinion of at least one news correspondent, point to several far-reaching conclusions.

First, that ideological activities—teaching of the Communist doctrine, persuading people to its cause, and motivating them to take political action in support of Communist objectives—constitute an integral and eminent part of the Communist strategy of world revolution.

Second, that the thrust of the Communist ideological effort, added to the impact of the concurrent revolutions of the 20th century in science, education, communications, and rising expectations of the masses of people of the underdeveloped countries, has profoundly influenced the entire character of the East-West confrontation and created serious challenge for the foreign policy of the United States. This conclusion—that the nonmilitary conflict is not only significant but may prove decisive to the outcome of the global struggle between the world Communist movement and those who oppose it—was underscored in a statement made by the late President John F. Kennedy on April 2, 1961, and cited by one of the witnesses who appeared before our subcommittee. President Kennedy said:

> We dare not fail to see the insidious nature of this new and deeper struggle. We dare not fail to grasp the new concepts, the new tools, the new sense of urgency we will need to combat it, whether in Cuba or South Vietnam. And we dare not fail to realize it is this struggle which is taking place every day without arms or fanfare, in thousands of villages and markets and classrooms all over the globe. * * * No greater task faces this Nation or this administration. * * * Too long have we fixed our eyes on the traditional military needs; on the armies prepared to cross borders; on missiles poised for flight. Now it should be clear this is no longer enough; that our security may be lost piece by piece, country by country, without the firing of a single missile or the crossing of a single border.

Third, that the U.S. Government has not attempted to meet the nonmilitary challenge posed by the Communist movement, and to advance our own foreign policy objectives abroad, with anything approaching a well-coordinated campaign of the size and scope of our other foreign policy undertakings. Rather, in the opinion of several witnesses, the U.S. Government has pitted a handful of limited, fragmented and frequently uncoordinated programs, against a massive, integrated, worldwide Communist ideological offensive.

Fourth, that private American initiative, embodied in programs conducted abroad by private American individuals and organizations, may play a vital role in deciding the outcome of the cold war—and that this realization was slowly beginning to produce positive results.

These broad conclusions emerged from the testimony of witnesses who appeared before our subcommittee during the initial part of our study. This does not mean that all of the witnesses agreed upon each and every conclusion—nor even that two or more witnesses would define any single conclusion in precisely the manner in which it appears above. Any attempt such as this to summarize the rich variety of views and ideas advanced by a group of thoughtful and well-informed persons is bound to do some injustice to each individual presentation. The same, of course, applies to the membership of our subcommittee. I know that each of its members could well improve upon this summary.

Nevertheless, these four tentative conclusions became the base from which the subcommittee continued its study. We were fully conscious of them as we moved into the next phase of our undertaking. That phase will be the subject of part III of my report.

How the Russians Think—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, former Senator William Benton, of Connecticut, recently returned from a visit to Moscow, where he spent 10 days seeking the answer to what lies behind the "relaxation of tensions" in that area. He wrote a series of articles on his trip and they were published in the Hartford Courant.

I believe they represent a penetrating analysis of Soviet strategy and give an interesting picture of the Russian Premier. I therefore submit the first article for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HOW THE RUSSIANS THINK: MR. KHRUSHCHEV'S "STATUS QUO" MEANS "FREEDOM OF SUBVERSION"—PART I

(By William Benton, publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica)

(Former U.S. Senator William Benton has visited the U.S.S.R. five times since 1955. During his last visit, in May, he interviewed 40 top Soviet officials in 10 days—including Chairman Nikita Khrushchev. "I wanted to see for myself what lies behind the so-called relaxation of tension," says Benton. "I didn't argue. I listened. I interjected comments and objections occasionally, only to help strip away some of the Soviet propaganda." The North American Newspaper Alliance asked Senator Benton, who is now chairman and publisher of Encyclopedia Britannica, and is also U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO, to summarize some of the highlights of his interviews. This is the first of four articles on his talks to Russian leaders.)

NEW YORK, August 15.—Soviet leaders expect to achieve victory for communism without a nuclear encounter with the West. They believe they can do this in part by supporting national uprisings, or liberation wars, conducted by guerrilla forces such as Castro's.

Chairman Khrushchev's strategy for overcoming the West was enunciated on January 6, 1961, at a meeting of world Communist leaders. The strategy has not been changed.

During my recent visit to the Soviet Union it became clear that the Chairman is as convinced as ever—Red China's violent reaction to the contrary notwithstanding—that his program for quietly burying capitalism can be accomplished without World War III. It can be attained in an atmosphere of peaceful coexistence—which means perpetuation of the cold war—in which the status quo of countries is guaranteed both by the United States and the Soviet Union.

The question then is, What is the definition of "status quo"?

When I met in Moscow with Chairman Khrushchev he went into the meaning and significance of "status quo" as he sees it. He spoke at length and with great warmth. He began by referring to his meeting in Vienna with the late President John F. Kennedy in the spring of 1961.

"BYPASSED" BY J.F.K.

The problem of "status quo," Khrushchev said, "is most difficult for your statesmen. They must face up to it. They must solve it." At Vienna, said Khrushchev, he had felt this problem most acutely. However, President Kennedy bypassed it.

"The question still remains," Khrushchev declared. "It remains for President Johnson."

The Chairman stated: "Mr. Kennedy tried to argue with me that we should have a status quo. This is quite correct. I don't deny this thesis. But, Mr. Kennedy gave a meaning to it of his own. The Soviet Government on December 31 last year published a letter on not changing the boundaries. Isn't this the status quo? Seemingly our policies on this subject of boundaries—the United States and the U.S.S.R.—are the same. However, Mr. Kennedy had a still further meaning to the status quo, and a still different meaning. We agree with him that the sovereignties of all individual countries should be maintained. We agree that there should

be no interference from the outside by any other country. We agree that each country has the right to pick its own social system. All else is mechanics. This is our stand in the U.S.S.R.

"NO SUBVERSION

"Mr. Kennedy spoke of not having any 'subversive activities' in any country. Now this is quite another question. I can agree on the undesirability of a second country or a third country moving in to interfere. But revolutions do happen. They do occur as they did here in the Soviet Union. A political system becomes rotten. And a rotten system leads to an explosion. Then the new is born through the struggle with the old. We in the U.S.S.R. feel that the revolutionary process should have the right to exist. Tender plants can and do break through the asphalt and can crack the concrete. (The Chairman emphasized this with an uppointed thumb.) Isn't it strange that a frail plant can break concrete?"

Khrushchev was eloquent at this point—and, demonstrating his emotional power, he said President Kennedy had opposed the right of any foreign power to help people in rebellion. But he (Khrushchev) insisted that people would continue to rebel, and would continue to succeed in rebellion. He said that any policy which opposed the right of people to rebel was doomed. (I could not break in on his torrential barrage to inquire about the right of the Hungarian people to rebel in 1956.)

U.S. POLICY "DOOMED"

Charging that the United States supports the reactionary forces, he asserted: "You Americans are happy at your victory in Brazil. President Johnson has just sent a congratulatory letter. But your policy is doomed to failure."

Then, slamming the table, Khrushchev promised:

"Indeed, it will be a pyrrhic victory. The reactionaries in Brazil can of course murder the leading figures who have opposed them. But the people will provide new leaders. The new leaders will emerge to organize the masses. This whole question of the right to rebel, and the Soviet right to help combat reactionary governments, is very serious and complicated.

"This question will not be understood by your American leaders. This is the question of questions. This affects our relations with you. Indeed, this question is at the heart of our relations with you. If you of the United States will only recognize the right of people to have the government they want—to have social systems they want and they like—if you will only not interfere with them in this goal—this will be the great step forward. Kennedy could not understand this. Here is the present question: Will Johnson understand it?"

HOW ABOUT VENEZUELA?

I wondered whether Khrushchev actually believed that the people of Hungary, or Poland, Czechoslovakia, or East Germany would agree with him if they were permitted to express themselves freely. Citing the most recent example, I said that I could not allow to pass unchallenged the suggestion that international communism did not interfere—as an outside party—in the domestic affairs of sovereign countries.

"Let us take Venezuela," I said. "President Betancourt was legally elected President of a democratic regime which we in the United States respected and admired. An effort was made to assassinate him which was traced back to Castro and Cuba. The Cubans further sought to foment revolution and shipped arms into Venezuela."

The Chairman did not let me continue. He waved his hand at me and said emphatically: "Who placed the arms in Venezuela? Was it Castro? Was it the CIA?"

I laughed. The Chairman then laughed also. Indeed, he laughed many times during the interview. He has a quick sense of humor. And he added with a chuckle: "Both things could have happened." Thus he evades the question. Thus he shows his skill at dialectics.

FREEDOM TO SUBVERT

When we analyze Khrushchev's definition of "status quo," we come up with the following: The United States and the U.S.S.R. are not to seek to alter the boundaries of other countries. Neither should overtly interfere with the social or political systems obtaining within these countries. But either should feel at liberty to help liberation movements everywhere—when these movements seek to overthrow reactionary forces or imperialism.

If Chairman Khrushchev could have his way—which he cannot—the United States would pledge itself to stand by idly while Communist guerrillas—with Soviet support—toppled governments by subversion and localized fighting. Thus Khrushchev chooses to regard the Communists in Vietnam as a legitimate revolutionary movement against the reactionary and hence illegitimate government which the United States is supporting.

Quite naturally President Kennedy did not agree to Khrushchev's definition of the U.S.S.R.'s right to intervene internally to assist antigovernment forces. President Johnson does not agree. When challenged to the brink of nuclear war, Khrushchev gave way on Cuba. This was an experience that may have taught him a great deal. But it has not compelled him to scrap his grand strategy for country-by-country Communist victory.

Immigration Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican presidential and vice-presidential candidates seem to delight in misrepresenting the facts regarding immigration legislation in this session of Congress.

The following statement by the Democratic vice-presidential candidate, Senator HUMPHREY, outlines the true facts concerning this legislation.

The New York Post editorial of September 11, 1964, gives valuable facts on U.S. Immigration legislation.

HUMPHREY SCORCHES MILLER ON IMMIGRATION STATEMENT

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY today assailed as "patently false and nonsense" the claim by Representative WILLIAM E. MILLER that President Johnson's immigration bill would triple immigration and cause unemployment.

Noting that "we are a nation of immigrants," HUMPHREY asked:

"When did Congressman MILLER lose faith in America?"

The Democratic vice presidential nominee pointed out that if present laws were effective 100 years ago Senator BARRY GOLDWATER'S grandfather possibly could not have come to the United States.

MILLER, in a speech on Monday in South Bend, Ind., said that if the administration bill passed, "the number of immigrants next year will increase threefold."

Following is the text of Senator HUMPHREY'S statement:

"First of all, Congressman MILLER has his facts wrong. He states that if President Johnson's immigration bill is passed, 'the number of immigrants next year will increase threefold.' Now, of course that is patently false and nonsense. The present law allows 155,500 persons to enter the United States each year. The President's immigration bill increases this by only 14,500. Now that surely doesn't mean a threefold increase. That kind of arithmetic just doesn't make sense.

"But the important question is: When did Congressman MILLER lose faith in America? Why, we are a nation of immigrants. Not 6 weeks ago Senator DIRKSEN, Republican leader in the Senate, offered in nomination a man whom he described as 'the grandson of a peddler, a proud honorable and spirited man who left his ancestral home in Europe at an early age and came to this land a century ago.' Now it is a fact that for the past 40 years our immigration law has in effect, discriminated against some peoples because of race, creed or national origin. In fact if the present law had been in effect 100 years ago, Senator GOLDWATER'S grandfather possibly could not have come to the United States.

"Now this is an area of discrimination in our national life that we have not yet brought into line with the rest of our laws and we ought to change that pattern of law. If Congressman MILLER is against the change that's his business. But we are for it and the people can make their choice on November 3."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, Sept. 11, 1964]

GOP Vice-Presidential Candidate MILLER'S attack on the administration's proposals for immigration reform has quickly backfired. And well it should have.

MILLER asserted that the administration's immigration proposals "would open the floodgates for virtually any and all who would wish to come and work in this country."

This happens to be nonsense. The purpose of the bill is not a substantial rise in the annual number of immigrants but abolition of a national origins quota system which discriminates against immigrants from eastern and southern Europe and contains overtones of bigotry.

As President Johnson has said, our question to an immigrant from Italy or Poland should not be, "Where do you come from?" but "What can you contribute to America?"

The administration's bill would carry out objectives originally projected by President Truman and reaffirmed by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. All party platforms except the 1964 GOP document have favored the goals it embodies. The measure bears the support of many distinguished GOP Congressmen.

Once again Mr. MILLER was as misinformed about his facts as he was impoverished in spirit. Has he ever visited the Statue of Liberty?

A Rousing Speech by the Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party and the Nation is privileged to have the services

of the Honorable John A. Gronouski in the office of Postmaster General. As well as being a most able public official, Mr. Gronouski is making himself noteworthy as a public speaker in this election year.

It was with great pleasure that I and several other Los Angeles Congressmen were the honored guests at a gathering of postal workers this past week, and we were doubly honored to have the Postmaster General as the main speaker for the evening. I consider Mr. Gronouski's speech to be of interest to all my colleagues and to the country at large, and I therefore submit it at this time for the attention of all concerned with the future of our country:

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. GRONOUSKI, POSTMASTER GENERAL

I am delighted to be here among my fellow Democrats. It's such a pleasure belonging to a political party that isn't ashamed of its leaders. That's quite a contrast with the Republicans, you know. I've traveled all over the country during the past several months, and no matter where I go, local Republican leaders and candidates are trying to pretend they've never heard of BARRY GOLDWATER. We Democrats have had to refresh their memory a bit.

And isn't it wonderful that we have a real two-party system again? A party of hope and a party of memory. For all this we can thank Mr. GOLDWATER. He was determined from the beginning to give the Nation "a choice, not an echo."

Some choice.

The Republican Party hasn't had a progressive idea since Calvin Coolidge decided not to seek reelection in 1928. And now they're desperately trying to stamp out the ideals of Abraham Lincoln.

Well, if the Republicans don't want Lincoln, we'll take him—and everything he stood for.

Here in California you have a U.S. Senator who has never been afraid to stand up and be counted when questions of human decency arise. And that Senator's name is PIERRE SALINGER. PIERRE is an old and close friend of mine and I know that he has strong convictions about the dignity of the individual—all individuals—and I also know that he has the courage to back up those convictions.

I believe, too, that the vast majority of Americans feel the same way. I believe that Americans have a heritage of fairplay and respect for their fellow man. I believe they would rather follow the honorable lead of a GEORGE BROWN or a GUS HAWKINS or an ED ROYBAL or a CHARLIE WILSON—rather than the lead of bigoted men who seek to fan the flames of hate and discrimination to promote their own political ends.

And in this context, I must say I am tremendously impressed with the quality of your repreesentation here in the Los Angeles area. Your four Congressmen—freshmen all—have already earned reputations for themselves, in Washington and in California, that far exceed their length of service. I could speak extensively about their records, their dedication to their jobs and their abilities, but I think there is one example I can give you that sums it all up.

As you know, President Lyndon B. Johnson recently signed into law the Economic Opportunity Act—better known as the Anti-Poverty Act. It represents the most massive attack on poverty in the history of mankind. One of the unique aspects of this law is that it places on the local communities the responsibility for developing their own programs. The National Government will assist—and will supply the funds—but the local government must decide what needs to be done and how to do it.

Thanks to the foresight of Congressmen BROWN, HAWKINS, ROYBAL, and WILSON, an organization has already been set up that will probably give this area a decided headstart over much of the rest of the Nation.

I speak, of course, of the Los Angeles Area Economic Development Agency. This organization, which has already done so much good for your poor, your needy, your youth, your aged and your unemployed, will now dovetail with the antipoverty program to bring a new dawn of hope to hundreds of thousands of less fortunate citizens in this area.

The way of the Los Angeles area is the way of progress: progress through Congressmen of outstanding experience, demonstrated vision, and forthright convictions.

Such, I am sorry to say, are not qualities readily found in the Republican Party under the temporary leadership of BARRY GOLDWATER.

Experience?

Mr. GOLDWATER has been a Member of the Senate for 12 years, and in that time, he has compiled one of the most lackluster records of any Senator of our generation. The fact is that not a single piece of major legislation bears his name.

Vision?

Senator GOLDWATER is afraid of the future—and you don't wonder when you hear what he proposes to do. In his own words he tells us: "My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them. It is not to inaugurate new programs, but to cancel old ones."

Convictions?

They certainly don't concern the welfare of the citizens of this Nation or this State. You have only to look at the record.

This administration—under the leadership of President Johnson—is committed to a realistic and humane program of health care for the aged; a program designed to assure them "dignity in sickness, as well as in health."

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on the aged by voting against medicare.

This administration believes that our generation—for the first time in history—has the knowledge, the wealth and the tools to eradicate poverty in America; to give all our citizens, no matter how lowly their station or inadequate their education, a new opportunity to help themselves.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on the poor by voting against the antipoverty bill.

This administration believes that social security represents one of the great social achievements of our century, providing peace of mind and a better life for millions of retired citizens.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on these people by advocating policies which would destroy the very fabric of our social security system.

This administration is committed to the proposition that our workers are entitled to a decent salary for an honest day's work.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on labor by voting against increases in the minimum wage.

This administration is determined to wipe out the cancer of long-term unemployment and hopelessness in the chronically depressed sections of our Nation.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on the unemployed by voting repeatedly against area redevelopment.

This administration believes that every child in America deserves a decent meal, no matter who his parents may be.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on hundreds of thousands of hungry children by opposing the food stamp and the school lunch programs.

This administration believes that our Nation cannot achieve its full measure of greatness until our young men and women—all of them—have an opportunity to develop their minds to their full capacities.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on our young people by voting against aid to education.

This administration believes that every man, woman, and child has the constitutional right to an equal opportunity in our society, regardless of the color of his skin or his religion or the accent with which he speaks.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on millions of Americans by voting against the Civil Rights Act.

This administration believes it has the moral and awesome responsibility of protecting every living creature from the poisonous effects of radioactive fallout.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on all the people by opposing the test ban treaty.

Yes, Senator GOLDWATER has turned his back.

While President Johnson seeks to unify our people behind a great national cause, the opposition seeks to obstruct, divide, and conquer.

And the hallmark of its approach is extremism.

I know there is an effort being made to hide extremism under the elephant's trunk. I know the temporary Republican leader went to Gettysburg and began talking like a "moderate" for the sake of party unity.

But I also remember what he said in San Francisco: "Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice," and "Moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue."

The echo of those infamous words will be reverberating throughout this Nation long after the last ballot is cast next November 3. They represent an open invitation to any radical of the left or right to take the law into his own hands by wrapping the American flag around his devious ends.

Extremism is hate and divisiveness. It is spitting on the Ambassador to the United Nations. It is labeling the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court a traitor and a Communist. It is storing up arms against what is called a "Communist menace," against the day when you brand everyone who disagrees with you a Communist.

Extremism is a racial issue. It is justification for turning dogs loose on Negroes, or bombing churches, or pouring acid into newly integrated swimming pools.

It is a program to foment prejudice among ethnic groups by playing on their economic insecurity. And it is a cynical disdain of those same ethnic groups by perpetuating a discriminatory immigration policy.

Extremism is encouraging lawlessness by stirring the passions of the disgruntled and the maladjusted.

And finally, extremism is reckless and suicidal nuclear irresponsibility. It is the surrender of life-and-death decisionmaking authority from the President of the United States to military field commanders.

But BARRY GOLDWATER insists that "extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice."

Hate: "in the defense of liberty."

Suspicion: "in the defense of liberty."

Prejudice: "in the defense of liberty."

Fear: "in the defense of liberty."

Assassination: "in the defense of liberty."

Divisiveness: "in the defense of liberty."

Economic deprivation: "in the defense of liberty."

And nuclear holocaust: "in the defense of liberty."

This Nation cannot afford such a "defense of liberty"—and neither can liberty itself. Because in the end, it would be liberty as defined by a rabid group of radicals—which means liberty for them to rule as they see fit.

We have long since passed the point where we can treat the radical elements among us as a joke. There is no shrugging it off. This is a grave national threat.

The extremists are organized, well financed, disciplined, and highly motivated. They have captured a major political party. The only way to defeat them is to expose them to the voters; to tell the American people that these people are not traveling the road of freedom and liberty; they are traveling the road to anarchy and chaos.

They must be repudiated before they poison our system completely. And the time to repudiate them is now.

Thank you.

School Dropout Problem Examined Among Mexican-American Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the Monterey County, Calif., Office of Education, in cooperation with the Chualar Union School District has just completed the 1st year of a 2-year education project under legislation approved by the California State Legislature in 1963. The study should be of interest to all educators and persons concerned with education of our youth.

The study confirms the theory that one of the major causes of school dropouts among students from Mexican and Filipino families is difficulty with English. Information on the study follows:

For a complete report on the project, requests may be directed to Mr. Ed Coffin, superintendent, Monterey County Schools, Post Office Box 851, Salinas, Calif.:

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROJECT

Difficulty with English is one of the major causes of school dropouts in areas where there is a high percentage of students from Mexican and Filipino families.

This statement was borne out by the Monterey County compensatory education project, carried out by the Monterey County Office of Education and the Chualar Union School District in Chualar during the past school year.

The project was one of four carried out by county offices throughout California.

A report on the project states: "English is the foundation of American education and as far as children from non-English speaking backgrounds are concerned, it is the greatest obstacle. It is undoubtedly one of the major causes of school dropouts in this segment of the population."

Chualar, a rural community 11 miles south of Salinas, was chosen for the project because of its isolation, its high percentage of Mexican families and its lack of cultural and educational facilities.

At the close of the 1962–63 school year, 231 students were enrolled in school in grades K–8. Of these, 74 percent had Mexican or Filipino surnames, with the Mexican names by far the most numerous.

The children were given the Wechsler intelligence scale in sixth and seventh grades. Fifty-one students were tested, and 59 percent had Mexican surnames. The children were cooperative and interested.

A look at the scores showed that at least half of the children were "culturally deprived" in that their experiences with language, knowledge, opportunities, and values of the American middle-class culture were limited. The majority of these children came from Mexican homes where little or no English was spoken.

Primarily, the children tested were of average intelligence. While the average for the performance IQ was higher than the verbal IQ in both the Mexican-American and non-Mexican groups, the difference was far greater in the Mexican-American group. This shows that while the Mexican-American group has the ability to do at least average work, it has not developed verbally.

The report states that the children often listened to the questions and directions and then merely shrugged. While this is usually taken as an "I don't know" answer, investigation showed that the child either didn't understand or didn't know how to answer in English.

The report said that these children need extensive work in learning English, beginning with the fundamentals and progressing through the comprehension of abstract concepts.

The report also details other features of the project, which included the initiation of a Spanish-English newsletter for Mexican families, adult education classes in English and Spanish, development of a community library, teaching of English as a second language, field trips to Sacramento and San Francisco for children and parents, and performances in Chualar by the county symphony orchestra.

The project generated interest in education in Chualar, both among students and parents. Teachers also felt they had benefitted from the testing by gaining new insights into students' problems.

Needs for the future, according to the report, include more effective face-to-face communication with Mexican parents to interest them in school-parent functions, and a plan for developing curriculum that will better accommodate Mexican-American children. Also needed is a continuation of the work in teaching Spanish, and in teaching English as a second language.

How the Russians Think—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, when former Senator William Benton, of Connecticut, toured the Soviet Union earlier this year, he talked with Yuri Zhukov, one of the senior editors of Pravda, and subsequently reported his observations in the Hartford Courant.

Zhukov's emphasis on disarmament presents an interesting view of Soviet attitudes. I believe it is well worth the study of this body, and I offer it for the RECORD:

HOW THE RUSSIANS THINK: ARE THEY SERIOUS IN TALKING OF SWORDS INTO PLOWSHARES?

(Former U.S. Senator William Benton has visited the U.S.S.R. five times since 1955. During his last visit, in May, he interviewed 40 top Soviet officials in 10 days—including Chairman Nikita Khruschev. "I wanted to see for myself what lies behind the so-called relaxation of tension," says Benton. "I did not argue. I listened. I interjected comments and objectives occasionally, only to help strip away some of the Soviet propaganda." The North American Newspaper Alliance asked Senator Benton, who is now chairman and publisher of Encyclopedia Britannica, and is also U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO, to summarize some of the highlights of his interviews. This is the second of four articles on his talks to Russian leaders.)

(By William Benton, publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica)

NEW YORK, August 16. A forceful member of the Supreme Soviet—one of the three senior editors of Pravda—has urged that both the Soviet Union and the United States reduce their armaments budgets, "on the basis of mutual trust." He envisages this as a first stride toward achieving a disarmament agreement.

This appeal was made to me in Moscow in May by Yuri Zhukov, former chairman of the state committee on culture, whom I first met in 1955 when he was foreign editor of Pravda.

Zhukov told me that "the most important opportunity for disarmament right now between our two countries grows out of the power of example." This was a reference to the American, Soviet, and British decisions to cut back production of fissionable materials, as a step toward decreasing world tension. Each government acted unilaterally. There were no treaty negotiations or agreements.

The United States and the Soviet Union "must seek to continue along this line," Zhukov said. He pointed out that "before the year is out, we of the U.S.S.R. are going to discuss our arms budget before the Supreme Soviet. You will have the same discussion in January. Cannot we agree that these discussions offer the opportunity for new and serious steps in the field of mutual example? Here is an idea which is very real. Here is an area in which we can move forward without any formal agreement, without any negotiations, but on the basis of mutual trust. Cannot we now take this further step? Cannot we both unilaterally reduce our armament budgets?"

HOPE FOR FURTHER ACCORD

Zhukov maintained that reduction in United States-U.S.S.R. armament budgets—on this basis—can then lead to further formal agreements, such as one barring underground nuclear tests and another establishing nuclear free zones.

"Of course we would like the whole world to be a free zone," he said, "but I appreciate that this is difficult. Why don't we start with Africa? Neither the United States nor the U.S.S.R. has anything in Africa of much importance. Why not support the Organization of African States in a move to get a guarantee by the United States and the U.S.S.R. to Africa which will make it a free zone? Why not set Africa up as an example? This will give to the African people a feeling of gratitude toward both the United States and the U.S.S.R."

Zhukov warmed to his subject and continued to talk for almost an hour, with very few interruptions from me. My interjections were designed chiefly to maintain candor. "We must start on nuclear disarmament with something. Let the two of us start. Let other countries come in later. Let one idea develop from another."

Zhukov charged that the United States has not given "sufficiently careful consideration, at a high level" to the problem of underground testing.

"PLENTY OF NUCLEAR ARMS"

"You have plenty of nuclear arms," he noted. "We have plenty. Why do you need any more tests? Yet since the nuclear test ban treaty you have made 20 underground tests. We are at present tranquil on this issue. We are calm. We have made no tests of any kind since the test ban. Every time you make a test, China puts on a big campaign to prove that the test ban treaty is a

hoax. Some people give tender ears to this campaign—some people in Asia, Latin America, and Africa. They try to prove that the United States uses the test ban treaty to step up U.S. nuclear power in contrast to the U.S.S.R. But the truth is that the authority of both the United States and the U.S.S.R. is being undermined.

"Can't we arrange an agreement to bar underground testing? Why can't we provide for the 'black box' inspection as proposed at the recent Pugwash Conference? This would be a very big step forward in the relaxing of international tensions."

I reminded Zhukov that disarmament discussions had bogged down because the U.S.S.R. had failed to agree to what we regard as "effective inspection." I asked him to explain his views on "effective inspection" in contrast to his "black box."

NOT READY TO TRUST

Zhukov continued: "By effective inspection the United States means sending people into the U.S.S.R. to go wherever they like and see whatever they like. We have not yet reached that point of trust. This is now premature. The black box is automatic. International teams spot the black boxes and control them. The scientists at Pugwash agreed that they can give an adequate check of underground testing. * * * What your State Department calls effective inspection—this is not feasible now. Later and by all means, it should be carried out. It will be carried out. We, too, will want it as the goal to effective disarmament."

Disarmament is very much on the mind of all Soviet leaders, due in part to the Soviet propaganda, even though specific proposals are few. Mikhail Millionshchikov, vice president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and most recently the chairman of the Soviet delegation to the Pugwash Conference in India this January, stated that "the goal of the improvement of living standards is the central goal of our Soviet program; it is set forth in every single speech by Chairman Khrushchev."

I said that significantly higher living standards were impossible without a major move toward disarmament, so that the Soviet economy could concentrate on producing goods for the Soviet people instead of armaments. He agreed immediately. Then he said flatly: "Our present armament program prevents the putting of resources into the improvement of living standards for our people.

DIFFERENT STANDARDS

Konstantin Simonov, former head of the Soviet Writers Union and a prominent novelist, put it this way:

"The heart of the problem which divides the United States and the U.S.S.R. is the great difference in living standards. We are less afraid now to send our people to the United States. The psychological problem isn't as great as it was. Five or ten years from now, as the gap closes, it will be still easier. It's very complicated when our boys, from both sides, move into an environment to which they're not accustomed. I am, of course, speaking now largely from the materialistic side. This does not mean that I am shying away from the ideological and psychological problems which divide us, but the materialistic side is closely related." Simonov recognizes the heavy block to improvement in Soviet living standards due to an armanent program which takes a much bigger chunk of the Soviet economy than does ours in the United States.

From my discussions with key officials in the Soviet Union, including Chairman Khrushchev himself, I am sure that few ever waver in their belief in the ultimate triumph of communism. Khrushchev wants to see a Communist society everywhere. He thinks that this is an attainable goal. His problem is this: How can capitalism be buried in this atomic age?

IMPROVED IMAGE

I believe Mr. Khrushchev feels that if nothing happens; if nothing helpful to the U.S.S.R. can be now achieved by negotiated agreements, then the best present position for the U.S.S.R. is a stalemate. How can the U.S.S.R. lose, if communism is the wave of the future? He is not now in a position for a showdown over Cuba or Berlin. When one doesn't know how to move in one direction or aonther, then why not a stalemate?

Even a stalemate helps to make some things happen. It helps to assure the world of a reasonable Soviet attitude. This in turn can leave two results: It keeps the West hopeful and hence relaxed; and it makes a very good impression throughout the so-called neutralist world.

However, even in time of stalemate, while we press for progress and for agreement on new fronts, we must be mindful that Khrushchev intends that he or his successors will serve as capitalism's pallbearers. True, he wants no head-on collision at this time. He and his subordinates are now seeking friendly gestures.

Khrushchev understands that the U.S.S.R. cannot fight America, and that America connot fight Russia. This is indeed hopeful. This came out in all my interviews with Soviet officials. They also understand that they cannot cause a revolution in America. Thus they have deemphasized their propaganda output to the United States and recognize that their best hope is to talk to the world.

Implicit in this hope, in the minds of many leading Communists, is the chance of isolating America. They even hope to make communism less unattractive within America—to persuade America that aggressive communism is merely peaceful socialism in Russian form.

Federal Juvenile Delinquency Planning Grant Gave St. Louis a Vital Headstart in War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Human Development Corp. has just made public its general plans for coordinating all of the many programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to wage the war against poverty in the St. Louis area—the city of St. Louis and St. Louis County. The program is an ambitious one and a practical one.

The St. Louis Human Development Corp. was established in 1964 as an outgrowth of the planning work done in St. Louis during the last 2 years with the aid of a grant from the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, made possible by the program enacted by Congress to provide funds for demonstration projects as well as planning. The planning project, initiated and directed locally, was sponsored by the St. Louis Department of Welfare, the health and welfare council, and the metropolitan youth commission.

In the course of the study, a close relationship was proved between the existence of continuing poverty in a family and incidents of crime or delinquency. As the market for unskilled labor diminished, it was not unusual to see a family appearing on the public welfare rolls through a third generation.

As the St. Louis Human Development Corp. points out:

People cannot pull themselves out of the rut of poverty without jobs. Many cannot get jobs without special training. They cannot take special training without basic schooling. It is hard for them to succeed in school if they come from a family situation and environment that stunt their capacity or desire to learn. So many seem doomed to fail in life before they start.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS APPOINTED BY MAYOR TUCKER

The St. Louis Human Development Corp. is an independent, nonprofit corporation qualified by the Internal Revenue Service to receive tax deductible contributions. Its board of directors was appointed by Mayor Raymond R. Tucker, of St. Louis. It includes not only outstanding residents of the city of St. Louis, but several directors residing in St. Louis County, and four ex officio directors including Governor Dalton, Mayor Tucker, the supervisor of St. Louis County, Mr. Lawrence K. Roos, and the regional director of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the action of the Congress in enacting the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and in view of our action here in the House just a few days ago in passing the supplemental appropriation bill containing three-quarters of a billion dollars for implementation of the act, I am sure there will be widespread interest among the Members in the plan of action developed by St. Louis to enable the community to gear up all of its resources for the most effective use of the aid to be provided by the Federal Government in combating poverty and misery. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an announcement of the plans sent to me by a good friend, Mr. Raymond H. Wittcoff, president of Transurban Investment Corp., of St. Louis, who is serving as chairman of the St. Louis Human Development Corp. The announcement is as follows:

ST. LOUIS HUMAN DEVELOPMENT CORP.

ORIGIN

The St. Louis Human Development Corp. was created early in 1964 with a board of directors appointed by Mayor Raymond R. Tucker. Originally its aim was to attack the basic causes of poverty and juvenile delinquency in a limited target area in the heart of the city. The grave problems of the people living in these particular neighborhoods, including the fact that 8,000 crimes are committed there annually, had aroused the awareness of the whole community. The creation of the corporation and the original target area were recommended by a planning project begun here 2 years ago.

The planning project was initiated and directed locally. It was sponsored by the St. Louis Department of Welfare, the Health and Welfare Council, and the Metropolitan Youth Commission. It was supported by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and local sources. Professional and lay leaders representing various public and private

agencies participated in the planning. Many people living in the target area were interviewed. The planning project proposed that while financial support for the program be secured from several sources both private and public, the principal sources of funds would have to be Federal agencies.

It should be noted that the planning project was begun and the idea of the Human Development Corp. was conceived by St. Louisans before the President proposed the war against poverty. The antipoverty program, which was incorporated in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 passed by Congress in August, provides for Federal support for community action programs like the one conceived in St. Louis. This will enable the St. Louis program to get underway, and on a basis broader than that originally proposed. The services of the corporation will not be limited to the original target area; they will be extended to the poor of the county as well as the city.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the St. Louis Human Development Corp. now is to coordinate the war against poverty in the city of St. Louis and St. Louis County.

There is no precise definition of poverty. It has been suggested that an income of $3,000 is needed for a family to live according to a minimum level of decency. Well over 200,000 people in the city and county belong to families with incomes below that level. The circumstances of these people vary greatly. Among this group unemployment, disease, broken homes, emotional illness, unsafe and unsanitary housing, school dropouts, crime rates, and death rates are high.

The aim of this program is to help people to help themselves. There will be no handouts. Funds will be invested in useful projects where people are earning and learning. The cost of this multimillion-dollar program will be substantial, but it will be small in relation to the cost of other programs arising out of human needs, such as the more than $32 million which is spent annually in St. Louis for direct welfare payments. To the extent that this program succeeds and people are prepared for more productive lives, human misery will be reduced and so will the burden on our economy.

About half of the impoverished here are age 21 and under. The children of the poor become parents of more poor. It is not unusual to see a family appearing on the public welfare rolls through a third generation. The cycle of poverty can be broken by helping young people to extricate themselves from the human backwash and to move upward in the mainstream of an expanding economy. So the planning project proposed that with the limited resources available the emphasis be on opportunities for young people and that the program be called Gateways for Youth. There is inspiring evidence that with new opportunities even the apathetic may be fired with ambition.

In the Nation as a whole it has been estimated that nearly 80 percent of the people living in poverty are white. In the original target area in St. Louis studied in the planning project 55 percent are Negro and 45 percent are white. This community is committed to the elimination of racial discrimination and the Human Development Corp. will act on that commitment in all of its operations. However, the elimination of racial discrimination will not by itself solve the problem of poverty.

The reduction of poverty depends on economic growth. Just as jobs are lost when industries leave and business is bad, so job opportunities increase when new industries are attracted to this metropolitan area and business is good. Progress in reducing poverty can only be made in an environment which is favorable to economic progress. But many people today are victims rather than beneficiaries of economic progress. Automation is throwing a lot of people out of work. In the past there were usually plenty of jobs for people who had good work habits even though they had no special skills. There were always places where the unskilled could get a foothold from which they could work their way up. Now, with the advances in technology, for many people the bottom rung has fallen off the economic ladder. The supply of unskilled workers is much greater than the demand. So it is unrealistic to assume that economic progress by itself will automatically solve the problem. While the demand for unskilled workers is rapidly diminishing, the demand for people with special skills is increasing. This suggests the importance of large-scale programs of vocational counseling and job training.

However, many people cannot take technical training because of deficiencies in their basic education. They have not learned how to read or to use numbers competently. How to give everyone the elements of a sound basic education is the greatest challenge. This means more than developing the capacity to learn a marketable skill (and then when the market for one's skill vanishes through automation to learn a new one). It means learning to use our abundant free time for truly human ends. And for everyone in a free society it means education for responsible citizenship.

People cannot pull themselves out of the rut of poverty without jobs. Many cannot get jobs without special training. They cannot take special training without basic schooling. It is hard for them to succeed in school if they come from a family situation and environment that stunt their capacity or desire to learn. So many seem doomed to fail in life before they start. They are roaming the streets out of school and out of work.

There is no simple answer to the problem of poverty. Its causes are complex. A war against poverty requires attacks on many fronts: basic and remedial education, job training and guidance, family counseling, child care, home economics, housing improvement, legal assistance, health, recreation. These attacks must be coordinated. Coordination is necessary from two points of view. From the standpoint of the community it is essential that the resources of the various public and private agencies be used efficiently with a minimum of duplication and waste. From the standpoint of the individual being helped it is essential that the complex of problems in which he is trapped be seen as a whole.

THE PLAN

Funds

Federal, State, and local government agencies and private foundations can coordinate their support for antipoverty activities in this metropolitan area through the Human Development Corp. Support is anticipated from all these sources. The corporation has been qualified by the Internal Revenue Service to receive tax-deductible contributions.

The corporation will operate some of its own programs. However, it will allocate most of its funds to existing public and private agencies which will implement major parts of the program under contract with the corporation. Useful work is now being done by agencies which merit more support. In a sense the corporation will be a coordinating conduit through which funds will pass from multiple sources to multiple operating programs according to a plan that will insure cohesive community action.

How much money the corporation will have for the various projects in which it will be interested has not as yet been determined. Negotiations are now underway with the sources of support. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 provides that up to 90 percent of the cost of community action programs in the first year may be met by the Federal Government. The amount of Federal funds available for distribution among and within States will be determined by formulas set forth in legislation.

Control and management

Although most of the funds in the beginning will come from the Office of Economic Opportunity and other Federal agencies, the Federal Government is not prescribing a plan for St. Louis. The operating plans, like the corporation itself, are being conceived locally. This is an independent nonprofit corporation. It will be free of any involvement with partisan politics or pressure groups in all of its operations.

The policies of the corporation are made by a nine-member nonpartisan board of directors which was appointed by the mayor of St. Louis (the board includes several county residents). The Governor of Missouri, the mayor of St. Louis, the supervisor of St. Louis County, and a representative of Federal agencies serve as nonvoting ex officio members of the board.

A general manager, appointed by the board of directors, is responsible to the board for the corporation's day-to-day operations, for the appointment of a staff, and for relations with the cooperating agencies and institutions. Wayne Vasey is serving as general manager on leave of absence from his position as dean of the School of Social Work at Washington University.

The Board has appointed Price Waterhouse & Co. to serve as independent auditors.

To promote coordination and to insure that the overall objectives of the program are being met efficiently, there will be a continuing systematic review and analysis of all projects which the corporation is supporting.

Neighborhood stations

The corporation will establish neighborhood stations in each of the areas where it is operating. These branch offices of the corporation will be near the people whose needs it serves. Where possible they will be located in schools or other public buildings. The neighborhood station will keep informed on the problems of the people in its area. It will see to it that there is no duplication in the services extended to persons. It will seek out persons who need service and are not now getting it.

At neighborhood stations people will get or be referred to places where they can get counseling on family problems; vocational training and employment opportunities; medical, prenatal, and infant care; and legal assistance.

Neighborhood advisory committees will be composed of people who live in the neighborhoods to assist and advise the corporation in its work. As people are involved they should develop more of a sense of belonging to a community. Young people especially should benefit from working together with staff persons and volunteers. It is vital that all young people have friendly contacts with healthy personalities who have achieved something worthwhile. Many who are in trouble have been denied this.

Special staff training will be given to employees of the corporation, the cooperating agencies and the many volunteers who will be doing staff work which will emphasize the overall objectives of the program and the importance of a sensitive, understanding approach to the people being helped.

The neighborhood stations will be contact points from which people may be referred to the special projects which are listed below.

Youth service corps

The youth service corps will provide short-term part-time work for boys and girls age 16 to 21 who seem likely to drop out of school or for dropouts who might reenroll. They will work at public or nonprofit private in-

stitutions, such as parks, hospitals, schools, libraries. The work must be useful to the community. The earnings will help them stay in school. The program will be administered in close collaboration with the schools. Enrollees will work under the supervision of staff members of participating agencies. They will learn skills and good work habits. Essential to the program is the requirement that enrollees be given professional counseling. They must be encouraged to continue their basic education or move into vocational training. Jobs will not be taken away from present wage earners.

Job Corps training centers

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 provides for the establishment of residential centers in various parts of the country for young people age 16 to 21 who have dropped out of school and whose potentialities are thwarted by the adverse circumstances in which they are living.

The enrollees will further their basic education, learn vocational skills, and do work on useful projects, such as conservation, national parks and forests. The Human Development Corp. will screen applicants from the St. Louis area for the Job Corps training centers. It is possible that one of these residential centers might be established here.

Basic and remedial education projects will be supported which will improve the chances for disadvantaged youngsters to do well in school and to keep them from dropping out. It will take all the inventiveness and imagination our educators can muster to develop changes in curriculum and methods to meet this challenge. Pioneering has been traditional with St. Louis schools. A grant has already been made through the corporation to the St. Louis Board of Education to strengthen and expand the nationally acclaimed work being done in the Banneker district with parents and children. Pre-school, after-school and summer-school remedial and tutorial projects will be encouraged.

Prekindergarten classes will be organized with professional staff and trained volunteers. Many children come from home situations which block their chances for success in school before they enter. It has been shown that their chances can be vastly improved by exposure during the formative years of 3 to 5 to the intellectual and emotional stimulus provided in a well-run prekindergarten program.

Youth groups under the leadership of trained personnel and volunteers can be an effective antidote for delinquency. Expanded organization of youth groups will be encouraged for youngsters not now being reached with opportunities for wholesome recreation and sports, creative expression through arts and crafts, the broadening of horizons through tours and camping experiences, and good fellowship.

A BEGINNING

The board of directors is humbly aware of how limited the corporation's resources will be in relation to the size of the problem. The scope of the program will depend on the availability of funds and qualified personnel. It will not be possible to start the whole program at once. Parts of the plan will be implemented as fast as sound arrangements can be made for financing, staffing, and mobilizing community resources.

The directors have no illusions that this program will bring total victory in the war against poverty. It can be a strong beginning. Ultimate success will depend on the determination of the people to whom help is offered. All citizens of the metropolitan area have a moral as well as an economic stake in the success of this program. As Americans we are committed to the principle of equal opportunities for everyone. As St. Louisans there is no more fitting way to observe our bicentennial year than to launch this community effort.

ST. LOUIS HUMAN DEVELOPMENT CORP. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chairman: Raymond H. Wittcoff, president, Transurban Investment Corp.

Vice chairman: Theodore McMillian, judge, circuit court.

Joseph P. Clark, president, St. Louis Labor Council, AFL–CIO.

William Kottmeyer, superintendent, St. Louis public schools.

J. Wesely McAfee, president, Union Electric Co.

H. Sam Priest, president, Board of Police Commissioners, St. Louis Police Department.

Edward J. Walsh, Jr., investments.

Secretary: Mrs. Irvin Bettman, Jr., vice president, family and children's service.

Treasurer: Ethan A. H. Shepley, Jr., vice president, Boatmen's National Bank.

Ex-officio: John M. Dalton, Governor, State of Missouri; Raymond R. Tucker, mayor, city of St. Louis; Lawrence K. Roos, supervisor, St. Louis County; James W. Doarn, director, region VI, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

General Manager: Wayne Vasey.

Address by A. Tyler Port, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Logistics), Before the Midwest Joint Government-Industry-Labor Surplus Area Procurement Workshop, South Bend, Ind., June 17, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, among the many steps taken in the effort to meet the challenge posed in December 1963, by the decision of the Studebaker Corp., to terminate the production of trucks and automobiles in South Bend, Ind., was the establishment by the Chamber of Commerce of South Bend-Mishawaka, Inc., of an office of Federal procurement and business assistance.

This office was established on the recommendation of President Johnson's coordiator of Federal activities in the area, Dr. Harold Sheppard. The purpose of the office was twofold:

First. To provide a closer liaison between the South Bend-Mishawaka business community and Federal procurement and business assistance agencies; and

Second. To create new jobs and payroll, and enhance the economy in the South Bend-Mishawaka area through local business exposure to business opportunities and business assistance offered by the Federal Government, as well as local, county, and State governmental agencies.

One of the ablest leaders of the South Bend-Mishawaka community, Eli D. Miller, assistant executive vice president and manager of the manufacturer's division of the South Bend-Mishawaka Chamber of Commerce, was designated as liaison or area coordinator in Federal procurement and business assistance programs to the chamber of commerce. Mr. Miller undertook extensive briefing sessions with Federal procurement and governmental representatives in Washington some weeks ago in an effort to inform himself in depth, so as to be able to give counsel and advice to business and industrial firms in our area.

Following the establishment of the office of Federal procurement and business assistance of the South Bend-Mishawaka Chamber of Commerce there was held in South Bend a Mid-West Joint Government-Industry-Labor Surplus Area Procurement Workshop which was attended by a number of contractors who do business with the Federal Government and who are interested in doing part of their work with Midwest firms.

Among the addresses delivered during this procurement workshop meeting was one given on June 17, 1964, by the distinguished Deputy Assistance Secretary of the Army for Installations and Logistics, Mr. A. Tyler Port.

Because I think Mr. Port's address will be of interest to Members of Congress throughout the Midwest, as well as from other parts of thet United States, under unanimous consent I include his address in the RECORD.

I appreciate very much the opportunity to be with you today and to participate in this meeting of Midwest representatives from both sides of the Government-industry team. I use the word "team" advisedly because I believe that, as never before, "team play" is absolutely essential in the implementation of the defense procurement program. This is particularly so in our joint efforts here today to study the methods of implementing the Government's policy to assist firms in depressed areas. We in the Defense Establishment and you in industry must continually strive to achieve a closer working relationship and a better understanding of our respective objectives, problems, and limitations.

I think that this thought was especially well expressed in a speech given less than a year ago by the then Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson, to a group of Government and industry officials, and because of the significance of his remarks I would like to quote at length from that speech—and I quote:

"Over the past two decades, we have learned that the security of our free society requires successful relations between Government and industry. * * * What this represents is a demand for closer cooperation and closer concern between industry and Government—between private technology and public policy. But this is a sensitive area in our system.

"The independence of private enterprise and the integrity of public policy must both be preserved and strengthened.

"We delude ourselves when we conceive the relationship between Government and industry merely to be that of customer and contractor.

"We likewise delude ourselves when we regard the purposes of Government as inevitably partisan and the policies of industry as inevitably anti-Government.

"In both instances, the damaging consequence is a cleavage between Government and industry in areas where there ought to be the greatest sense of common purpose and common understanding.

"The national interest is not served when Government castigates industry for failing to see the broad view of national interest

when no effort is made to communicate that broad view.

"Likewise, the national interest is not served when industry deplores Government's lack of efficiency, lack of talent or lack of business-like methods while withholding these capabilities from Government * * * these times require Government and industry to work together in a new climate of mutual trust, understanding and common purpose.

"There are, for both parties, common problems and obstacles which can only be removed by this approach."

I am sure that the fundamental views conveyed by Mr. Johnson's remarks prevail in this meeting today. I am equally sure that I can add little of substance to the exchange of views that have been expressed this morning or will be further discussed this afternoon on the specific subject at hand. I would therefore like to leave with you some food for thought on a broader scale about our methods of procurement.

MAGNITUDE OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT

First of all, I think it is well for all of us to reflect upon the sheer magnitude of defense procurement today, not to overwhelm you but, rather, to recognize the impact and implications necessarily brought about by the sheer size of military procurement in this atomic age. Within the past 25 years, with the demands or threats of war on the one hand and the strides of science on the other, the Federal Government and particularly the Defense Department, has emerged as the principal buyer, as well as the principal seller of goods and services, as the principal source of credit, and all in all, as the most important single business factor in the entire national economy.

The Department of Defense is responsible for spending nearly 10 percent of the gross national product of this country. It employs 3.7 million Americans directly, in and out of uniform, and millions more indirectly in every aspect of our economic life. It absorbs over half of every tax dollar, as it has done for over a decade. With "Peacetime" budgets running at $50 billion plus, there has come a realization that national survival can be at stake on either of two fronts, military or economic.

Thus, it is fitting and proper that in the development of our procurement policies we take into account socioeconomic factors. Indeed, it is a mandate of Congress as well as the President that consideration be given, for example, to labor surplus areas and small business while at the same time not infringing upon specific laws and rules of good procurement practices such as using formal advertising, obtaining price competition, and assuring equitable treatment to all potential participants. I assure you that the development of procurement policies in such a fashion as to give proper balance to the interrelationships of all these factors is not an easy task nor is it something which can be developed in a vacuum. We need and seek your advice and counsel.

We in procurement have a role which is not always a popular one. Almost any procurement policy is inevitably to the disliking of some specific group or groups of people. Certainly, when it comes to the matter of specific contractual awards, we seldom make more than one individual firm happy, while making several unhappy.

KAISER-JEEP TO PRODUCE ARMY TRUCKS IN SOUTH BEND

I am delighted, however, on this occasion to make reference to the Department of the Army's announcement of contract award to the Kaiser-Jeep Corp. for 2½-ton trucks which will be produced here in South Bend, and the award for the engine production to Continental Motors. I think both of these firms are to be congratulated for winning these very sizable contracts which will be performed here in the Midwest over a 3-year period. The award of these contracts, together with the 5-ton truck production which was transferred to Kaiser-Jeep under novation agreement with Studebaker Corp., will provide a firm employment base for an extended period of time. This improved employment situation will accomplish what I am sure President Johnson had in mind in his press release of December 24, 1963, wherein he stated and I quote, "On December 9 I directed that an interdepartmental committee be established to do everything possible to help South Bend meet the emergency created by the closing of Studebaker facilities and the idling of some 8,000 workers."

In addition to these contracts being a very pleasant subject to mention to this audience, I would like to cite them as an example which typifies innovations which we have developed to achieve cost reductions and which we believe are in the best interests of the Government, industry, and the taxpayer. First of all, we moved away from the historically negotiated type of procurement for this item to the more preferred formally advertised method of contracting. This was accomplished through a technique which we call "twostep" formal advertising. This technique is designed to permit fixed price competition on the basis of publicly opened bids by competent suppliers in cases where our initial specifications are not sufficiently precise for onestep advertising, or where the item is of such complexity that we must take extraordinary steps to assure ourselves that the potential producers fully understand what the Government desires to procure and what is involved in the production process itself. In the first step, the bidder submits his technical proposal without regard to price. The purpose of this step is to evaluate the technical approach of each prospective bidder, and to select those bidders who are considered to be technically capable of competing. Under step two, the technically competent bidders submit sealed bid price proposals and award is made to the firm determined to be the lowest responsive and responsible bider. To dispel any idea that we take lightly our task of determining the responsibility of prospective bidders, I would like to quote from a letter signed by Secretary McNamara in February of this year.

"In working toward better defense procurement, nothing is more basic to satisfactory procurement than that we deal only with responsible prospective contractors. Contract awards to concerns of marginal capabilities can lead only to delays or failures in obtaining delivery of needed items and to increased eventual costs to the Government." Secretary McNamara's directive went on to emphasize that contracting officers are required to make an affirmative determination that the "prospective contractor is responsible before any contract award may be made."

MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENTS

Again, inviting your attention to the 2½-ton truck and engine contracts, I would like to point out that they were multiyear procurements. That is to say, the contracts cover the estimated and anticipated requirements for a 3-year period. From the Government's standpoint, this has the advantage of: (1) Achieving true competition for the requirements which will arise over an extended period; (2) avoiding the gaps in production which could result from an annual shift of contractors; (3) promoting the standardization program; and (4) minimizing those occasions when sole-source negotiations for follow-on production may be necessary. From industry's point of view, management has a more stable basis upon which to plan, and, by the same token, labor can reasonably anticipate 3 years of continuous work. It also provides the prime contractor a far better opportunity to effectively implement his own subcontracting policies and procedures such as in the case of the policy which is being discussed here today in the interest of promoting greater opportunities for labor surplus area concerns.

I should also stress the point that the competition for these awards was keen and very real. Several reputable firms competed, some of whom had not always expressed an interest in the 2½-ton truck procurements. Also, not to be overlooked is the fact that the Government achieved what we consider a very fine price. It is estimated that based upon last year's award price we effected a savings of approximately $20 million for the 3-year period covering both the vehicle and the engine.

Speaking of the engine, we are using essentially the same multifuel engine in this 2½-ton truck as we will use in the 5-ton truck. This, of course, has obvious logistical advantages which in an indirect but very real sense accomplishes additional savings.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S COST REDUCTION DRIVE

I am sure that all of you are aware of the emphasis which Secretary McNamara is placing upon the President's drive to reduce costs. Within the Department of Defense and at all echelons throughout the military departments there is a formal, well-organized and closely managed program to reduce costs wherever possible. This program is extremely broad in scope, covering as it does all phases of the military department's operations to include value engineering, computation of requirements, traffic management, communications, etc. The one aspect of particular concern to us in procurement is the mandate "to buy at the lowest sound price." For a procurement, of course, the ideal way to "buy at the lowest sound price" is through competition. This is why we are taking such extraordinary steps to increase competition and to utilize the formally advertised method of procurement. There are, of course, circumstances where competition is not possible and where, quite properly, sole source procurement is in the best interest of the Government. In these cases it is imperative that a system be used for computing profit which is equitable both to the Government and to the contractor. A great deal of effort and study has been made by the Defense Department to establish the conditions wherein a contractor is provided the opportunity to earn a greater profit. The result of this effort has been the establishment of what many of you, I am sure, know as "the weighted guidelines technique." The weighted guidelines technique is designed to draw a very substantial distinction between the contractors who do and those who do not undertake cost risk; between those who do and do not provide their own facilities and working capital; and between those who have a good or a poor record of past performance. Also, it is intended, other things being equal, that there should be greater reward for more difficult work in the use of higher skills.

Before leaving the subject of reasonable prices and our objective of buying at the lowest sound price, I would like to emphasize a fact which probably is not well known or, if known, is not given sufficient attention. The fact to which I refer is that roughly half of the dollars which we spend with the prime contractor are, in turn, spent by the prime through subcontracting or with other suppliers. Hence, assuming for the moment that we in the Defense Department are "buying at the absolute lowest sound price" it is still only half of the story. The burden of the other half is on industry, not only to achieve the lowest sound price in its subcontractual actions but also to share its rightful responsibility for the implementation of the socioeconomic policies of our Nation to which I have referred.

We are encouraged with the manner in which industry on the whole is recognizing its responsibility for assisting and alleviating problems in areas of substantial unemployment. In fiscal year 1963, out of a procurement budget of $25 billion, the Department of Defense awarded directly about $4 billion to firms in depressed areas. Our statistics show that of the $21 billion awarded to prime contractors in nondepressed areas, almost $6 billion was in turn awarded by these prime contractors on a subcontractual competitive basis to firms located in depressed areas.

More specifically, here in the Midwest, the Department of Defense awarded $4.2 billion in prime contracts, of which $600 million was awarded directly to firms located in depressed areas. This $600 million represents 14 percent of the $4.2 billion placed in the eight Midwestern States: Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, Michigan, Missouri, Iowa, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

In closing, I would hope that this meeting today will serve to emphasize that "these times require Government and industry to work together in a new climate of mutual trust, understanding and common purpose."

Thank you.

Joseph J. Lombardo, Brooklyn, N.Y., Completes Term as Commander in Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on August 28, the then national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and my good and longtime friend, Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, a distinguished attorney of Brooklyn, N.Y., completed his tenure as the highest official of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

He was succeeded in the office of commander in chief of the VFW by another outstanding patriot, Mr. John A. "Buck" Jenkins, of Birmingham, Ala. I rise at this time to express, not only for myself, but I am confident, on behalf of the many Members of this House who know and admire Joe Lombardo, our deepest appreciation for the truly important services which he has rendered to our Nation and to the cause of freedom throughout the world during his year as commander in chief of the VFW.

It would be impossible, due to limitation of time, to itemize even briefly his many acts of constructive leadership. However, there are some things which Joe Lombardo did during his time as commander in chief of the VFW, which especially merit our attention and gratitude.

Throughout the past year he has demonstrated abundantly his qualifications to join that long list of veteran leaders who have risen to the high position as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and who have, additionally, demonstrated high qualities of national leadership. During his tenure, the VFW, and veterans as a whole, had in Joe Lombardo a truly wise, strong, and effective spokesman.

He championed, logically and forcefully, every just cause of U.S. war veterans. As Members of this House, I am sure, are aware, the important veterans' legislation passed in this session is a reflection, in large measure, of the understanding and effort with which Joe Lombardo fought for those things which our Nation's veterans so rightfully deserve. Examples of legislation, which the VFW, under Joe Lombardo's leadership, helped bring to successful accomplishment are the new laws providing nursing care for aging invalid veterans, and providing educational assistance for children of veterans totally disabled in service.

Although continually and deeply interested in the specific problems of veterans, Joe Lombardo, as commander in chief of the VFW, also exerted a strong and wholesome influence on our Nation's defense and foreign policy. Under his leadership the VFW continued its role in the forefront of national organizations supporting a strong military posture for our Nation, and a sound commonsensed, and farsighted foreign policy. Repeatedly, during his year as head of the VFW, his statements with respect to South Vietnam, Cuba, and our military weapons helped pinpoint basic issues and contributed toward a better understanding of these issues by our citizens.

I believe it particularly pertinent to point out that although he never played favorites and never pulled his punches, Joe Lombardo's views are recognized as fair, forthright, and based upon logic and reason. While not slow to criticize, neither was he slow to praise. His consistent public support of our Government's policy of resisting Communist aggression in South Vietnam is but one example of how the VFW, under Joe Lombardo's leadership, has helped strengthen our Nation.

One of the things that gained such widespread admiration and respect for Joe Lombardo was the fact that in discussing defense and foreign policy matters, he knew what he was talking about. He was not an "armchair strategist." Almost invariably, his press releases and policy speeches were based upon his personal observations.

During his tenure as commander in chief of the VFW he saw communism in action: He stood at the Berlin wall. He saw the indispensable role being performed by a great naval base in Guantanamo Base, Cuba. He visited the Far Eastern outpost of freedom—the embattled island of Quemoy. He visited the outpost of combat in South Vietnam. There, incidentally, he went far north into the mountainous area and met with the American, South Vietnamese, and tribal leaders who had been fighting to turn back Communist aggression.

He has visited our fleets at sea, and our Strategic Air Command headquarters.

And each place where Commander in Chief Lombardo went, he carried with him an inspiring message of the VFW's support of, and faith in, our men in uniform.

But, the VFW, under the leadership of Joe Lombardo, as under his predecessors, knows that in spite of highly technical and complicated weapons, it is still people upon which our Defense Establishment, in the final analysis, rests.

During his time as commander in chief, Joe Lombardo continued to give meaning to the VFW's determined efforts to protect the interests and improve the lot of our military personnel: Active, retired, and their dependents. With good reason, the VFW has continued to be looked upon as an understanding and effective champion of our servicemen.

Our Nation is, indeed, fortunate to have veterans organizations that produce leaders such as Joe Lombardo. We who are his longtime neighbors and friends in Brooklyn are proud of Joe Lombardo. We know that he has served his Nation well as commander in chief of the VFW, and we know, too, he will continue to serve his community, and his Nation in the future.

I am confident Joe Lombardo's many friends in this House join with me in expressing sincerest appreciation for the services which he has performed for the VFW, for veterans everywhere, and for our Nation.

The Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, a long time ago I expressed the belief—I am a farmer and I know farm and smalltown opinion firsthand—that rural America was entertaining disquieting fears as to its ultimate position should the Democrat approach to the farm problem collapse .

In fact, I said that many people in rural America were actually anticipating the day when the whole jerry-built structure, might collapse and either bury farmers in chaos or force them from the land that has been their home for over a hundred years.

It is my belief that this rural and small town unrest has resulted in the American people being given a choice this year in their selection of a President of the United States because the people who went to the Cow Palace in San Francisco knew exactly how they felt and exactly what they were doing. And in the choice they made they are offering the United States a chance to indicate whether or not it too feels disquieting fears and whether or not it would like to change direction.

This point can be stated at length, but never as well as it is stated in two editorials published in current issues of the Farm Journal.

I submit these editorials:

[From the Farm Journal, September 1964]

THE CHOICE—PART I

The election this November will be the most crucial of the century thus far, for as at no other time in recent decades it will determine the basic direction this country is now to take.

This will be true no matter who wins. If Mr. GOLDWATER wins, the people will have issued an unmistakable mandate for some fundamental changes. If he loses but comes somewhere near close it will be a clear signal to slow up sharply in the present drift toward the welfare state. If Mr. Johnson wins big, it will be just as clear an indication that people are content with the way things are going. We've come to a basic choice.

The thing to keep in mind through the heat of the election campaign is that the overriding issue is the choice between philosophies of government. True, we will be choosing between men, too. But more importantly, we will choose between what they champion. We may or may not like everything about the man we vote for. We may or may not agree with everything he says. But which man represents more nearly the way we want this country to go? That is the big question. Let's never lose sight of it.

Moreover, it's the first time in many years that the choice has been clear cut. Mr. GOLDWATER is not a "me too" Republican. He doesn't just claim that he could carry out a version of the Democratic program, under another label, better than the Democrats could. He offers a fundamentally different program. And he has the courage to state it forthrightly without the kind of something-for-everybody and let's-offend-nobody political pap we are so used to. Agree with him or not, it's refreshing and it's a change. You know where he stands.

What are some of the choices in policy we have the chance to make? Well here are a few:

1. We have seen a steady drift toward a bigger, more powerful, more centralized, more authoritarian big state. That can scarcely be denied. Anyone who wonders whether it is real can measure it concretely by our increasing number of bureaucrats, our ever-bigger budget, our continuous deficit spending, our proliferation of "programs" which try to solve every problem in the country (including those that can better be solved closer to home), our ever more numerous handouts to more and more people, the increasing reach of Government into the private lives of its citizens, the penchant for putting Government increasingly into business in competition with private enterprise. We all know this has been going on and at an increasing pace. Do we want it to go further or is it time to call a halt? We can do it without "reverting to yesterday," which, incidentally, no one is proposing.

2. Do we want more—or less—Federal dabbling in local affairs? Who knows better what we want and how to get it—we ourselves, and our State and local governments, or an army of nonelected bureaucrats and "wise men" down in Washington?

3. Do we want a dollar that amounts to something or one continually cheapened by a government that has decided not to live within its income?

4. Do we want to continue indiscriminate and wasteful "foreign aid" that "can't be cut further," or pare this back to a sensible program that probably would, in fact, achieve its objectives even better?

5. Do we want a farm policy which continues to aim at further Government control over agriculture, or one that begins to hand farming back to farmers, with markets rather than bureaucrats setting prices?

6. What kind of appointments do we want made to the Supreme Court? More like we've had?

These are a few of the questions that face us this November. And as we said in the beginning, let's not get so absorbed with personalities that we forget what the real issues are.

[From the Farm Journal, October 1964]

THE CHOICE—PART II

It has been amusing to read the comments in the European press expressing incredulity and shock at the "suicidal" actions of the delegates in San Francisco who nominated Senator GOLDWATER a few week ago. How could anyone who just might be President of the United States, be so uncouth as to put America's interests first, without the usual pussy-footing?

The screams from the eastern press in our own country have been almost as hysterical.

What apparently hasn't got through to some of the professional politicians, columnists and TV commentators—particularly those from east of the Alleghany mountains—is that, as one shrewd observer put it. "Mr. GOLDWATER did not produce the popular revolt against the way things are going in Washington. The revolt produced Mr. GOLDWATER."

The fact is, there's a groundswell of protest across the Nation and it only broke into view in San Francisco. All those delegates in the Cow Palace weren't hypnotized. They knew how people back home felt and they expressed it. The home folks hadn't been talking much but they had been doing a lot of thinking and they were deeply disturbed—not just over this particular or that, but over the whole post-war trend toward the super State at home and an indecisive foreign policy abroad.

Whether the forces of revolt will prove to be in the majority or the minority we won't know until November. Be that as it may, they'd rather protest and lose than acquiesce and win. The way they feel, it will have been worth the fight either way.

Interestingly enough, the revolt is most pronounced West and South of where "the East" leaves off. It is strongest on the farms and in the towns of rural America. There is nothing surprising about this. In any land and at any time farmers and other nonurban people have always been the chief opponents of the big state. (Witness the wheat referendum last year when farmers showed that they could vote against a short-term pocketbook interest in favor of a principle.) They have been the prime defenders of personal liberty, self-reliance, and the right of the individual to make his own decisions and control his own destiny. They have acknowledged the need of Government to perform some functions and exert certain authorities but they have favored keeping these as limited as possible, and as near home as possible. They agree with Mr. GOLDWATER that an ever-growing paternalistic big state inevitably becomes "a leviathan, a vast national authority out of touch with the people and out of their control." They're just not for it.

Particularly is this true of younger people who, unlike some of their elders, are less interested in becoming wards of the state and more interested in individual opportunity. They don't want the Government for a guardian the rest of their lives.

Actually this transcends party. Whereas we will be using the usual Democrat and Republican labels this fall we will see an alinement of so-called conservatives versus liberals, with a lot of crossing of party lines. We say "so-called" because both labels are misnomers. Throughout history those who have wanted to vest more authority in Government have been the real conservatives. Those who have wanted to wrest control from Government and give it back to individual citizens have been the real liberals. It is no accident that "liberty" and "liberal" come from the same root word.

One thing sure: No longer can the Republican Party be tagged as being in the control of "Wall Street" and "the East." A lot of common ordinary Americans have taken it back. How many we'll have to wait and see, but it could be a surprising number.

How the Russians Think—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD another in the series of articles written by former U.S. Senator William Benton following his return this year from a visit to the Soviet Union, during which he interviewed 40 top officials. This particular article describes the Soviet concern about Germany and their arguments with respect to the policy which the Soviet Union wants to press. I believe it is a useful analysis of this aspect of Soviet thinking.

The article follows:

HOW THE RUSSIANS THINK: SOVIET FEARS OF GERMANY BORDER ON THE HYSTERICAL—PART III

(Former U.S. Senator William Benton has visited the U.S.S.R. five times since 1955. During his last visit, in May, he interviewed 40 top Soviet officials in 10 days—including Chairman Nikita Khrushchev. "I wanted to see for myself what lies behind the so-called relaxation of tension," says Benton. "I didn't argue. I listened. I interjected comments and objections occasionally, only to help strip away some of the Soviet propaganda." The North American Newspaper Alliance asked Senator Benton, who is now chairman and publisher of Encyclopaedia Britannica, and is also U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO, to summarize some of the highlights of his interviews. This is the third of four articles on his talks to Russian leaders.)

(By William Benton, publisher and chairman, Encyclopaedia Britannica)

NEW YORK, August 17.—The United States and the Soviet Union will continue to differ for a long time about Germany. Yet they have similar goals with respect to Germany. Both oppose a belligerent, militaristic Germany equipped with nuclear weapons—a Germany with the capacity to attack Russia. Thus both seek a peaceful Germany—and I assume the U.S.S.R. even shares our hope for a prosperous Germany.

It is upon the means of attaining these goals that the United States and the Soviet Union thus far have failed to agree.

Pavel Romanov, head of the U.S.S.R. State Committee on Publishing, which is responsible for all Soviet publishing—is one of many Soviet leaders who believes that a principal aim of German policy is to divide the United States and the U.S.S.R. The Germans seek to instigate a quarrel between the United States and the Soviet Union, he charged, adding:

"There isn't any reason for a war between our two countries. Why should we have a war? Yet this is the goal of the German troops who seek revenge."

UNFORGETTABLE PAST

Each day during my stay in the Soviet Union I was exposed to the passion of Russians who had fought against the Germans in World War II. At one luncheon in my honor, each man around the table was introduced to me and his native city speci-

fied—cities that had been totally destroyed by the Nazi armies. Romanov spoke of his part during the siege of Leningrad. Few of us in the United States remember that in this siege 600,000 people died of starvation. It is difficult for Americans to comprehend the passion of Russian feelings about Germany. We remember the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact; they do not remember it. We must weigh in the balance their passion over their 20 million dead as we judge many questions that relate to our disagreements about Germany.

Pressed for the identity of the German revenge seeking forces, Romanov replied they are the groups who seek to revise Germany's eastern border.

"Adenauer and Erhard publicly proclaim that they will not abide by the present borders," he said. "Is not this a revival of the military spirit? Everywhere there are evidences of this revival."

He continued: "Won't you admit that the Germans waged the last war for world domination? Aren't they again producing submarines? Aren't they again pressing for atomic weapons? Won't they get the atomic weapons through your submarines, or won't they get the atomic weapons through General de Gaulle? Doesn't this all show the desire for revenge?"

NATO USURPERS?

Yuri Zhukov, a senior editor of Pravda, accused the Germans of trying to "move into command posts in NATO." This greatly alarms him. The Russians also are deeply concerned over growing German military budgets.

What are these revenge seeking forces doing? Romanov cited examples: "It is announced that the election of the West German President will be held in Berlin. The Soviets have never agreed to this. This is illegal."

I replied that I did not see this as an example in any way of the revenge seeking forces but merely as an expression of the German people's desire to unite.

Romanov pressed on: "The military committee of the Bundestag is going to meet in the Reichstag, the building destroyed by Hitler."

I inquired how this can be construed as revenge-seeking. To me this was another example of the German people's understandable desire to unite. But Romonov said it was like "forcing your birthday party into your neighbor's house even if he did not want to give you a birthday party."

I kept emphasizing to Soviet officials that the U.S.S.R. does not understand the American view on Germany. Yes, the U.S.S.R. had suffered much more at the hands of Germany than had the United States. But we Americans had been pulled into two wars because of German aggression.

Twice in this century we had been forced to raise and equip great armies and send our young men thousands of miles overseas to fight Germany. We, too, have our reasons for fearing renewed German belligerency.

ADAMANT IN MISUNDERSTANDING

But the Russians maintain that we in the United States do not understand their view on Germany, Romanov said to me: "If the United States and the U.S.S.R. share the same goals on Germany, why doesn't the United States accept the most reasonable proposals on the withdrawal of its troops from Europe?"

The Soviet spokesmen will not recognize—they do not wish to recognize—that U.S. and other NATO forces are in Germany for the defense of Western Europe from potential Soviet aggression.

I said that if the detente between the U.S.S.R. and the United States progresses, and if the indications continue to grow that the climate is improving—if further formal agreements supplement the test ban treaty—there could come a time when the United States would most eagerly want to withdraw its troops from Europe. I said I did not know when this time would come. I pointed out the great cost to us of keeping these troops abroad, and the resulting upset in our dollar balances. I also suggested that the troops were one of the negotiable items on the table in front of us as we moved ahead into disarmament negotiations.

CONSTANT REAPPRAISAL

In my talk with Mme. Ekaterina Furtseva, U.S.S.R. Minister of Culture, I asked whether she would not agree that the overwhelming probability is that Germany will be unified at some future time—perhaps not for 10 or 20 years—but that this is inevitable. Would not she agree that this is a legitimate aspiration of the German people? Isn't it possible that the division of Germany now helps stimulate the revenge tendencies within Germany which are watched with such fear by the Soviet observers?

Mme. Furtseva did not reply directly to my question. But she perhaps replied obliquely. She said:

"The worst policy is that of standing still. The worst policy is doing nothing. We must constantly reexamine our policies. We must constantly negotiate. Any decision is better than no decision."

Conceivably, the U.S.S.R.—when it deems the time is right—will make new moves in respect to the German problem. A reiteration of the present Soviet position on Germany will be implicitly a decision to prolong the stalemate. When and whether the United States and the Soviet Union will agree on the means for a solution remains to be seen.

The dilemma remains this: Russians fear and distrust Germany deeply and passionately. But can there be real peace in Europe so long as a great and vigorous people like the Germans remain divided? Will the time come when the U.S.S.R. agrees to German unity? What are the possible terms for such agreement?

Excerpts From Speech by Congressman Bob Taft, Jr., at the Republican Veterans Convention, Marietta, Ohio, September 19, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Honorable ROBERT TAFT, JR., before a group of Ohio veterans, did much to cast away the cobwebs of doubletalk and obfuscation from a question that has troubled Americans for many years: Should the present military draft laws be changed?

This is just one of many national issues that have been avoided purposely in this year's campaign dialog by the incumbent administration. In the following remarks, Mr. TAFT does much to dispel the cloud of fog that has been permitted to surround this question of vital importance to millions of our Nation's young men, their wives and mothers.

Because of its high degree of clarity and conciseness, I recommend BOB TAFT's remarks to my colleagues in the House and Senate who—sooner or later—must finally come to grips with this problem:

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN BOB TAFT, JR., AT THE REPUBLICAN VETERANS CONVENTION, MARIETTA, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 19, 1964

Under present draft laws, we continue to play with the liberties and opportunities of millions of American young men. We do so unfairly and unnecessarily.

Yet the Johnson administration and the congressional majority continue to stall. They are studying the problem to death in an apparent attempt to forestall both criticism and change. Tragically, it appears certain that Congress will adjourn without taking action on any of the meaningful bills which propose a comprehensive congressional study of the draft system.

The excuse to be given? It's this: Because the Defense Department has initiated its own study of the selective service program, both it and the Bureau of the Budget—two arms of the Presidency—are opposed to any independent study by Congress.

Completely overlooked is the fact that the draft has far deeper implications than mere manpower procurement for military purposes. Then again, perhaps the point isn't missed at all. There may be those who view the draft as a sociomilitary scheme directed to other ends which justify its perpetuation.

I am certain the American people do not agree with this contention.

The draft system is a congressional responsibility, especially so since it is the most direct of all Federal interferences with individual liberty. Only the Congress can and should decide what policies to follow. The special interests of the social and military planners should disqualify any report they may submit.

In view of the explosive nature of the issue, it is not surprising to see it played down in an election year. Still, the Nation must make a choice. The voice of the people, as expressed in the Congress, deserves a chance to be heard.

The degree of administration opposition to a congressional draft study can be seen in its refusal to consider a prompt moratorum on induction of young men to judge its effect upon enlistments, something I suggested more than a year ago. Such a test might prove conclusively the absence of a need for the draft.

Some claim such a test would be discriminatory in that a number of young men would be freed of their service obligations during the test period. But how could it be any more so than the present hit-or-miss system of exemptions for fathers, deferrals for students, and rejections for physical misfits?

There are many other valid reasons for criticism of the present system. A number of them were outlined recently by Congressman THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri. He said:

"1. The draft is an invasion of individual liberty. The existence of an aggressive world Communist conspiracy necessarily means that freemen must relinquish some freedom of choice in order that the great remainder can be preserved. But individual liberty should be infringed upon only when no effective alternative means exist for achieving the goal. Conscription should be the last resort, not the first expedient.

"2. The draft actually impairs national security. Men who enter the services of their own free will make far better servicemen than those who are drafted or who enlist from the threat of the draft. The high personnel turnover produced by the draft system—73 percent of Army first-term enlistees, 97 percent of all draftees—means that the Armed Forces lose far too many reliable and experienced men and must fill those positions with fresh trainees. The draft produces draftees at age 22, about 4 years older than the Army would like.

"3. The draft is inequitable. Today every other young man never enters any form of military service. The draft favors the physically and mentally unfit, those who marry early, those who can afford to stay in college to age 26, criminals, perverts, and those who can obtain an occupational or hardship deferment. The principle of universality, upon which the present system was sold to the public years ago, is today a transparent falsehood.

"4. The draft produces the evasion mentality. Young men attempt to avoid induction. If unsuccessful, they attempt to avoid responsibility while in the service. Upon their discharge, should we be surprised if they evade their responsibilities to their community, their nation, and their fellow man? The existence of a whole generation of men imbued in various degrees with the evasion mentality is a matter of the gravest concern to society and especially to Republicans.

"5. The draft has harmful social effects. It encourages early marriages, which in turn raise the national birth and divorce rates. The higher incidence of broken homes results in an increase of psychological and welfare problems both for parents and for children. The draft contributes to youth unemployment because employers are reluctant to hire a man who may be snatched away by the draft after expensive training. Thus, many youths float around until draft age, 22, unable to get a job, but unwilling to volunteer for induction or enlistment because they know they have a good chance of avoiding service altogether.

"6. The draft is inefficient. Instead of recruiting men with the needed skills by offering incentives comparable to the private sector, the services are forced to spend great sums on personnel training. Thus, instead of attracting experienced, middleaged bakers, who can bake if not fight, the army drafts an unskilled 18-year-old, trains him to be a baker, and most likely watches him depart in 2 years.

"7. The draft is costly. The high turnover rate caused by the draft system is extremely wasteful of training funds. Without the need to justify the draft, many functions could be transferred to the private sector at a saving.

"8. The draft law, as written, is unworkable. It forces administrators to find ways of circumventing the clear intent of the law. This is always a dangerous practice in a democracy. Administrators should be given a law that will work as written and not be forced to resort to tricks of interpretation."

But perhaps even more important than any of these, to the individuals threatened, is the adverse effect of the draft on employment opportunities. As I stated on April 21 on the floor of the House:

"We have found in our studies on manpower and employment in the Committee on Education and Labor in various hearings that we have had on measures before us in this session of the Congress, that the rate of unemployment of those under the age of 22 in this country is double the rate of unemployment of those over the age of 22, or indeed of the entire unemployed labor force.

"The rate is now, I believe, somewhere in the neighborhood of 10 or 11 percent. Certainly, without doubt, one of the contributing causes for the unemployment rate has been and continues to be the fact that the average induction age under the draft is now about 22 years of age. This means that many employers or potential employers, who seek someone for a particular job in existence today, must give careful consideration to any young man who perhaps is out of high school—who may or may not be a dropout—or who may have completed his high school training. Employers are faced with a problem. Employers know that if they hire this young man, within a year or two he may have to leave his employment and go elsewhere, and he will return with employment rights—which he should have. Nevertheless, the employer is faced with that possibility, and the employment of older men under these circumstances is far more likely, with the rejection of the younger man, who has not yet completed his military obligation."

Certainly, all of us agree that we cannot—and we will not—endanger our national security by cutting off the draft permanently, without assurances of a substitute procurement policy adequate to our defense needs.

But the problems created by the present system are so serious as to justify some immediate action and a trial suspension of inductions, higher pay, if necessary, and a fairminded bipartisan study of the entire problem by the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

Security Agents Told To Burn Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter from a typical American mother who lives in the 15th District of Illinois, which it is my privilege to represent:

Bob and I are extremely concerned over this article and would appreciate it if you would investigate the directive and, if possible, instigate a movement to have it abolished. Please note the time limit of October 1:

"U.S. SECURITY AGENTS TOLD TO BURN RECORDS

"(By Willard Edwards)

"WASHINGTON, September 24.—The State Department's Security Office has directed its agents in 20 major cities of the United States to destroy the bulk of their field office records, containing data on Government security risks.

"By October 1, according to a directive dated August 28, resident agents 'will destroy all completed investigative reports by burning process with a special agent in attendance,' as a witness.

"'RAW FILES' TO GO

"The Department's security agents investigate State Department employees and applicants for employment to ascertain if they are loyal to their country, have Communist connections, or have difficulties in character, such as drunkenness or homosexuality, which would make them potential security risks. They also investigate passport frauds.

"The data to be destroyed will include not only copies of reports forwarded to Washington but what intelligence agents call 'raw files.' These include data useful in subsequent investigations such as names of prospective witnesses and leads to subversive activities.

"A field agent has complained to his Senator that the destruction of his records will seriously impair his usefulness in the future and hamper his inquiries into the background of State Department employees.

"Henceforth, under the order, the agents will receive only that information which the Office of Security in Washington sends them and they are forbidden to accumulate data for future use. All security records will be based in the Washington headquarters.

"In issuing the order, the Office of Security asserted it was designed to effect efficiency and economy.

"These agents, especially veterans of many years' service, have accumulated filing cases full of data which they must now burn, with a witness looking on. They may keep no records in the future of their cases. They will dictate a report and send it to the field office which, in turn, will transmit it to Washington.

"'He—the agent—will be operating out of his hat,' commented an intelligence authority. 'The new system is calculated to handicap investigative work, if nothing worse.'

"The Office of Security maintains field offices in Boston, New York, Washington, Miami, Chicago, San Francisco, and Los Angeles."

The clipping which she attaches appeared in the Chicago Tribune of September 25. Other Members of the House from the Chicago area have received equally strong protests from their districts.

I have written the Secretary of State as follows:

HON. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have before me State Department Office of Security letters C–64/17 dated August 6, 1964, and C–64/18 dated August 28, 1964. These obviously will curtail field office activities of your security division. I should like to know the reasons underlying such a decision. If you have evidence which establishes that the threat of Communist imperialism has lessened to a degree which permits relaxation of security procedures in your Department, I believe the Congress and the people should share this information. If, however, this is an economy measure, I would like to know if there is not some activity which could be curtailed with less risk to our Nation.

A story based on these letters appeared in the Chicago Tribune, September 25, 1964, and has aroused grave concern among the people of Illinois. It appears from this article that the August 28 letter will, in the opinion of some of your employees, handicap the investigative work of the State Department. If their understanding of this order is incorrect, I suggest immediate clarification in the interest of maintaining the high level of security and efficiency which I am certain we both wish to see in all of the activities of your Department.

I feel that in fairness I must withhold judgment in this matter until I have heard what Mr. Rusk has to say. Nonetheless, the timing of this action is strange. Last Sunday the Washington Star reported a Presidential directive demanding tighter security checks on Government appointees. According to that paper the directive reads as follows:

TEXT OF MEMORANDUM

We have been somewhat concerned about our procedures in requesting security name checks, particularly from the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for appointees to the Federal service. Such procedures are an essential part of any effective security program.

In most instances it would seem desirable to request such checks prior to serious consideration being given to an individual, and most certainly before a firm commitment is made to the interested party or parties. Not only should this be observed in the respective departments and agencies, but also in instances in which recommendations for appointments are made by departments or agencies to the White House.

These procedures can prevent considerable embarrassment both to the Government and to the potential employee himself. Irreparable harm can be done to a person's reputa-

tion in instances where publicity is given to his possible appointment to a Government position, yet subsequent security checks result in a decision to suspend action on the appointment.

SOUND BUSINESS SENSE

It would be unfortunate if undesirable individuals were put on the Federal payroll simply because sufficient precautions were not taken prior to their appointment. This is merely sound business sense and should not be construed as an unwarranted invasion of privacy or violation of any person's constitutional rights.

Commonsense must naturally be exercised in the administration of name checks requests. For example, high-ranking military personnel who have possessed top-ranking clearance normally would not require security checks prior to appointment in the civilian service.

It would be desirable for all departments to examine their procedures in the above regard. This practice is in effect at the White House now and will be strictly adhered to in the future.

As we all know, a subcommittee of the other body has recently completed a 2-year investigation of security procedures in the State Department, which I am told will be made public sometime after the first week in November. I think Mr. Rusk would have been wise to see what that committee had to say before making these changes. It is also strange that Mr. Rusk has curtailed security activities at a time when the President has decided that stricter security investigations are necessary.

I am confident Secretary Rusk will provide an early explanation of this seeming difference of opinion within the administration.

Public Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, appearing in the Hastings News, a New York weekly newspaper, is a strong editorial purporting to relate a vote in favor of the Tuck bill as a position in opposition to reapportionment of State legislatures and an effort to reverse the one-man, one-vote formula.

The editorial naively went on to say that a vote for the Tuck bill was a vote against greater representation by the town of Greenburgh on the Westchester County Board of Supervisors. Nothing could be less true nor more farfetched.

In the interest of public policy, I would like to clarify these points:

The basic controversy in the Tuck bill lies solely in the matter of jurisdiction over legislative reapportionment of State legislatures. The Tuck bill removes the Supreme Court and lower Federal courts from involvement in this matter in which the Supreme Court itself has refused to intercede throughout its history—that is until 1962. The Tuck bill in effect would place State reapportionment matters back in the hands of the State legislatures and State courts where it had always been before the 1962 decision—Baker against Carr.

A vote for the Tuck bill does not signify opposition to the principle of reapportionment. Although I voted for the Tuck bill, I am decidedly in favor of reapportionment of legislatures when it becomes evident that inequities in representation exist. But, I would stress that the controversy is one of who has jurisdiction to decide, not one of opposition to the principle.

Furthermore, passage of the Tuck bill would leave completely untouched the one-man, one-vote decision handed down this year—Reynolds against Sims. A constitutional amendment would be necessary to reverse this ruling since the decision establishes a constitutional right to one man, one vote.

Contrary to the editorial, local county reapportionment for Westchester is not affected by recent Supreme Court decisions, nor is Westchester County awaiting a U.S. Supreme Court decision on reapportionment of its board of supervisors. Never in the history of the Supreme Court has the Court established jurisdiction over county government reapportionment matters.

Those who would like to pin a "liberal" versus "conservative" label on each side of the argument—terms which are misnomers anyway and which tend to obscure the actual issues—would be interested to look back at the dissent in the 1962 Supreme Court decision. Two apostles of judicial restraint, Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Mr. Justice Harlan, dissented against the decision on the basis that no matter how desirable reapportionment may be in itself, the use of the judiciary for such political reforms reflects a mistaken view of the function of the Federal Courts.

When the Supreme Court by its decisions overruled the will of the people as expressed in public referenda results—it ignored the fact that ours is a Government of, by, and for the people. Thus, the nullifying of the results of a legally constituted election by the Federal courts, is probably the most outrageous and dangerous byproduct of its interference in legislative matters.

I agree with Senator JAVITS, who recently said:

There may be a case for an amendment to the U.S. Constitution, if it is limited only to permitting the people of any State, if they wish it, to choose by referendum to have one house of their legislature apportioned with reference to a factor other than population.

The Senator has introduced a resolution calling for such an amendment, and I am proud to sponsor an identical measure in the House of Representatives.

The text of the resolution follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE XXV

"SECTION 1. Nothing in the Constitution of the United States shall prohibit a State having a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of its legislature upon the basis of factors other than population, if such apportionment has been submitted to the qualified voters of the State through a statewide referendum held in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution, and such apportionment has been approved by a majority of those voters in that referendum.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Vinson Hall, Proposed Navy-Marine Corps Residence for Elderly, Should Be Encouraged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Navy-Marine Corps Residence Foundation was incorporated in the District of Columbia in March 1961 under the guidance of Adm. "Mick" Carney. Adm. W. H. Callaghan was elected president of its board of trustees. Its purpose is to create in the Washington area a residence for 300 elderly persons consisting of 200 single and 50 double apartments together with public rooms such as a chapel, lounges, dining room, card room, recreation room library, service facilities, and a modern infirmary to provide the best of nursing care. The residence will be named Vinson Hall in honor of the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

Those who would be eligible to seek admission by approval of an anonymous admissions committee include: widows of Regular Navy and Marine Corps officers; widows of Reserve officers who die on active duty or retire after at least 20 years' active service; retired officers and their wives; retired commissioned female officers, Navy and Marine; retired officers, on space-available basis.

While a site for Vinson Hall has not yet been obtained, 12 possible sites in the area have been inspected by the foundation's building committee, headed by Rear Adm. A. C. Husband, CEC, U.S. Navy, retired. About 10 acres of land will be needed. Pending is the bill H.R. 11609 to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey real property to the foundation for the residence should that appear desirable.

This project is a most worthy one. There is real need here at the hub of Naval and Marine Corps activity for suitable accommodations for the widows of officers and retired officers themselves. When, on sad occasions, officers occupying very high ranks and assigned Gov-

ernment quarters have died, their widows almost immediately have been forced to vacate the quarters, often with little, if any, place to go in their period of bereavement. This is only one of the needs Vinson Hall would fulfill.

It will be a club-like residence charging reasonable costs commensurate with an individual's ability to pay. Its entrance fee and monthly charge will guarantee not only lifetime tenure, but also nursing care whenever needed. Maximum security for the elderly is aimed for at a minimum cost.

This project has sponsorship of the highest caliber. Vice Adm. Laurence H. Frost, U.S. Navy, retired, is administrative manager of the tax-free, nonprofit and charitable organization. Secretary of the Navy Paul H. Nitze on August 14 certified his support by stating:

The foundation has my enthusiastic support as a much-needed and worthy undertaking.

The Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. David L. McDonald, made this statement regarding it:

Most Navy and Marine Corps officers make the best provision they are able against the day when their wives may suddenly be left alone. Most similarly provide for their own advanced age. But it is generally recognized that even these best efforts may not be enough.

The whole purpose of the Navy-Marine Residence Foundation and the facilities they aspire to build is to help close this gap for those elderly retired officers and/or their spouses who need help.

The plans of the foundation are attractive and impressive. But, as we all know, this job must be done without appropriated funds. I fully support the efforts of the foundation, the Navy and Marine Officers' Wives' Clubs whose labors have built up the existing fund, and all others who in the future will lend a hand to the ultimate success of the task.

McDonald's counterpart, Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps, said:

The career of a military officer is primarily one of service rather than one of reward. All too frequently retired officers, and especially widows of officers, find themselves approaching their golden years with no suitable place to live.

The Navy-Marine Residence Foundation, a chartered, tax-free, nonprofit organization, has undertaken to provide suitable retirement housing for elderly career retired Navy and Marine Corps officers, both Regular and Reserve, and their wives or widows.

The foundation is a worthy undertaking. It is sponsored by capable and responsible individuals. It has begun on a sound financial basis, but needs assistance to continue. It merits the support of all of us. The Marine Corps is squarely behind this project.

The foundation is administered by a board of trustees of not less than 9 or more than 19 members, and now is composed of the following:

Mr. William C. Allen, U.S. Naval Academy, 1929, president.

Rear Adm. Preston V. Mercer, U.S. Navy, retired, vice president.

Vice Adm. Stephen R. Edson, U.S. Navy, retired, treasurer.

Capt. Will J. Davis, Jr., U.S. Navy, retired, secretary.

Rear Adm. H. Lamont Pugh (MC), U.S. Navy, retired.

Rear Adm. Alexander C. Husband, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. Frederick J. Harlfinger II, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. J. O. Cobb, U.S. Navy.

Capt. Viola Sanders, U.S. Navy, Wave.

Lt. Gen. Robert M. Pepper, U.S. Marine Corps, retired.

Mrs. Frank Virden.

Mrs. John S. Oldfield.

Mrs. C. J. Van Arsdall.

Mrs. A. M. Shinn.

Mrs. R. F. Skylstead.

Under the able sponsorship of the Navy and Marine Officers' Wives Clubs, servicewide, $120,000 has been raised through contributions, bazaars and membership subscriptions to start the residence foundation on its way to success. The foundation's welfare committee also carries on work of disseminating information and fundraising. This committee is chaired by Mrs. A. M. Shinn and has as its advisers the wives of the Chief of Naval Operations, the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Naval Personnel.

When completed Vinson Hall will cost about $4½ million. Its building loan will be paid from income and no contributed funds will be used for support of any resident who is financially able to pay his own way. As a tax-free organization, at least one-third of its residents must receive at least partial financial assistance.

The Army Distaff Hall, for widows only, in Washington is operating most successfully. Vinson Hall will generally be similar to Distaff Hall. However, the Navy-Marine Residence will accept officers, male and female, of both services, and the Nurse Corps, as well as officers' wives and widows.

The cost of living in the Distaff Hall varies depending on accommodations. Each resident pays an entrance fee of from $4,000 to $9,500 and a monthly rental of from $75 to $172.50, depending on unit size. Adjustments in costs are made for those in financial need. All but the smallest accommodations contain cooking facilities.

The Honorable Fred Bantz, former Under Secretary of the Navy, has volunteered to act as chairman of the national fundraising campaign aimed at turning the dream of Vinson Hall in to bricks and mortar. His campaign will begin October 1 with the volunteer assistance of Navy, Marine, and civilian individuals and groups throughout the world.

Present address of the Navy-Marine Resident Foundation, Inc., is building 54, U.S. Naval Observatory, Washington, D.C.

Farley Sees Fall Sweep for Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James A. Farley has made a prediction on the outcome of the 1964 presidential election. In view of the accuracy of his prediction in 1936, there are many who hope that his prediction for 1964 will turn out as well. It follows:

FARLEY SEES FALL SWEEP FOR JOHNSON

(By Lyn Nofziger)

ATLANTIC CITY.—James A. Farley, who prides himself on being a political realist, thinks Lyndon Johnson will sweep to a landslide victory in November.

And Farley, mastermind of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's first two campaigns and his Postmaster General, will do all he can to help.

Farley, who no longer holds official party positions, is still regarded as one of the Democratic party's most astute politicians. He is in regular touch with the White House and the President.

VIEW UNCHANGED

Farley, who predicted in February that Mr. Johnson would do as well in 1964 as Roosevelt did in 1932, when he carried all but six States, hasn't changed his mind with the nomination of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER as the Republican candidate.

He cannot see GOLDWATER carrying any section of the country, not even the South, the West or the Middle West, the areas where GOLDWATER is considered strongest.

In the South, Farley sees political expediency bringing the States back to the Democratic Party "as the evidence grows that Johnson will win." He thinks only Mississippi and Alabama will bolt to the Republicans.

FARM OUTLOOK

In the Middle West he sees farmers voting "belly" issues. He points out that GOLDWATER's votes on farm issues generally have been against price supports and subsidies. "The Democrats have done the most for the farmer," Farley insists. "There is no reason for him to vote for GOLDWATER."

In the far West he thinks the trend is to the Democrats.

"I think Johnson will even carry Arizona," he says.

Farley, still mentally sharp and physically active despite his 75 years, thinks also that Mr. Johnson will carry some now-Republican congressional districts with him and he even sees a slight gain for the Democrats in the Senate.

PROSPERITY CITED

Why a Johnson victory? Prosperity, mainly, in Farley's opinion. "There are two occasions," he says, "when people don't want to rock the boat—war and prosperity."

To top the situation off, Farley says he thinks "Johnson is the greatest political leader we have had in the history of this country. I want to be very active in this campaign to help Johnson win."

Mississippi Crusade—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, during the past summer several hundred courageous volunteers participated in the Mississippi summer project. In the face of constant threats and violence they were determined to help the cause of equality. Three sacrificed their lives. Alex Poinsett described the situation in the September 1964 issue of Ebony mag-

azine. Yesterday I brought to my colleagues' attention the first part of his article entitled "Crusade in Mississippi." Today I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remainder of the article. I urge every Member of Congress to read this account of bravery and dedication.

[From Ebony, September 1964]

CRUSADE IN MISSISSIPPI: COUNCIL OF FEDERATED ORGANIZATIONS CONDUCTS SUMMER-LONG PROJECT—Continued

(By Alex Poinsett)

The dialog continues, first the Negro, then the white youth patiently chipping away at the fear Mississippi has programed into the old man's nervous system. They tell him about the nine vote-discrimination suits the Government has pending in seven delta counties. They explain how COFO President Aaron Henry, a Clarksdale druggist who also heads the State NAACP, polled 82,000 votes (in only 3 weeks of campaigning) last fall in a mock gubernatorial election to demonstrate potential Negro voting strength. Before they leave, the old man finally agrees to accompany them to the courthouse later in the week. One down and thousands to go.

In Gulfport, Harvard student, Gibbs V. Kinderman, 21, and colleague George Johnson, 17, are canvassing for vote registrants when a red truck which has been trailing them pulls up. The driver asks what they're about then frowns as Kinderman explains. "Boy, things are fine," the driver replies. "We don't want things changed. If I see you around again, I'll beat your a——. In fact, I'm going to beat your a—— now." Leaping from his truck, he collars Kinderman who manages to free himself and flee with Johnson. As they run the driver explodes in a spasm of frustration: "Stop, or I'll beat your a——."

In Jackson, a COFO worker is hours overdue, setting in motion a series of security measures that can lead all the way to contact with the U.S. Justice Department and the FBI. A worried communications officer phones the Mabon, Miss., sheriff's office and asks: "Do you have a Mr. James R. Brown in jail there?"

"We have a nigger named James Brown in jail here," the voice on the phone snarls. "Now are you white or another one of those niggers?"

"Have you fixed bail on him?"

"I'll fix it when you get here," the voice promises menacingly.

In Clarksdale, local COFO Project Director Lafayette Surney, 22, walks one of his white girl volunteers to the uptown bank to open an account. "When we walked in everything stopped, including the clock," Surney recalls. "All eyes were on us. The girl was so nervous she messed up a dozen applications." Lafayette, peat-black and proud of it, does not mention he had risked his life.

He has been incurably "hooked" on the freedom movement ever since 1955 when his uncle, the late Rev. George Lee, was shot to death in Belzoni, Miss., for refusing to take his name off the town's voting rolls. At age 6 Lafayette had seen a white woman push down an 80-year-old Negro. Before he could rise from the sidewalk, several white men jumped on him and beat him to death. "I'll never forget that," Lafayette says. "It's an educational experience for me to work with white people now, because I grew up hating them." He nibbles on a lettuce-leaf in a Hattiesburg restaurant, having refused an offer of a full lunch with the explanation that he had disciplined himself to eat only one meal a day. He had to since for 2 years his salary as a SNCC worker had been $9.64 a week, raised 2 cents by the recent income tax cut and collectible if and when payroll money was available—which was seldom.

Lafayette walks down the street, now wary but not afraid of passing carloads of hostile whites. Sight of the nearby COFO Freedom School reminds him of a white woman who earlier had driven up with a boy of about 6. Getting out, she had led him to the opened school door, pointed to several white volunteers and said: "See there. Those are nigger-lovers. I don't want you to grow up to be like them. Do you hear me?"

And Lafayette had walked over to the boy and said: "Son, don't you ever believe anything your mother tells you again."

But the little boy is already hopelessly contaminated with what University of Mississippi History Professor James W. Silver describes as "the constant refrain from city and State officials that there is no racial problem in a social order where segregtaion is voluntary and where, they would have it believed, a peaceful, happy, and carefree citizenry is occasionally stirred to angry protest only by outside agitators."

And so in Vicksburg, police hound outsiders like Neil Hindman, 21, COFO's local project director, then jail him on a drunken driving charge, although he swears he has not tasted liquor in 2 months. His acquittal on the charge does not stop police snooping into his activities. Tall, rangy, his throat scarred by a boyhood trachea operation, Neil had come to Vicksburg in late May after completing a semester at Tougaloo College where he nearly forgot he was white. Working alone, he had renovated an ancient building for use as a freedom school and spent $70 of his own money to buy and build book shelves for the school library.

The school is in session as Neil fidgets from side to side, conscience-stricken for spending a moment away from work. "I'm going to do something I'll be a little ashamed of next week," he says. "I'm going to take a day off. I want to visit my girl friend at Tougaloo." He does not identify her race, ignoring it as one would the color of drinking water. "One of the reasons I came to Vicksburg," he continues, "is because this is her home. But she can't meet me here because her parents wouldn't approve of us going together. That bugs me. We're going to get married someday."

For the present, Neil busily teaches courses in algebra and geometry in a curriculum dominated by Negro history. Classes which had begun at 9:20 a.m. are disbanding for an afternoon break that will run until 7 p.m. in deference to Mississippi's mid-day heat. Neil moves with his students and faculty into a large room and joins them in a medley of freedom songs ending with the movement theme song, "We Shall Overcome." "We have these song sessions twice a day," he explains later. "They help keep up our morale."

But music only blots out temporarily the terrible reality that dominates Mississippi like its hot sun—the thought control imposed by the white citizens council, the tyranny of its police and courts, the appalling ignorance of most of its inhabitants, the savagery, the hate, the hopelessness. Veteran COFO worker Stokely Carmichael, who reportedly won't drive a car in the State unless it will go 120 miles an hour, manages to communicate some of that reality to Representatives PHILIP BURTON, Democrat, of California, AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, Democrat, of California, and WILLIAM F. RYAN, Democrat, of New York, in the State to see firsthand what seemed unbelievable in press reports. The eloquence of raw courage flows effortlessly from Stokely as he tells of clandestine visits to delta plantations to encourage voter registration—visits made although "the boss men," those country gentlemen romanticized by the "Southern mystique," carry rifles in racks on their trucks to shoot civil rights intruders. Stokely comes dressed in dungarees and carrying a hoe. While chopping cotton, he makes his pitch for freedom to the plantation workers. Despite being shot at several times, he, a New Yorker, and George Green, a native Mississippian, succeeded in signing up about 600 Negroes last summer.

The distinguished visitors listen attentively to Stokely. They are white-shirted and manicured men, trying desperately to understand the strange and frightening world of blue denim and red clay. Finally, one of the deeply concerned Representatives wants to know: "What can we, as Congressmen, do to help you"

"We're under heavy attack and no one is answering our critics," Stokely replies. "You can at least speak out." Against what?

Against the Mississippi's flourishing all over this land.

Against the Mississippi soaked with the blood of nameless and numberless martyrs.

Against hopelessness.

Hopelessness is FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover claiming that there is no more lawlessness in the State of Mississippi than elsewhere in the country.

Hopelessness is the U.S. Justice Department needing more evidence of a breakdown of law and order in Mississippi before it will send in marshalls.

Hopelessness is martial law in Mississippi—the U.S. military one day coming to preserve law, order, and the status quo while the dignity of human beings remains crushed.

How the Russians Think—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD the fourth and concluding article written by former U.S. Senator William Benton, of Connecticut, and published in the Hartford Courant following Senator Benton's return from a visit to the Soviet Union earlier this year.

In these articles, Senator Benton has summarized some of the highlights of his interviews with the Soviet leaders. As U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO, he is keenly aware of Soviet programs and has developed information which I believe should be broadly available:

HOW THE RUSSIANS THINK—SOVIET VIEW OF HOT SPOTS PRESENTS A DISTORTED IMAGE—PART IV

(Former U.S. Senator William Benton has visited the U.S.S.R. five times since 1955. During his last visit, in May, he interviewed 40 top Soviet officials in 10 days—including Chairman Nikita Khrushchev. "I wanted to see for myself what lies behind the so-called 'relaxation of tension,'" says Benton. "I didn't argue. I listened. I interjected comments and objections occasionally, only to help strip away some of the Soviet propaganda." The North American Newspaper Alliance asked Senator Benton, who is now chairman and publisher of Encyclopedia Britannica, and is also U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO, to summarize some of the highlights of his interviews. This is the last of four articles on his talks to Russian leaders.)

(By William Benton, publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica)

NEW YORK, August 18.—How do the Soviets view the world's current "hot spots"?

Chairman Nikita Krushchev told me emphatically: "We don't like American forces in Korea or South Vietnam. In South Vietnam, the ground is aflame while in Korea your boys walk freely in the streets."

During my interview with the Soviet Premier in May in Moscow, he declared:

"The sober and only possible decision for you is to withdraw your forces. Otherwise, you will sink deeper and deeper into the swamp."

In Chairman Khrushchev's view, any native population should seek to rise up against its "capitalist imperialist exploiters"—and ought to be encouraged to do so. (Hungary in 1956 to him was an example of the exploiters trying to get back into power.) "You in the United States receive every uprising against tyranny as a Communist uprising—even when it is a revolution by people with no knowledge of Lenin or Marx, and where there is no Communist Party. We are honored that you attribute all such ideas to us."

Yuri Zhukov, a senior editor of Pravda, who has been a close associate of Khrushchev and a cabinet minister, warned:

ESCALATION FEARED

"There are those among you who want you to bomb North Vietnam. This can lead on to the bombing of China. This will precipitate another Korea. * * * If you bomb North Vietnam the risk of war is very great."

From Nikita Khrushchev down the Kremlin ladder, there is deep and I believe genuine concern that the American presence in southeast Asia and over Cuban skies may touch off world war III.

The Russians now seek no armed solution to the problems that divide East and West. They believe communism can triumph on a global scale through the force of its ideas, through subversion (Soviet support of so-called national liberation movements), and through propaganda and economic competition. This will take time, they admit, but Khrushchev and his followers are prepared to wait.

While they are waiting, they will talk tough to appease the Chinese but will also try the commonsense approach to the West. They will try to convince us that our policies in Vietnam, Laos, and elsewhere are all wrong. And of course they will try to convince the world that U.S. policies are wrong. Further, they will continue to hope for U.S. and other credits to help build their industrial machine.

CAN'T CONTROL CASTRO

Khrushchev is deeply concerned over the danger of a new Cuban crisis. The implications of his talk with me—during which he conceded the U.S.S.R. uses satellites to photograph our military installations—are clear: he cannot control Castro.

"If sober sense doesn't reign," he said, "Cuba will shoot down your planes. This can provoke a crisis even more severe than the last crisis over Cuba. Neither President Johnson nor I want this crisis." He asked me why the United States doesn't take its reconnaissance photographs from satellites.

Zhukov, who—to my surprise—spoke highly of Castro's responsibility as a leader, said:

"Right now we must do everything we can to avoid aggravating international problems. Will there be a war over Cuba before the election?"

Zhukov admitted "I am gravely worried" over Cuba. "The Cuban emigrees could not be doing what they are—without plenty of American money."

I interjected to say that the U.S. Government is not financing the anti-Castro attacks by the Cuban emigrees; that there are rich Cubans who had built up large fortunes—deposited outside of Cuba—before they migrated. Why won't he concede that they may be supporting the operations of the Cuban emigrees?

BLAST AT CIA

"Your CIA is said to be a state within a state," Zhukov retorted. "You must realize that the situation is very tense. Every day, there are small invasion forces into Cuba. Daily there is a war announcement. A government-in-exile is formed. I assure you that our press is very reticent on all these subjects * * * but this is not because they don't concern us. We remember our duties. We may be forced into a position in which we must interfere. We don't want to interfere. We need help from the United States to insure that we do not interfere. You Americans know that we Russians don't want war. Chairman Khrushchev's speeches clearly reflect this."

Zhukov shifted to southeast Asia:

"Take Laos for example: I recognize that this is very complicated. But how can your people stand by and do nothing about the organization of the rightist coup d'etat? You could have prevented this. You have a very good intelligence operation in Laos. We in the U.S.S.R. want the Geneva compact observed. This rightist coup has created new hostility. You have given bombs and planes to be used against the Pathet Lao. You confirm the Chinese claim. The Chinese have always insisted that a neutral Laos is impossible. The situation is rapidly becoming more complicated."

DIFFERENT APPROACH

Zhukov conceded that the Soviet approach toward national liberation movements is very different from that of the American. He termed these movements psychologically and politically most important.

"We share the desire of all people to get rid of colonialism," he said. "Take Angola, Mozambique, South Africa. We of the U.S.S.R. must help the people. The United States itself often helps. However, these are small questions."

I interrupted to suggest that the American people are sympathetic to the goals of the people in Angola and Mozambique, and acutely sympathetic with the Negro groups and their goals in South Africa.

Zhukov pressed on, "Let me finish the case I am making out.

"When colonialism has been done away with we shall move into a new era. Our two countries have now decided we cannot resolve the issues which divide us by war. How can we then resolve them? Our systems are antagonistic. What kind of trouble can we anticipate? Chairman Khrushchev has often spoken on this question * * * he is formulating the issues of the new epoch. The antagonistic struggle of the United States and the U.S.S.R. must be confined to economic competition. For this, both countries have great opportunities."

DULLES' MISTAKE

Zhukov said that due to Secretary of State Dulles' "mistake in Egypt"—a reference to the withdrawal of U.S. aid for the Aswan Dam—Chairman Khrushchev was at Aswan instead of President Johnson, who should have been there. Dulles, he pointed out, then repeated his "grave mistake." He repeated it in India when he told the Indians that their Government could not build their steel mill with American cooperation—that "only private enterprise could build it." This gave the Russians the opportunity to build the steel plant at Bhilai.

"The West Germans have put up a new plant in India," he said. "The British have built a new plant. Here we are competing among the three of us. This is all to the good. But where is the United States?"

I interrupted to tell him that our last year's AID budget for India was $835 million—our largest for any country in the world. I conceded that the Russians have been smart propagandists in seizing some of these big, spectacular projects. But I pointed out that it is a fair assumption that much of this $835 million has been used constructively for the benefit of the Indian people. Zhukov did not deny this.

COMPETITIVE STRUGGLE

"Yes, this is a competitive struggle," said Zhukov. "This is economics. This is no war. And this is how we see the 21st century. Let us compete without war at the economic level."

I said that the 21st century is a long way to look ahead. I suggested we settle for the 20th century.

Zhukov then concluded with this warning:

"But let there be no illusions in the United States about the weakening of the determination of the U.S.S.R. Your press often suggests that the time has come to push the U.S.S.R. for concessions. Your press stresses our economic difficulties. Our bad harvest. Our quarrel with China. All of this is senseless."

The U.S.S.R. is of course seeking to widen its influence in the underdeveloped world. Here is where the Russians are trying hardest to "bury capitalism." They are surely hoping to kick us out of the Middle East and to take over our oil interests there. They are hoping eventually to out-vote us in the United Nations on the admission of Red China and other questions. Assuredly, their phrase, "the new colonialism"—which I often heard from Russian leaders during my stay in the U.S.S.R.—is aimed primarily at the United States. England, France, Portugal, the Netherlands, represent the old colonialism. The new colonialism—to the Kremlin—is American capitalism; it is this equated with the term reactionary forces. Therefore, in the Soviet sense, American opposition to guerrilla uprisings means American support of "the new colonialism"—of reactionary forces.

INTERFERENCE

It is clear that, on paper and in formal discussion, both the United States and the U.S.S.R. agree that all peoples should be permitted to determine for themselves how they wish to live, and to decide this without any interference or pressure from outside.

Where the two countries disgree is here: the U.S.S.R. contends that, if the people are allowed to develop without capitalist-imperialist interference they will seek not only national independence but a Social-Communist form of society.

We in the United States agree that the local populations are entitled to seek freedom and independence—and should be encouraged to do so—but should be encouraged and allowed to seek a free and democratic form of society.

We do not agree with Khrushchev that the seizure of control by a Communist minority is a legitimate form of revolution or a step toward "liberation."

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 22297–22316

Bills Introduced: Two bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3225–3226. Page 22298

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 6218, granting a second extension to certain desert land entrymen in Palo Verde Mesa, Riverside County, Calif. (S. Rept. 1603);

H.R. 12633, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965, with amendments (S. Rept. 1604);

H.R. 11812, fiscal 1965 appropriations for the foreign aid program, with amendments (S. Rept. 1605); and

H.R. 1096, relating to the administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve, Wis., with minority and individual views (S. Rept. 1606). Page 22298

President's Communication—Appropriations: Communication from President transmitting proposed appropriation for the fiscal year 1965 in the amount of $800,000 for the Appalachian Regional Commission, was received, referred to Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 105. Page 22298

Private Bill: H. Con. Res. 367, to correct enrollment of H.R. 6593, a private bill, was adopted. Page 22297

Private Bill: S. 724, private bill, the Senate's unfinished business, was by unanimous consent returned to calendar. Page 22316

Indiana Dunes: Senate passed with amendments S. 2249, providing for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, after adopting the following amendments: Committee amendments en bloc, which were then considered as original text for purpose of further amendment; and Douglas amendment authorizing Secretary of the Interior to make cooperative agreements with State of Indiana for access to Little Calumet River banks. Motion to reconsider passage of the bill was tabled. Pages 22316–22323

Presidential Succession—Constitutional Amendment: Senate agreed to reconsider Senate's action of Monday, September 28, in passing with committee amendments S.J. Res. 139, proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to succession to the Presidency and the Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and on its reconsideration the bill, with committee amendments, passed unanimously by 65 yeas. Motion to reconsider passage was tabled.

Pages 22299–22300, 22302, 22336–22341

Tariff: Senate worked on H.R. 12253, to make amendments in the Tariff Schedules of the United States, taking the following actions on amendments thereto, but not completing action on the bill:

Adopted: Two Long (Louisiana) amendments of a technical, corrective nature; all committee amendments en bloc, which were thereafter considered as original text for purpose of further amendment; and Kuchel amendment respecting rates on brooms and whiskbrooms.

Senator Kuchel submitted notice of his intention to move to suspend the rules for purpose of proposing an amendment to the bill.

Pages 22323, 22335–22336, 22358–22372

Confirmation: One judicial nomination was confirmed. Page 22372

Nomination: Nomination of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., for appointment to the grade of colonel, U.S. Marine Corps, was received. Page 22372

Record Vote: One record vote was taken today.

Page 22341

Program for Wednesday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 6:35 p.m. until noon Wednesday, September 30, when it will continue on H.R. 12253, Tariff Schedule amendments. Page 22372

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—FOREIGN AID, AND SUPPLEMENTAL

Committee on Appropriations: Committee, in executive session, marked up and ordered favorably reported with amendments H.R. 11812, fiscal 1965 appropriations for the foreign aid program. As approved by the committee, the bill would provide a total of $3.7 billion, of which amount $3.3 billion is for title I of the bill.

Committee also approved with amendments H.R. 12633, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965.

Appendix

We Must Retain Our Essential Weapons

SPEECH
OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have served as chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee for more than 15 years. This year we have provided substantial funds, $25,500,000, to increase our efforts to find and use all means to protect ourselves and our source of food from insects and disease. We mean to see that this effort is speeded up, for we have been working in this field for many years.

In the meantime, we must not prohibit the use of proven weapons, of effective agricultural pesticides which are so essential to our standard of living and to our welfare—where there is no evidence of injury to our people, simply because we come up with a new test which shows an infinitesimal amount of residue, which in itself has not been determined to be dangerous.

We must provide for reasonable tolerance on pesticides and a standard test, if we are to protect the cheapest, the best, the widest variety of foods ever enjoyed by any nation, as each year our life expectancy increases. If we do not take action in this area, the consumer will be at the whim of local authorities, where health is not endangered, as in the Washington milk situation. I regret to see some say that elimination of chemicals might cut production; that it would be a good thing in view of our surpluses.

This is a shortsighted viewpoint, which ignores several extremely important factors—the world's food and population situations and the contest between us and Communist-dominated countries.

Aside from the possibility of nuclear conflict, probably the foremost problem in the world today is hunger. Approximately half of the world's 3 billion people suffer from malnutrition and the World Food Congress was told in 1963 that around 10,000 persons die every day from starvation. India has a food crisis just now due to bad weather. We are rushing wheat and other foods from our surpluses in an effort to avert chaos. I said that India has a food crisis. I should have said "an accentuated food crisis" since that vast subcontinent has a year-round hunger problem. So do many other areas in the world, mostly the underdeveloped ones. Moreover, hunger probably will grow more and more intense with the passage of time. The world's population increase is almost unbelievable. Each year births exceed deaths by almost 60,000. The way things are going now, it looks as if this globe will have close to 6 billion persons by the year 2000.

As Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, said in a speech in 1963:

> Two grim specters beckon mankind toward oblivion today. One offers instant and wholesale death by nuclear means. The alternative guarantees eventual starvation when the human population exceeds the food supply.

Also, the efficiency of American agriculture is a most important and practical weapon in the struggle with communism. The failure of Communist agriculture, a failure which is chronic and deep seated, has tremendous implications to the hundreds of millions constantly plagued by hunger. The Communist inability to produce efficiently and abundantly plainly tells them—if they get the message—that there is little hope along the Communist road.

If they follow this path—as they are being urged to do every day—all they have to look forward to is more starvation and misery.

In my opinion, this contrast between our systems, the contrasts in agriculture, should be used to the fullest. I cannot think of any better answer to Communist propaganda. As Don Paarlberg, of Purdue University, in his book, "American Farm Policy," said:

> Agriculture represents our greatest absolute advantage over the Communist world.

Modern agricultural production would be impossible without the use of chemical pesticides and herbicides. Even with their use, destructive insects do damage every year approximating $4 billion. One of the primary reasons for world hunger and human diseases is the absence of effective chemical pesticides in extensive areas of the world. I know for I have seen many of these countries. In India where, as I have pointed out, hunger is endemic, destructive insects work almost unhindered. For example, it is almost impossible to maintain supplies of stored grain in that country because of the depredations of weevils and beetles, including that pest of pests, the Khapra beetle.

If there is to be any improvement in the food situation abroad, we must not only use our food reserves to combat hunger; we must keep our agricultural products available and offered on the markets of the world.

Mr. Speaker, in our recent bill providing funds for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for fiscal year 1965 the Congress provided approximately $25,500,000 for increased research on the handling of insects and insect diseases of man and animal and plant life. Pending results from such efforts we must not permit anything to take away our present weapons, where there is no evidence of danger to human health.

Since our report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies, I have made a rather thorough study of the overall problem of chemical pesticides and the alternatives, research for which we financed in that bill. It is our agricultural chemicals, our machinery, and improved and prolific varieties of plants which make it possible for so few to provide for so many. Without these agricultural tools a great many of our people would have to go back to the farm, possibly as many as half. Should that occur, we would not have the many things which make our life so much better than that of the rest of the world.

I am convinced the American people cannot do without farm machinery, improved varieties of plants or the new, better, and more lasting pesticides which are essential if we are to keep insects and diseases from seriously damaging our food supply.

What makes the situation doubly bad is that so many of our people in key positions apparently want to capitalize on a public opinion built up by a wonderfully written book, a mixture of fact and fantasy, by the late Miss Rachel Carson; yet our leading scientists all point out that it is not a scientific book at all but a marvelously written narrative, really a rather nostalgic plea for a return of yesterday, though its warning as to proper use is both timely and helpful.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks we all have been aware of the burning of thousands of acres of timber, of homes and buildings in the Santa Barbara watershed area of California. Today we are told that more than 80,000 acres will have to be replanted with trees for which $1 million is requested and I know if we don't protect these young seedlings with effective pesticides, the seedlings will be cut down by rodents as fast as they are set out.

Last week the House of Representatives provided for payment by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of $8,800,000 in damages incurred in the Washington, D.C., area by milk being condemned by the local health department, because of new tests and the residues which they showed, without any evidence of danger to public health. All authorities I have studied clearly prove that chemical residues do not continue to build up in humans, and I have found no evidence that injury has resulted where chemical pesticides have been properly used. What makes the situation bad is the fact that writers have gone from discussion of injury by misuse right into "residues," where there is no evidence of potential injury.

During a recent debate someone talked about the Mississippi River fish kill. I have read the hearings on this case; the fish were almost all salt water fish and died just below a spot where one of our major cities dumps 17 million gallons of sewage daily—500 miles down river from Memphis, Tenn., where it was claimed pesticide residues were allowed to enter the river.

Much has been made of the bird kills. Instead of fewer birds we have had a bird population increase of explosive proportions as chemicals have held down mites, rodents, and other pests and animals which destroy bird life.

One of the most effective chemicals has been DDT, which without doubt has saved many lives in and since World War II. However, the use of DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbon chemicals has been banned, to all intent and purposes, on lands administered by the Department of the Interior. Insofar as I have been able to ascertain, there is no evidence of damage to wildlife, or any other form of life, to sustain this ban. It is true that DDT, improperly used, has killed fish and other forms of wildlife, just as it is true that aspirin, improperly used, has killed human beings—more every year, and all by misuse incidentally, than pesticides, where, too, it has all been from misuse. But DDT and some other of the chlorinated hydrocarbons are very efficient agents in combating destructive insects. They are efficient because their effects are long lasting and persistent. On application lasts quite awhile, which is why they do the job.

In announcing the ban on the chlorinated hydrocarbons, the Interior Department did not announce any new proof of injury or hazard. I can only hope that within a year or two insect damage on some of the forest lands administered by Interior has not proceeded to the point where there has been havoc from such pests as the spruce budworm, together with great damage to watersheds and an enhancement of the threat of fire in areas in the West.

In 1963 the Connecticut legislature failed to approve money for pesticides to spray forests against the gypsy moth. As a result, there was drastic curtailment of pesticide use against the pest. In 1964 a sharp rise in damage from the moth in Connecticut has been evident. In the absence of preventive measures, we may expect this damage to increase every year and the major danger is fire which would be diastrous to hundreds of watersheds and cities below throughout the country.

In connection with the theory that pesticides accumulate threateningly in the water and soil, I went hunting not long ago in Mississippi for doves. We hunted in an area where pesticides, the chlorinated hydrocarbons, had been used in large quantities for years and years. Yet game was plentiful, so plentiful that the hundreds of hunters got the overall limit, 12 each, in a very few hours.

The Mississippi Delta, or a large portion of it, is in my district. Pesticides, the persistent kind, have been used to literally drench much of the delta for years in order to protect crops. Nevertheless, fish and game flourish and thrive. Moreover, my constituents of the area are vigorous and healthy. Their lifespan like that of the people of the Nation has risen sharply since the use of DDT eliminated the malarial mosquito and the disease itself. In addition to the scientific evidence, the evidence of commonsense is against the present charges.

I quote from the report of our Appropriations Committee:

THE PESTICIDE RESIDUE PROBLEM

The need for additional research on development, testing, and use of pesticides and insecticides, together with the effects of sprays or other residues from products used in agricultural production is very acute. Recent well-publicized books and articles, not always based on complete and objective information, have increased public concern about this matter. Current statements in the press which make certain claims concerning the effect of agricultural pesticides on fish in the lower Mississippi River present a completely one-sided point of view, and in this instance it is not claimed that health is affected.

To enable the Department to protect agriculture and the consumer by developing and presenting full and complete facts on this matter and to develop improved methods of insect and pest control, some expansion of research activities in this area is necessary. Congress provided for the establishment of a weed-control laboratory last year. Since the work at this location will be directly concerned with the use of pesticides, insecticides, other agricultural chemicals, materials, and methods, plans for this facility should be modified to permit testing and development of pesticides, insecticides and other materials necessary to agriculture, including effects of residues.

For expanded research on use of pesticides and control of insects and pests, the committee included approximately $25,500,000 in the final bill for next year, including such amount as may be needed for the modification of plans at the weed-control laboratory provided last year to include this type of research.

Both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Agriculture are deeply interested in protecting the public health. Both Departments have responsibility for approving materials for use as pesticides and insecticides for agricultural purposes.

Neither Department, we are sure, would want to needlessly deprive the American consumer of any part of the finest and cheapest food any nation has ever enjoyed. In recent weeks, however, after materials have been approved and put into use, new means of detection of minute amounts of residue have resulted in news releases, press accounts, and headlines which needlessly frighten the consumer, do financial damage to the manufacturer and the farmer, and lessen the supply of food for the consuming public, though there is no claim that the public health is endangered. Neither the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, nor the Department of Agriculture would want to needlessly destroy any American business or agricultural enterprise. Yet that is what present policies are doing in cases where there is no evidence of danger to the public health.

The members of the committee recall the cranberry incident in 1960, when a whole industry was practically destroyed by reckless statements and charges. It took $10 million recommended by President Eisenhower to compensate for the damage and bring back public acceptance of this commodity. The public health must be protected. However, the supply of food and the processes which make food and fiber plentiful and cheap must also be protected where there is no evidence that public health is endangered.

In an effort to prevent further financial damage to American producers and loss of food for consumers as a result of reckless handling of this problem, the committee has set up $250,000 for the use of the Secretary of Agriculture to collaborate with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in working out rules and regulations including the recommendation of such changes in the law as may be necessary to protect our high standard of living with the most plentiful, cheapest and finest food and fiber any nation ever had—while at the same time protecting the public health.

The food supply shortage is said to be Russia's "Achilles heel." Russia's monumental failure to provide food for her people and their allies is her chief weakness in the world of today. We must prevent our Nation, where only 18 percent of total income goes for food, from sinking to Russia's level, where some 50 percent or more of national income is spent for food.

It is the firm belief of this committee that news releases or other public statements regarding any pesticide or other material which such departments have authorized for use should not be made unless at least one of such departments states that there is evidence that the continued use of such material would injure the public health.

Further, some provision should be made for payment of financial losses to any producer, processor, or manufacturer resulting from statements or actions concerning the use of approved pesticides, insecticides, chemicals or other materials, where there is no evidence that their use endangers the public health. The payment for such damages should be made by the department issuing or negligently permitting the issuance of such statement or action.

PROTECTION FROM DISEASE AND PESTILENCE

It is estimated by officials of the Department that, if it were not for the use of fertilizers, insecticides and pesticides, in 5 years the cost of a very inferior quality of food to the American consumer would double, and in 10 to 15 years the people of this Nation would be short of essential foods.

The threat from insects and diseases becomes increasingly serious as the speed and volume of travel increases between all areas of the world. Nearly 57 million more persons entered the United States during fiscal year 1963 than in 1954. The number of planes, ships and other carriers in 1963 was over 26 million as compared to 14 million in 1954. The number of pieces of baggage inspected increased threefold in 6 years—from 9 million in 1957 to over 27 million in 1963.

The opening of additional ports along the St. Lawrence Seaway and increased nonstop oversea air flights to airports in the interior of the country are also increasing the threat of introduction of new pests from abroad.

It has been estimated by agriculture experts that the damage to crops by the more than 600 different kinds of major destructive plant insects in the United States amounts to nearly $4 billion each year. Cotton insects account for nearly $600 million annually, cereal and forage insects account for some $400 million annually, and stored grain and household insects cause annual damage of over $1 billion. It is further estimated that annual losses caused by plant diseases total $2,500 million, and that livestock losses due to diseases and parasites exceed $2 billion per year.

If foot-and-mouth disease should become established in this country, it is estimated that annual losses would be in the billions of dollars. It is further predicted that the

introduction of fowl pest in this country could virtually eliminate the poultry industry. The introduction of rinderpest would cost the Nation $1 billion annually.

To fully appreciate the effects of these destructive diseases and pests, it is necessary only to look to other parts of the world where food production is subject to their ravages. In the Middle East, desert locusts have been sweeping the semiarid lands for centuries, leaving ruined crops and starvation in their wake. In Pakistan, severe locust, caterpillar, and cricket outbreaks have caused losses as high as 80 percent in some areas. It is almost impossible to maintain supplies of grain in storage in India because of the ravages of weevils, bran beetles, and the world's worst pest of stored grain—the khapra beetle, which is now a threat in the United States.

Stored-grain pests are so bad in tropical areas of the world that the race to eat the grain before insects devour it results in frequent periods of starvation. The people compete with the pests for survival. Their low standard of living thus becomes understandable.

The distribution of cattle in Africa is determined primarily by the presence or absence of the tsetse fly. This is a major reason why an African child, once weaned, may never again taste milk. The cattle tick and the human warble or torsalo fly cause tremendous losses to hides, beef, and milk production in Central and South America. Mortality among calves may be as high as 70 percent in some of the most heavily infested areas.

A recent report from Argentina indicates that 50,000 calves succumbed in 1 year's time to screw-worm—the same one found in this country. The Argentines have had no effective means of dealing with this pest.

PROTECTION OF MARKETS FOR LABOR AND INDUSTRY

The economic welfare of each segment of the Nation's economy is dependent on the economic strength of each of the others. History demonstrates that our Nation is prosperous only to the extent that our agricultural economy is strong and healthy.

Agriculture is the principal source of new wealth. It is the main provider of basic raw materials which support all segments of business and industry. Around 65 percent of the basic raw materials used in industry come from the farm. Reliable estimates indicate that each dollar of wealth taken from the soil generates $7 of income throughout the rest of our economy.

Agriculture is our largest industry. It employs 12 times the number of people in the steel industry, 9 times the number in the automobile industry, and twice the number in the transportation and public utility industries. In addition, it supports directly another 10 percent of our nonfarm population which supplies the farmer with his needs and processes and markets his products.

Agriculture is a major dollar earner in world markets and is playing an important role in solving our balance-of-payments problems. It is expected that agricultural exports will represent 25 percent of our total exports in fiscal year 1964 as compared to 22 percent in fiscal year 1956.

Agriculture is one of the major markets for the products of labor and industry. Agriculture uses more steel in a year than is used for a year's output of passenger cars. It uses more petroleum products than any other industry in the country. It uses more rubber each year than is required to produce tires for 6 million automobiles. Its inventory of machinery and equipment exceeds the assets of the steel industry, and is five times that of the automobile industry.

Urban workers benefit directly from this rural demand for machinery, equipment, supplies, and the other items used on the Nation's farms. Significant changes in this demand, therefore, have a direct effect on business and employment in urban areas. Every major business recession in this country has been preceded by the loss of income and purchasing power at the farm level.

This important rural market must be protected by the assurance of adequate income to the producers of farm commodities and maintenance of farm purchasing power. Business prosperity and full employment in the cities is dependent on a strong and dependable agricultural market, including both large and small farms.

The programs of the Department which help the producer to market his commodities at home and abroad efficiently and profitably, as well as the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation and other agencies which have an effect on production and commodity prices, have done much to maintain agricultural income and thereby protect this important market for labor and industry. The committee has attempted to provide sufficient funds in the bill for fiscal year 1965 to make certain that these essential services will be available to the producer and their benefits will be available to the consumer during the coming year.

Goldwater No Demagogue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, an excellent article, entitled "Goldwater No Demagogue," was published today in the Washington Post. The article was written by John Chamberlain. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 30, 1964]

THESE DAYS—GOLDWATER NO DEMAGOGUE

(By John Chamberlain)

Whatever may be the faults of BARRY GOLDWATER, he is not one of those who rave and rant about anything. So far as his own personal speechmaking is concerned, he has been waging the least demagogic national campaign that anyone now alive could possibly remember.

Just consider how he has been breaking all the more cynical campaign rules. He goes into West Virginia and unburdens himself on the subject of the current anti-poverty campaign for the allegiance of the Appalachian States. He says a mere billion dollars will do practically nothing toward eliminating poverty, which is certainly a true statement. But it is not the sort of thing that a demagogic ranter and raver would choose to tell an audience in the heart of the region that will be getting the money.

On his swing through the South, Mr. GOLDWATER stops in Tennessee. There, where it is supposed to be political suicide to attack the TVA, he reaffirms his proposal to sell certain TVA appendages, such as fertilizer plants, to private owners.

Moving on into Texas, he speaks at Fort Worth, where the local plant of General Dynamics Corp. has been awarded a $6 billion contract to manufacture the TFX aircraft. He tells the Texans that the TFX contract was "politically oriented," and that it should have gone to Boeing in Seattle, a company which, Senator GOLDWATER said, was in a position to make a better plane.

Mr. GOLDWATER'S refusal to play it safe is cause for almost ecstatic wonder in a most unlikely place, the little Freedom and Union magazine put out by Clarence Streit, the prophet of a federation of the Atlantic democracies. When Mr. GOLDWATER made clear at San Francisco that "Atlantic union is a key issue to him," says Streit, "the extreme nationalists in the Goldwater camp and his extreme critics in the other who seem convinced that he is dominated by 'isolationists,' 'Birchers' and 'Fascists' * * * were struck dumb." Streit finds Mr. GOLDWATER far more satisfactory than Lyndon Johnson on the subject of Atlantic community, for the Johnson acceptance speech at Atlantic City "made no reference to Atlantica, whose flowering had so big a place in Senator GOLDWATER'S acceptance."

As the Goldwater campaign unfolds, it becomes increasingly apparent that we have a most unpolitical nominee contending for the Presidency. The man seems extreme because he is extremely honest. It is true, of course, that GOLDWATER hasn't been talking recently about making social security "voluntary," which might be construed as a retreat.

But the reason for the silence, I think, is that Mr. GOLDWATER despairs of making himself understood on the subject in a campaign year. The original Goldwater statement on social security followed the publication of a poll taken in Britain which indicated that more than 50 percent of the English voters would like to have the opportunity to "contract out" of Government welfare schemes. "Contracting out" implies that welfare must be kept up, but that a choice would be allowed between the public and private kinds.

Now it is not true that the American Government is powerless to find a way to finance a social security system that would permit a person to select a public or a private old-age insurance policy, the qualifying stipulation being that he must maintain either one or the other. But a presidential candidate would have to take a battery of insurance actuaries along with him to be convincing on this point. And very few people would hang around long enough to listen.

Senator GOLDWATER'S honesty, which transcends the call of duty, recalls that of John Stuart Mill in Victorian times. When he was campaigning for the English Parliament in 1865, Mill was confronted by a group of workingmen who asked him if he had authored a quote that said "the lower classes, though mostly habitual liars, are ashamed of lying." Mill looked the workingmen in the eye and said, "I did." Whereupon they cheered him and voted for him—and he won his seat in Commons.

That, however, was a century ago. And besides, it was in another country.

Tribute to the Late Walter Norblad

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life and service of our departed colleague, WALTER NORBLAD.

It would be superfluous to say here that I express my sorrow, because every Member knows of the fondness and

friendship in which WALT was held by his fellow Members. We all mourn his passing, in particular because WALT always had a kind word for each of us, and I do not know any Member of the House who had more friends or a warmer personality.

As to the public service of WALTER NORBLAD, I can speak personally as to his interest in fisheries. He constantly asked me, because of my membership on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, about pending fishery bills and matters of that nature. But, of course, his great contribution was as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. Here, again, he kept me and others I know of posted on developments which he thought were important to us and our districts.

Mr. Speaker, I think that especially WALT NORBLAD'S important public service is recognized in his efforts to eliminate waste and unnecessary spending of the taxpayers' money. But, actually, his talents were not limited to any one field; he was—as those of us who served with him know—a well-rounded, able and conscientious Representative. He was close to his constituents and served them well.

Of even greater importance, however, he was a U.S. Representative whose first consideration always was the welfare of the entire country.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege to associate with WALT, day in and day out, now, for the first six terms I have been here. I am going to miss him, but I will always remember him with respect and affection.

Meanwhile, my wife and I extend to his beloved wife and son our deepest sympathy.

Clifton E. Cushman Gives a Challenge to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I, for one, believe the youth of today generally compares favorably with the youth of any other time. I know of no period in our history when there have been more outstanding young people. One such young man is Clifton Cushman, of Grand Forks, N. Dak. He is a young North Dakotan of whom all of us are very proud.

Lieutenant Cushman is an outstanding athlete. In 1960, he placed second in the 400-meter hurdles in the Olympic Games at Rome. This year, he was determined to bring back a Gold Medal from the 1964 Olympics, to be held in Tokyo, Japan. Lieutenant Cushman worked and trained very hard to this end, only to be denied a berth on the U.S. Olympic team through an accident which, in the trials at Los Angeles, saw him stumble on a hurdle and fall, thereby disqualifying himself.

Mr. President, the fine qualities of this young man are best expressed in an "open letter" he wrote on September 17 to the youth of Grand Forks, N. Dak. I ask unanimous consent that Lieutenant Cushman's letter, as published in the Grand Forks Herald, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I know of no more ringing challenge to our young people than that expressed in Lieutenant Cushman's letter, and I know of no better example for our young people to emulate than that of Lieutenant Cushman. His indomitable spirit and his will to succeed are best shown in his challenge to our young people.

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

[From the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald, Sept. 17, 1964]

CUSHMAN NOT GIVING UP SETTING GOALS DESPITE OLYMPIC TRIAL MISS—WRITES OPEN LETTER TO YOUTH

Lt. Clifton Cushman of Grand Forks, whose hopes for a place on a second consecutive U.S. Olympic team fell with him over a hurdle in a trial meet last Sunday, says he will not give up setting goals for himself and trying to reach them.

In an open letter to Grand Forks youth received here Thursday, Cushman challenged them to do the same thing. The letter follows:

"Don't feel sorry for me. I feel sorry for some of you.

"Last Sunday you may have seen the U.S. Olympic trials on television. If so, you watched me hit the fifth hurdle, fall and lie on the track in an inglorious heap of skinned elbows, bruised hips, torn knees, and injured pride, unsuccessful in my attempt to make the Olympic team for the second time.

"In a split second all the many years of training, pain, sweat, blisters, and agony of running were simply and irrevocably wiped out. But I tried. I would much rather fail knowing I had put forth an honest effort than never to have tried at all.

"This is not to say that everyone is capable of making the Olympic team. However, each of you is capable of trying to make your own personal 'olympic team,' whether it be the high school football team, the glee club, the honor roll, or whatever your goal may be. Unless your reach exceeds your grasp, how can you be sure what you can attain?

"And don't you think there are things better than cigarettes, hotrod cars, school dropouts, excessive makeup, and ducktail greasecuts?

"Over 15 years ago I saw a star—first place in the Olympic Games. I literally started to run for it.

"In 1960 I came within 3 yards of grabbing it; this year I stumbled, fell and watched it recede 4 more years away. Certainly, I was very disappointed in falling flat on my face.

"However, there is nothing I can do about it now but get up, pick the cinders from my wounds, and take one more step followed by one more and one more, until the steps turn into miles and the miles into success.

SCRIPTURE QUOTED

"I know I may never make it. The odds are against me but I have something in my favor—desire and faith. Romans 5: 3–5 has always had an inspirational meaning to me in this regard.

"'* * * we rejoice in our sufferings, knowing that suffering produces endurance, and endurance produces character, and character produces hope, and hope does not disappoint us.'

"At least I am going to try.

"How about you? Would a little extra effort on your part bring up your grade average? Would you have a better chance to make the football team if you stayed an extra 15 minutes after practice and worked on your blocking?

MANY UNHAPPY

"Let me tell you something about yourselves. You are taller and heavier than any past generation in this country. You are spending more money, enjoying more freedom, and driving more cars than ever before, yet many of you are unhappy.

"Some of you have never known the satisfaction of doing your best in sports, the joy of excelling in class, the wonderful feeling of completing a job, any job, and looking back on it knowing that you have done your best.

"I dare you to have your hair cut and not wilt under the comments of your so-called friends. I dare you to clean up your language. I dare you to honor your mother and father. I dare you to go to church without having to be compelled to go by your parents.

"I dare you to unselfishly help someone less fortunate than yourself and enjoy the wonderful feeling that goes with it. I dare you to become physically fit. I dare you to read a book that is not required in school.

"I dare you to look up at the stars, not down at the mud, and set your sights on one of them that, up to now, you thought was unattainable. There is plenty of room at the top, but no room for anyone to sit down.

"Who knows? You may be surprised at what you can achieve with sincere effort. So get up, pick the cinders out of your wounds, and take one more step.

"I dare you.

"Sincerely,

"CLIFTON E. CUSHMAN."

The AMA's Able Staff Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following article from the AMA News is worthy of the attention of the Members of Congres and ask that it be made a part of the RECORD:

AMA'S ABLE STAFF MEN

The Kiplinger Washington Letter, an old and widely read newsletter, recently charged the AMA's representatives in the Capital with threatening Members of Congress who favor the King-Anderson bill.

The charge is false.

The men who represent the Nation's physicians in Washington are honorable and are respected by Congressmen in both political parties. Legislators who disagree with the AMA's position on the financing of hospital care for the elderly through the Social Security System have praised not only the competence but the character of the AMA's representatives.

President Lyndon Johnson, back in 1959 when he was the Senate majority leader, said: "The greatest legislative representative that I know and the individual in whom I have the most confidence and respect is the representative of the American Medical Association, Cecil Dickson."

More recently, during the 1963 House Ways and Means Committee hearings on the King-Anderson bill, Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, of New York, had this to say:

"I • • • get the impression that there goes abroad the notion that those of us on the committee who are presumed to be supporters of the pending legislation have a total and complete disregard for the American Medical Assocation, and I want you to know that I do not join with them.

"Without intending to embarrass them, candor compels me to tell you here today in these circumstances that in Cecil Dickson and Jim Foristel you have two very able, very gracious, and very effective spokesmen.

"My only critical comment of them would be that on occasions they have been somewhat too effective."

Earlier last year, the Associated Press in an article published nationwide, cited Dickson as an example of a successful representative whose tactics could be emulated by young people aspiring to be Washington lobbyists. "Dickson," the AP said, "is rated one of the most effective—though by no means the highest paid—lobbyists in town." The AP story continued:

" 'One rule should always be observed,' Dickson says. 'Never throw a Congressman a curve by giving him misinformation. If you once embarrass a Congressman, the word gets around.'

"What seem to be facts to the AMA may look like nonfacts to opposing lobbyists, but Dickson does his best to supply facts according to his lights, even if they may temporarily hurt his cause."

The other AMA representatives in Washington are Richard N. Phillco and Harold Slater. Like their colleagues Dickson and Foristel, they do their work forthrightly and with tact. They have not imperiled their effectiveness by issuing threats to Congressmen. This is not their way, personally or professionally.

It should be noted that the Kiplinger Letter does not support its charge with facts. It gives no detail—and not even a generalized description—of the "threats." Plainly, there are no facts. The Kiplinger Letter was wrong in making this charge, as wrong as it was in 1962 when it repeatedly told its readers that medicare would be passed by that session of Congress.

Gift of Calves to the Dominican Republic by Albemarle Ruritan Club, of Charlottesville, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I have received a very interesting letter from Mr. John E. Gerow, vice president of the Albemarle Ruritan Club, in Virginia. The letter, which is self-explanatory, describes a project undertaken by the club. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gerow's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

ALBEMARLE RURITAN CLUB,
Charlottesville, Va., September 14, 1964.
Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I thought that you and your fellow Senators might be interested in a project that the Albemarle Ruritan Club has undertaken. As you know, we are a civic organization. In thinking of a worthwhile undertaking, we decided that with all of our agricultural surplusage we should be able to help some of our less fortunate neighbors.

Upon writing to various Embassies, we discovered that the Dominican Republic was struggling against desperate odds to overcome 31 years of the most oppressive dictatorship this hemisphere has ever known. We found out that there is a horrendous shortage of protein, especially milk for the youngsters.

The average yearly consumption is something like 50 liters per person.

With all of our dairy cattle and dairy surplus, we decided that we could help by assembling an airplane load of calves, if the Dominican Republic would provide the transportation. We have been working with Ambassador Bonilla and the University of Santo Domingo. These calves are being assembled on three different farms here in Albemarle County, and in October the plane from the Dominican Republic will pick up these animals.

The University of Santo Domingo will raise these animals and see that they are properly grown out. They will be used for class work and training poor farm boys in the proper care of dairy cattle. When they are safe in calf, deserving youths, properly trained, will be given an animal with the understanding that the first heifer calf will go back to the University for payment. The University has made arrangements with the American Breeders Association of Chicago to supply frozen semen in order that well-bred sires be used.

We feel that besides helping in a very small way to raise the intake of milk, this is an excellent way to promote good will and help stem the tide of communism. This project has caught the imagination of nearly everyone. Dairymen have donated many calves and Southern States has donated feed to care for these calves. Everyone is working hard to bring this undertaking to a successful conclusion.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN E. GEROW,
Vice President, Albemarle Ruritan Club.

Double Standard in Name Calling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the following significant editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News of September 23, 1964, and which clearly presents one of the dangerous facets of the presidential campaign—a double standard in name calling.

Mr. Speaker, the choice that the voters make on November 3 can very well change the course of our history. It is essential that each voter make certain he is not influenced by the reckless charges being made in the heat of the campaign. It is essential that the voters be made aware of the excesses which are resorted to, so that they may think logically and objectively on the many issues being discussed and judge for themselves. Editorials such as the one which follows are a helpful contribution to clear thinking and I commend it to the readers of the RECORD:

HITLERISM? FASCISM? DOUBLE STANDARD IN NAME CALLING
(By John M. Johnston)

If you detect in your political opposition a tendency toward communism you are a bigot, a screwball, an extremist and a hatemonger. But you may charge your opponents with a leaning toward fascism and remain a liberal.

The campaign against Senator GOLDWATER is taking advantage of this double standard in malediction. No sooner had the Republican candidate been nominated than California's Governor Brown announced that "the stench of fascism is in the air."

Recently came the Reverend Martin Luther King to assert, "We see danger signs of Hitlerism in the candidacy of Senator GOLDWATER." The motion has been seconded by George Meany, the union tycoon, and Representative CELLER, Democrat of New York.

What the Reverend Dr. King meant to suggest was that GOLDWATER is using the Negroes as Hitler used the Jews as scapegoats in a drive for power. In his defense, the Reverend Dr. King would doubtless cite the support for GOLDWATER by such race-minded people as Mississippi's Governor Johnson.

It would be decent of him to mention GOLDWATER's personal record of service to the cause of integration. It would also be fair to note that Arkansas' Governor Faubus and his like all over the South remain faithful to President Johnson and the Democratic Party.

But at this stage of the game, not all are concerned with being decent or fair. The Reverend Dr. King even adds, regretfully, that he fears outbreaks of violence should GOLDWATER be elected. No waiting to see what the new President might do; just as soon as the returns are in. Nobody can say he wasn't warned not to vote Republican.

The charge that Goldwater conservatism is akin to Hitlerism is really outrageous. Hitler rose to power on a tide of national socialism, not individualism. That socialism was the culmination of a long accumulation of state welfarism, which GOLDWATER vigorously opposes.

Essential to fascism, as it is to communism, is a strong central government, gathering into its hands control over local matters through its custody of the purse. Is the greater totalitarian threat then GOLDWATER, who advocates decentralization of the vast bureaucracy and sharp reduction of the income taxes?

Was it GOLDWATER who declared it to be his ambition to siphon off the wealth of the rich and distribute it among those who need it more? It was not; that was President Johnson, and if you are looking for a candidate for mobmaster, score that one for L.B.J.

A noteworthy condition of the Germany that produced Hitler was the fading of the line dividing the left and right. Big business and workers alike agreed that national socialism was just what the country needed. Does such an alliance back Goldwater?

It would be nonsense to accuse President Johnson of flirtation with the idea of dictatorship. All he wants is unity behind his policies and general agreement that he is the man preeminently qualified to administer them.

The outlook is that he will get it. But if words have any meaning left, this program will continue the national drift toward socialism.

Those who consider this welfarism to be the wave of the future like to attribute to GOLDWATER a desire to return to the McKinley era. They ought at least to acknowledge that Hitlerism and national socialism were not products of the 19th century.

Harpers Ferry, W. Va., Continues To Record Growth as a Major Tourist Attraction—Thousands Enjoy the History and Heritage of Civil War Landmark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the community of Harpers Ferry continues to grow in popularity as a center of interest for tourists and students of American history. Located at the confluence of the Shenandoah and Potomac Rivers, the city has performed an important role in events which have shaped our Nation. Today, it has been restored and developed as a reminder of our heritage and traditions.

During 1963 some 709,285 persons toured Harpers Ferry and enjoyed the rugged beauty of the surrounding hills and valleys. In the first 8 months of 1964 the visitor total stood at 512,369 as compared to 480,040 for a similar period last year.

As sponsor of the original measure to establish Harpers Ferry as a national monument, and as sponsor of the legislation which changed the official name to Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, I have been gratified to note the high degree of public acceptance which has been achieved. Likewise, it is heartening to note the helpful activities of the U.S. Park Service which are contributing to the progress of the Harpers Ferry area. The Park Service this summer dedicated the Stephen T. Mather Interpretive Training and Research Center on what was formerly the campus of the old Storer College. This new facility is being utilized in the training of Park Service personnel.

Mr. President, on Sunday, September 13, 1964, the Potomac magazine of the Washington Post printed an informative and effectively written article describing the beauty and benefit which awaits the traveler at Harpers Ferry, W. Va. I commend the author, Ian Ledgerwood, and ask unanimous consent that this significant article be printed in the Appendix.

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

[From the Washington Post, Potomac, Sept. 13, 1964]

THEY BRING HARPERS FERRY BACK TO LIFE

(By Ian Ledgerwood)

It was born on the river and often it has almost died under it. The Shenandoah and Potomac gave birth to Harpers Ferry but they seem to be jealous of its unique position and keep trying to remove it by flood.

Less than 2 hours from Washington, this West Virginia town that lies in the shadow of the Blue Ridge Mountains has seen much violence since it was first settled in 1733 and is the focal point of a tour that takes in three States in a 138-mile round trip. You can see all three States at once at Harpers Ferry, if you are the climbing type.

Take the beltway to Route 70, then head north to Frederick, Md., where you turn south on Route 340 at the Harper's Ferry exit.

Most of the route is fast but take it slow through Jefferson, Md., an "olde worlde" town where you can almost hear the stagecoach coming around the next corner. Freeway construction will cut your speed on the last few miles—but this may be a blessing because it gives you a chance to admire the magnificient scenery.

Prior to the Civil War, Harpers Ferry had a population of 3,000. Most of the inhabitants worked in its arsenals. Although industry has long since disappeared, it is still a thriving community of 600, many of whom commute to Washington by train.

Despite the risk of inundation, the National Park Service has restored several of the buildings to their pre-Civil War glory and has plans to restore many more.

On Shenandoah Street, the recently reopened 1826 Stagecoach Inn has a theater where one can hear a slide lecture before starting the tour of the town.

Although Shennandoah Street is below the flood line, the Weather Bureau's 24-hour warning is enough time to remove the exhibits to higher ground. The buildings have to stay, or course, but they are used to floods.

Oldest dwelling in the town is the Harper House, built by Robert Harper who arrived in 1747 and who saw the possibilities of waterpower from the two rivers.

The house was Harper's third home, the other two having been destroyed by floods. Above the flood line, this house was begun in 1775 but not completed until 1782 because of the labor shortage during the Revolution. By this time, both Harper and his wife had died.

It first saw service as a tavern—George Washington and Thomas Jefferson were among those who slept there—and later became a private home.

As you wander around the pre-Civil War buildings, now being restored at the intersection of Shenandoah and High Streets, marvel at the marksmanship of the Confederate sniper who shot the owner of the confectionery shop from his hideout on the opposite side of the Potomac.

And reflect on the clean-living Union troops: when many layers of paint were removed from the shop, only names were found. There were no obscene words and somehow or other, Kilroy missed Harper's Ferry.

Even if you are not energetic, find the strength for the stiff, 300-yard climb to Jefferson's Rock. There are few finer views and you will agree with Jefferson that "the scene is worth a voyage across the Atlantic."

The town's situation made it a strategic position in the War Between the States, during which time it often changed hands, but Harpers Ferry is best known for the John Brown raid.

Today only the ruins remain of the covered bridge over which Brown led his men in a bid to liberate the slaves in October 1859.

Harpers Ferry has another claim to fame, again in the military sphere. Gunsmith John Hall had a factory there and in 1819 received a Government contract for 1,000 breech-loading, flintlock rifles, his own invention.

The guns were so exact in scale that all parts were interchangeable—the first successful application of the principle that led to modern mass production.

None of the arsenal buildings remain, having been burned by retreating Union troops in 1861, but the ruins of Hall's rifle works are still there.

On your way home, circle Harpers Ferry by leaving through Bolivar, scene of Col. Dixon S. Miles' surrender to "Stonewall" Jackson in 1862, and return by way of Route 671 and Leesburg, Va.

Facts and figures: this is not a costly trip. Admission to restored buildings is free and there is a tree-shaded picnic area by the Shenandoah River.

If you do not want to drive, you can take the train from Union Station. There is one at 8:30 a.m. and another at 2 p.m.

Return trains are at 4:30 p.m. and 10:40 p.m. The journey takes approximately 1 hour, 10 minutes and the round trip fare is $3.36. Children 5 through 12 travel half fare. The visitor center opens at 8 a.m. and closes at 7 p.m.

The Urban Complex

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 28, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Robert Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, has been an outspoken and articulate spokesman for better housing in the United States. He has handled the enormously complex problems of his office with a keen understanding of the human aspects as well.

In his latest book entitled "The Urban Complex" Dr. Weaver clearly displays his firm grasp of the social and physical problems which so gravely affect our rapidly expanding metropolitan areas. This book has been well received, as can be seen from the following reviews which have appeared in newspapers throughout the country:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 1, 1964]

BOOKS OF THE TIMES—THE BEST OF OUR DREAMS AND THE WORST OF OUR NIGHTMARES

(By Charles Poore)

Years ago discussions of slums and blight reminded Robert C. Weaver of the general condemnation of sinfulness in the world at large.

"Few, if any," he remarked dryly, "were in favor of these social ills, but there was, and is, a vast difference between being against sin and knowing what to do to eradicate it. Similarly, opposition to slums was, and is, far from commitment for their eradication or realization of the painful and slow process that is involved in effecting this objective."

Yet the "painful and slow process" is Mr. Weaver's lifetime dedication. Others drop into what you might call its slow-motion maelstrom from time to time. They make stirring speeches. They write powerful pieces. They demand funds, funds, funds, and action, action, action. Then, like as not, they move on to get properly warm and righteous over the use of insecticides and fluoridation, cancer, and cigarettes, the preservation of the two-party system in America and the hydrogen-bomb-haunted survival of the human race.

Mr. Weaver's aim is not inimical to any of these attitudes. Indeed, I take it from his forceful and persuasive book, what he is primarily after is a decent setting in which all Americans can consider their problems, pursue their folkways and enhance their abilities to share the best of what man has thought and said and done.

In working for the achievement of that decent setting of which none need be ashamed and all can be proud, Mr. Weaver has a list of duties as long as your arm. He

is chief adviser to the White House on everything having to do with the Nation's city planning and development, housing, and the codes and practices of the real estate world.

He is responsible for the operation of the Housing Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Public Housing Administration and the Urban Renewal Administration.

Urban renewal, the heart of this book on "The Urban Complex," means many things. It means dust in your eye as you walk down the street. It means finding ways to make people feel that they won't have to spend all their lives living three or five or seven to a room in the tenements of desperation.

It means, in a word, change. And fighting change often oddly unites remarkably varied elements. The conservative and the liberal form an unacknowledged front when anyone threatens to touch a fine old tree or a picturesque old building.

And they have complementarily uncomplimentary things to say about the design of the new housing block, the new shopping center, the slashing throughway, or the bunch of glass and steel that allegedly scrapes the clouds that eventually appears.

Meanwhile, absolutely everyone is dutifully shocked at the way our big towns are—miraculously—(a) dying and (b) growing.

Mr. Weaver can give you facts and figures about that till they numb your ears and glaze your eyes. The wonder is that with the full magnitude of the matter before him he can remain so calmly determined and hopeful. Some things do get done, you know.

Ordinary people may grow moody when they traverse the long honky-tonk stretch of industrial and shore-dinner backwoods along our Atlantic coast, for example. But not Mr. Weaver. He centers, first, last, and all the time, on the human element involved. He is determined to make us see that it is better to try to live up the best of our dreams than to wallow in he worst of our nightmares.

The Dallas Times Herald of August 23, 1964, had a review by J. F. Rothermel, Sr., as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald, Aug. 23, 1964]

THE FEDERAL VIEW OF URBAN NEEDS

(By J. F. Rothermel, Sr.)

This book may be taken as presenting the current official thinking at Washington on all such matters as housing, slum clearance, urban renewal, city planning, and the like. As Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Mr. Weaver is the chief Presidential adviser on these matters, and an intelligent, persuasive spokesman in behalf of a strong Federal role.

But because a lot of emotion is involved in such questions as housing, who shall live where, and the respective roles of private business, local government, and the Federal Government. Mr. Weaver's book will run into mixed reactions.

For example, he says flatly that we "have not, do not, and apparently cannot produce an adequate amount of housing for low-income families without some form of public assistance." The fairly recent voting in Dallas on bonds to enable matching Federal assistance in housing projects indicated a majority of Dallas voters may not agree with that statement.

And again, those Dallas citizens who declare that what happened here last November could happen anywhere will hardly find comfort in his somewhat incidental statement that communities develop personalities—some bad, and some good.

But we should not do Mr. Weaver an injustice. His book is not in itself argumentative. He doesn't say much about the philosophy of housing, urban adjustments, and the like. He concerns himself mainly with the techniques of Federal action in the area. (Perhaps that's his bureaucratic experience showing up.) He writes more of the ways in which the Federal Government is, and can be, of help in moving toward that social goal of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

One of Washington's chief roles, as Mr. Weaver sees it, lies in advising local communities to adopt coordinated planning. He doesn't illustrate that type of assistance with reference to Dallas, but he might have. Planning for the best land use in an area involves more than a central government. The Dallas metropolitan area, for example, he no doubt thinks, should have a coordinated program. But that would mean cooperative action by 4 county governments, at least 30 municipal governments, and various other governmental bodies. The Federal Government, with its overall point of view, and its accumulation of the experience of many communities, can be of help in such planning.

There is, however, an implied warning, and one that may be found in many areas of our national life; unless State and local governments act, the Federal Government will assume responsibility.

Along the way, Mr. Weaver looses a few blows at some ideas that are strongly held. The idea that colored infiltration of an area lowers market values is not true, he says, where the nonwhite families moving in are comparable in living standards, education, and social behavior to those already living in the area. Also, he says, in housing as in education, there is no such thing as separate but equal facilities.

Generally, Mr. Weaver is hopeful. He believes that under intelligent urban renewal programs, our cities can become economically more healthful, esthetically more pleasing, and culturally more vital. With Washington's help, of course.

The Saturday Review of September 12, 1964, in a review by Robert A. Low stated:

[From the Saturday Review, Sept. 12, 1964]

NO PLACE LIKE HOME IN THE CITY

("The Urban Complex: Human Values in Urban Life," by Robert C. Weaver (Doubleday. 297 pp. $4.95), explores what Government is doing to try to meet the phenomenon of urbanization. Robert A. Low is chairman of the Buildings Committee of the New York City Council.)

(By Robert A. Low)

Some 70 percent of the people of the United States live in 1 percent of the land area, and the concentration of our population in metropolitan areas is continuing at a striking pace.

The dramatic urbanization of American life has prompted many planners and social scientists to analyze the phenomenon. Perhaps the most noteworthy of these efforts is that of the French geographer Dr. Jean Gottmann, who described the urbanization of our northeastern seaboard from Maine to Virginia in "Megalopolis."

But government response to the challenge of urbanization has been slow, whether at the Federal level, where Congress still hesitates to act on the creation of a department concerned with urban affairs, or at the local level, where a multiplicity of political jurisdictions continues to hamper efforts to deal with problems that are metropolitan or even regional in scope.

Only a handful of government officials have spoken with perception about the problem. One of these, Robert C. Weaver, who is administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, has compiled and brought up to date in "The Urban Complex: Human Values in Urban Life" material from articles and lectures published over the last decade setting forth the challenges of urbanization and what the Government is trying to do to meet them. His emphasis is on housing and urban renewal, fields in which Dr. Weaver's credentials are excellent. Today he is the highest Federal official concerned with urban problems; he has also served in Government positions at the State level—as New York State rent administrator—and at the local level—as chairman of New York City's Housing and Redevelopment Board. Robert Weaver has frequently been mentioned as a possibility for the Cabinet post should Congress create the long-awaited Department of Urban and Community Development.

In this volume his essays explore slum clearance, relocation of tenants from cleared sites; barriers to the movement of nonwhites within the core city and to the suburbs; successful and unsuccessful efforts to achieve integrated housing; rehabilitation of run-down properties, and Federal and State programs to deal with these difficult matters.

Dr. Weaver analyzes perceptively the interrelationship of the Negro in-migration and the changing character of our core cities. The chapter entitled "The Urbanization of the Negro" previously appeared under the title "The Changing Structure of the American City and the Negro" in "Assuring Freedom to the Free," edited by Arnold Rose.

The author notes that the in-migration of the rural poor to the city is not peculiar to the United States, but is prevalent throughout the Western World. Even in Denmark, where the population is ethnically homogeneous, this in-migration is accompanied by an outmigration to the suburbs of those who have moved up the economic ladder. Dr. Weaver concludes: "Urbanization is neither the salvation nor the damnation of Negro Americans," but it is "the sine qua non of the Negro's participation in the mainstream of national life."

Although he is aware of the need for more public housing for families of low income, he suggests that meaningful integration may come sooner through federally assisted programs for housing for families of moderate and middle income.

Dr. Weaver is no dreamer. His thinking is tempered by the frustrations that confront a dedicated public servant eager to get on with the task of providing decent housing for every American.

The publishers of this volume have performed a service in making possible a wider audience for Dr. Weaver's insight into the urbanization process that is so drastically affecting the face of the United States.

Dr. Herbert Sandick and the Massachusetts Civil Defense Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to call attention to a most interesting and important development in Massachusetts with regard to the civil defense program.

I am pleased that in this particular instance, the area involved happens to be my home city of Pittsfield—where a distinguished doctor, Herbert Sandick, has pioneered in certain medical self-help programs and, in doing so, has

brought great credit upon himself, his country and the entire State and Nation.

The two articles that follow are from the Berkshire Eagle in Pittsfield, Mass., and they describe in full the remarkable efforts of Dr. Sandick and his colleagues in Berkshire County. It would seem to me that the example of these men could be used as a model for the entire Nation.

I know that all of my colleagues in the House, as well as Members of the other body, will be greatly interested in "The Berkshire Story." For this is a story based on knowledge, the kind of knowledge which replaces fear.

The articles follow:

[From the Berkshire Eagle, of Pittsfield, Mass., Sept. 11, 1964]

COUNTY'S MEDICAL SELF-HELP PROGRAM HELD UP AS MODEL BY STATE CIVIL DEFENSE HEAD

"The Berkshire Story," a Massachusetts Civil Defense Agency folder being distributed throughout the State, has lauded the "stick-to-it-ive-ness" of the civil defense medical self-help program in Berkshire County.

In outlining the progress of the disaster program in the county, the folder points to the pioneering work done in western Massachusetts by Dr. Herbert Sandick, of Pittsfield. An orthopedic surgeon, Dr. Sandick was serving at the head of the county disaster committee when he became interested in the medical self-help program.

Initiated several years ago under Dr. Sandick's direction, the program met with limited success as a result of public indifference to the Berkshire Medical Society's advertising campaign. A later appeal to industries and hospitals brought a wider response. Today 2,000 county residents are trained in medical self-help.

The training programs are carried out by a small group of county doctors, concerned with the effects of natural or nuclear disaster on normal medical assistance accommodations.

The program directors hope to enlist more students in the medical self-help course. In a letter included in the folder, Daniel J. Finn, director of the MCDA, praised the progress made in Berkshire County and urged that all State residents take the medical course.

Registration for the course can be made by contactnig the Berkshire County Medical Society in Pittsfield.

[From the Pittsfield (Mass.) Berkshire Eagle, Sept. 12, 1964]

NAME IN THE NEWS

"Just what the doctor ordered," is the opinion of Director Daniel J. Finn of the Massachusetts Civil Defense Agency. The physician is Dr. Herbert Sandick. What he ordered dealt with the medical self-help program in Berkshire County, and the results are so spectacular that Mr. Finn has summarized the doctor's methods in a pamphlet just issued.

Entitled, "The Berkshire Story," the civil defense unit presents it as a model for the entire State to follow in self-help programs, some of which are lagging. This was the case also in the Berkshires when Dr. Sandick launched the project November 23, 1962, before a class of medical assistants. Despite publicity, the hoped-for-public response did not follow the first gathering.

Dr. Sandick wasn't daunted; just disappointed. He was sold on the concept of medical self-help and its priceless value in case of natural or manmade disasters, which may strike anywhere, any time. The Worcester tornado is one uncomfortably close example of the former; too-frequent crashes of huge planes into populated areas, the latter.

Actually, Dr. Dandick's concern with medical self-help sprang from a course he took on his own initiative 2 years ago in Washington, D.C. It was on a national scale, and subject was the danger from radioactive fallout. Soon after he returned to Pittsfield, he launched the self-help program. He had the full backing of his fellow members of the Berkshire medical district disaster committee, of which he was—and is—chairman.

Associates of Dr. Sandick cite him as a wizard on organization and in the fine art of inspiring others to help him carry out projects such as this. Poor response early in the game brought this comment from him: "While the first group was small, it was enthusiastic. But we realized that there existed a resistance of indifference to the program, with the public not realizing fully the value of such training, what it could mean in the saving of lives or preventing the aggravation of injuries if the proper initial steps could be taken by a trained person prior to the arrival of professional personnel."

Casting about for more direct means of promoting the program, Dr. Sandick instinctively hit on the direct approach: taking the message by word of mouth to those he sought to influence. He and other speakers appeared before clubs, workmen's groups, employers and other gatherings throughout Berkshire County. Individuals were contacted through their employers, industrial and government leaders were brought together for "get acquainted" sessions. From these sessions came requests from agencies, industries, and hospitals asking that medical self-help classes be set up for their employees.

Under the impetus established by Dr. Sandick, interest in the project appeared in other quarters. Self-help training for all the teaching nuns in the Berkshire parochial schools was carried out, and the Red Cross added 6 hours to its first aid courses so students could learn of medical self-help procedures.

"As a result, nearly 2,000 Berkshire County residents were trained in this field through the drive and determination of a small group of doctors realizing the value of such training," says the Civil Defense pamphlet.

Resting not at this point, Dr. Sandick and his associates have drawn up plans to enlarge greatly the number of self-help classes. The idea is to penetrate further into industry by training plant personnel as instructors, and to spread the message that disaster can take many forms. This can be a fall in the home an auto accident, storm, flood, or nuclear incident.

In addition to toiling in the more populated centers of the county, Dr. Sandick and his fellows stand ready to arrange for self-help training in every town and village in the region. Only requirement is that persons be willing to give 16 hours of their time to learn the rudiments of self-survival. "Remember," says the pamphlet, "knowledge replaces fear. And fear has no place in disaster, no matter what type the disaster may be."

Dr. Sandick opened his practice in Pittsfield in 1953 as an orthopedic surgeon, with offices at 222 South Street, and later moved down the street to 262. He came here from Bayonne, N.J., after graduating from Columbia College and Columbia University Medical School. He interned at Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, and spent 2 years in the service as an Army captain in various post hospitals.

As a final word on the medical self-help program: It is rumored among Dr. Sandick's colleagues that the U.S. Department of Defense in Washington is considering using the Berkshire method in its drive to sell the idea on a national scale.

Address by Mr. Elwood Moffett, President, District 50, UMWA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Elwood Moffett, president, District 50, UMWA, at the 44th Consecutive Constitutional Convention of the United Mine Workers of America on September 2, 1964, at Bal Harbour, Fla.:

ADDRESS OF MR. ELWOOD MOFFETT, PRESIDENT, DISTRICT 50, UMWA

President Boyle, Vice President Lewis, Secretary-Treasurer Owens, delegates to the 44th Consecutive Constitution Convention of the United Mine Workers of America, I bring and extend to you the fraternal greetings of my associate executive officers, the office and field staff, and the officers and members of the 1731 local unions comprising the International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, in 41 States of the United States and in the Dominion of Canada.

District 50, United Mine Workers of America, was created and established as a special district of the United Mine Workers of America on September 1, 1936. The formation of District 50 was in response to the request of some 10 Federal labor unions in the New England area, which had been chartered by the AFL on Federal basis, comprising the employees of gas utility and coke plants in that area.

These 10 local unions were dissatisfied with their Federal status in the AFL and were unwilling to be chartered by some organization of the CIO but desired to become an integral part of and a direct affiliate of the United Mine Workers of America. They, as well as others, recognized that the United Mine Workers of America was the outstanding champion of the industrial union type of labor organization and the powerhouse behind the drive to extend industrial union organization to the unorganized workers in the great mass production industries in America—they wanted to be a part of that powerhouse and they still are, as a part of the largest affiliate of your great organization.

The chartering of District 50 enabled the United Mine Workers of America to extend its philosophy, principles, and policies into areas reaching far beyond the coal industry in the United States as well as in Canada. This has been good for the labor movement in America, and it has been good for America.

The birth and development of District 50 constitutes one of the milestones in the economic history of the United States. Its organization was concurrent with the industrial unionization of the major mass producing industries. This was made possible by the United Mine Workers of America through massive organization campaigns, the creation of the Committee of Industrial Organization and, later on, the formation of the Congress of Industrial Organizations—better known as the CIO.

The efforts of the unions associated with the AFL–CIO to play down the magnificient contributions of the United Mine Workers of America and its great leaders in the creation and establishment of industrial unions in the mass production industries of the United States and Canada is but a puny effort to ignore the indelible record of our

history, but the record of history has recorded and will show that the CIO was created—it was nurtured and developed—by one man and his union—in fact, the modern labor movement, as we know it in America, was the result of the contributions, the sacrifices and the aggressive leadership of John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers of America.

In the 28 intervening years, District 50 has expanded to a degree that its membership embraces employees in some 30 or more different industries. In the chemical and allied products industry, we have a larger membership than any other labor organization—we have a substantial membership in the gas and electric industry throughout New England, as well as in the Eastern, Midwestern, and Southern States of the United States—we have thousands of members organized in the pulp and paper industry, the refractories industry and in the fabricated metal products industry, among many others in the durable and nondurable goods industries.

We are making substantial progress in organizing the employees in the heavy construction, highway and roadbuilding industry. At the present time, we have statewide agreements with the heavy and highway construction companies in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Delaware, Tennessee, and Kentucky. We are extending the establishment of our organization in this industry to many other areas of the United States and Canada. Our growth and progress in this industry in several of the States has provided employment for unemployed coal miners on these road construction and related jobs.

When we entered the field of organizing the workers in the heavy and highway construction industry, we borrowed the principle of industrial unionism from the United Mine Workers of America and applied it to the building of public roads, highways, bridges, tunnels and dams.

The AFL and their craft union system were flourishing in their futile effort to organize this industry for the same essential reasons that the craft unions floundered in their futile efforts to organize the great mass production industries 28 to 30 years ago.

District 50 is carrying on the great work that the United Mine Workers of America developed during more than seven decades of its history. The United Mine Workers of America—its loyal membership and its outstanding leadership of yesterday and of today—have a right to be proud that it can contribute so much for so many and still have more than it gave.

In total membership, district 50 ranks among the top 20 international unions in size in North America. The achievement of this status has been accomplished notwithstanding the concentrated harrassment by the AFL–CIO on district 50 directly and on the United Mine Workers of America indirectly. It might not be out of place for me to suggest that the AFL–CIO spend more of its time and energy in organizing some of the 48 million unorganized workers in this country and less time in raiding fratricidal warfare.

We have achieved rank among the 20 largest international unions in this country notwithstanding the coercive tactics of antiunion employers' use of certain permissive features of the Taft-Hartley Act to defeat the effective unionization of their employees.

Despite these handicaps, district 50 continues to move forward, continues to grow in membership and carry on our program of organizing the unorganized among those workers who need and want union representation to assist them in securing improved wages and working conditions.

We in district 50 are making a determined effort to stimulate and breathe new life and activity into the labor movement—to utilize our talents and energy to organize the unorganized—to extend the trade union movement to include an ever-increasing number of employed industrial workers.

We believe that to extend union organization to the unorganized workers is as important in this decade as it was in the decade a quarter of a century ago.

To understand this law of growth is an inheritance passed on to us by the United Mine Workers of America. Throughout the 74-year history of the United Mine Workers of America, your leadership has been in the forefront of labor's struggle for recognition and has led the way—breaking new ground for others to follow—to achieve and establish modern conditions of employment.

The total number of employed industrial workers in the United States is steadily increasing—keeping apace with our population growth. The total membership of the AFL–CIO declined some 5 million members between the years 1957 through 1963. In 1957, the membership of the AFL–CIO represented 29.1 percent of our work force; in 1963, it was only 18.7 percent.

On the other hand, District 50 is among the few international unions in this country showing some growth in membership.

There are some 48 million unorganized industrial workers whose wages and working conditions are not protected by collective bargaining agreements or in any other way protected except by the minimum standards established under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

This situation extends a challenge to the leadership of your great union—and to District 50 as well—to give of our manpower and leadership to organize the unorganized in this decade as your great organization and its aggressive leadership met a similar challenge three decades ago.

Modern history teaches us that organized labor has made very substantial contributions to the growth of our economy and to the strength of our governments on the North American Continent.

The thousands of collective-bargaining agreements freely arrived at between management and labor have over a period of years produced the highest standard of living in any country in the known world. The fact that management and labor in a large segment of our economy fix the wages of labor by contract through the collective bargaining process has resulted in Government being excluded from functioning in this area.

On the other hand, in the free world countries—using Western Europe as an example—where industrial production is high, plants are quite modern, and production know-how compares favorably with our own, but where labor unions are in too many instances weak and ineffective, little is being done in the area of collective bargaining as we know it, the wages of labor are low and the nation itself is unable to carry on its own full burden in relation to the rest of the world, the spread between the standards of living of management men and of the workers grows wider and the tendency becomes strong among the underpaid workers to nationalize the industries employing them.

In North America, where labor unions are relatively strong, our governments are strong and we are thus able to contribute manpower and generate military and financial aid in astronomical amounts to protect the "free world" from the penetrating influence of international communism.

It is well that we keep in mind that it is a strong labor force—well paid, well fed, well organized—in strong, free and effective labor unions that makes possible, supports and protects a free and strong government—that it is a free labor movement engaging in free collective bargaining with employers—that it is the surest safeguard, if not the principal one, that labor and management has to preserve our private enterprise system. These are the instruments of our strength and of our freedom.

We think that the time has now come when steps should be taken to remove and modify the legal impediments of the Taft-Hartley Act which shackles unions and restricts essential areas of collective bargaining and enables antiunion employers to effectively deny their employees the right to self-organization and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing—accordingly, we take the position that at least the Taft-Hartley provisions be amended and modified in the following manner:

First. Outright repeal of section 14(b) of the act. This would result in voiding and eliminate State right-to-work laws and restore to Congress the jurisdiction over union security in all States of the Union. It would eliminate the need for at least one extremist hate group with its misguided zeal, tortured arguments and twisted logic.

Second. Modify section 8(a)(5) and make it mandatory that the National Labor Relations Board seek immediate injunctive relief where an employer refuses to bargain after certification of a representative of its employees by the NLRB.

At the present time, an employer who refuses to accept the procedures of collective bargaining after certification by the NLRB may exploit all the procedures before the trial examiner and an appeal to the NLRB before it becomes mandatory for the Board to seek enforcement of its order by the court.

These procedures may, and often do, consume as much as 2 years' time. In the meantime, the employer has suffered no current penalty—he has gained 2 years' time—because in the end he has no retroactive obligation. We have been victimized by exploitation.

Third. Modify section 8(c) of the act to the end that concealed coercion and implied threats on the part of the employer may not be construed as a protected activity in a representation election and thus effectively thwart the policies of the act.

Under this section, the National Labor Relations Board has been prone to construe clever abuses of freedom of speech on the part of antiunion employers as protected activity. Given a liberal construction under this section, an employer may and has used the threat to refuse to bargain if certified, with the further threat to use the delaying processes of the law—thus thwarting the policies of the act and defeating the hopes of the employees to have effective union organization.

One can speak endlessly of the new ground that has been broken by the United Mine Workers of America for others to follow. Little was known about pension security for the aged of our workers in any industry until your United Mine Workers of America welfare and retirement fund was negotiated and established by your great union.

While others talked about a shorter workweek, you were the first to establish reduced hours of employment without loss of earnings. The provisions for union security in wage agreements were virtually unknown until you first established union shop and checkoff provisions in your contracts in the thirties.

It has been your organization and your leadership that have pioneered State and Federal legislation throughout the length and breadth of this land, to name but a few:

Section 7(a) of the old National Recovery Act which legally affirmed the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of its own choosing. Upon the demise of the National Recovery Act, section 7(a) survived and was incorporated in the Wagner Act, which was the Magna Carta for labor in this country. Section

7(a) still survives in the Taft-Hartley law.

The Fair Labor Standards Act, or "minimum wage and hour law" as it is commonly known, was born of the leadership of your great organization and that principle of public policy for America is unique among all the nations of the world. This public policy establishes minimum rates of pay, maximum hours, restricts child labor, establishes other minimum standards of working conditions, and indirectly the minimum wages become the instrument for the regulation of commerce between and among the States.

These are some of the instruments of our freedom. For your vision—for your wisdom—for your leadership, we say thanks.

But this is not all—no other union—I repeat, no other union—can point to the record of accomplishment that the United Mine Workers of America has achieved throughout its long and illustrious history. It can be said that the modern labor movement, as we know it today, is the creation of the United Mine Workers of America.

Your organization established the principle for organized labor to follow—that labor abide by its contracts and conduct labor-management relations as set forth in the language of its wage agreements.

Your refusal to tolerate work stoppages under contracts is now a recognized procedure in all labor organizations and that disputes arising under and within a contract shall be settled under the grievance machinery of the existing contract.

The first Secretary of Labor, William B. Wilson, came from the ranks of the United Mine Workers of America. The deeds and accomplishments of another of your leaders, John Mitchell, exceeded that of any labor leader of his time. No individual has done so much for so many over so long a period as the creator of the modern labor movement, President Emeritus John L. Lewis. His successor, our beloved and late Thomas Kennedy, as president of the United Mine Workers of America, devoted a lifetime of service to the men of the mines and was widely known for his devotion to the cause of helping the underprivileged everywhere.

Only last week I had the pleasure of meeting with several of the representatives of the Indonesian Government. This new Republic is only 14 years old. They wanted to know something about the labor-management conference program of District 50.

During our discussions, these two representatives of the Government of Indonesia made the comment that the two best-known and respected Americans in Indonesia were John F. Kennedy and John L. Lewis.

The job of president of the United Mine Workers of America is a big job. In our time, the leaders of your great organization, because of the vast accomplishments of John L. Lewis and his associates, have been looked upon with respect not only among the laboring people of North America but by leading citizens throughout the world. With all the responsibilities of this high office, an individual must be well-trained and must have vast experience to handle the reins that guide the destinies of your organization and its members. You have such a leader in your international president, W. A. Boyle. He capably and diligently performs the duties and requirements of his high and important office. With his vision and through his guidance, your organization will go forward to achieve new goals and greater accomplishments in the years ahead.

In your new vice president, R. O. Lewis, you have a most capable and experienced lieutenant and counselor to your president; and, in your secretary-treasurer, John Owens, you have a great leader in his own right. He has experience due to his background as an outstanding district president. He commands the respect of all men and women in the labor movement, and he is looked upon as one of the great labor leaders of this country.

In your international officers you have a triumverate of leadership who are most capable, and, with that type of leadership, you have little to fear in the future.

We in District 50 have endeavored to build and administer our union organization in the chemical, gas and electric, pulp and paper, heavy construction and other miscellaneous industries with the same meticulous care and in the image that you operate your union in the coal industry. I can assure you that every member of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, is as proud of his union and of your union as the coal miner is proud of both of our unions.

During the past few years, we have spent considerable time in realining our regional operations, and this has resulted in consolidating smaller regions and reducing the total number of regional operations, which has improved the capabilities of our entire field staff.

We have improved our financial condition so that our position is sound and we are accumulating a reasonable operating surplus.

We have very recently completed an extensive field staff training program for the more than 300 members of our field staff throughout the United States and Canada.

This field staff training program was conducted by our resident officers and the staff of our international headquarters and was directed toward greater competence, the negotiation and administration of our more than 3,400 wage agreements, and in extending our union to those workers who wish to broaden their horizon, lift their standard of living and improve their security.

During the past year, we created a rather broad labor-management conference program. We have held more than 600 of these plant-site conferences with management to review problems created by the introduction of automation and new mechanical devices—the problems created by competitive imports produced by low-wage labor—employment opportunities—retraining of workers to qualify for the changing occupations and the problems of plant safety.

Management, as well as labor, must recognize that these problems are of mutual concern to both parties.

The field staff of District 50 negotiates and renegotiates an average of more than 50 wage agreements each week. This totals nearly 3,000 separate and distinct contracts that are negotiated each year.

We continually make appearances before governmental agencies—both State and Federal—in such matters as wage and hour hearings and in the processing of petitions involving representation elections and unfair labor practices before the National Labor Relations Board. Also, we represent local unions in hundreds of arbitrations cases annually.

Through the offices of our general counsel, we dispose of, through our own initiative, many matters of litigation involving our organization.

Through the facilities of our research department, we provide information and assistance which is helpful in the organization of new members and in the negotiation of contracts, the establishment of pension programs and related welfare matters.

In concluding my remarks, I trust you will accept the very best wishes from our officers and members to the officers and members of your great organization.

District 50, United Mine Workers of America, is a growing organization and, as each month and year goes by, our union will become a greater and stronger economic force. As an affiliate of your great organization, we will stand shoulder to shoulder and march into the future together.

Peaceful Coexistence—A Glossary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, there has been called to the attention of the House in recent days a significant publication of the standing Committee on Education Against Communism of the American Bar Association entitled "Peaceful Coexistence: A Communist Blueprint for Victory." The committee is headed by Mr. Morris I. Liebman, prominent attorney, of Chicago, and this absorbing analysis of the strategy of the international Communist movement is the work of Dr. Richard V. Allen, chairman of the study program on communism at the Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

In the understanding of the devious techniques and perverted lexicon of communism, the inclusion of a glossary of terms in their communistic usage is particularly helpful, and I include it under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, as follows:

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Adventurism: Error committed by Communists who incur unnecessary risks, or who profess "excess revolutionary zeal"; used by both Soviet and Chinese Communists in arguing their differences, as well as by Communists in general.

Aggression: Any act which serves to impede Communist achievement of a goal; also any action by "imperialist" nations attempting to defend their own interests when dealing with weaker nations.

Aggressive military blocs: Those military-assistance organizations formed by the West to counter Communist aggression; e.g., NATO, SEATO.

Antagonistic contradiction: A problem or difficulty inherent in the internal relations of "capitalist" countries and between "socialist" and "capitalist" countries, and which can be solved only with the downfall of the capitalist system; as distinguished from a nonantagonistic contradiction.

Anticommunism: Any opposition to communism; recently used to refer to the "black reaction" of democratic socialists and labor leaders who refuse to unite with, or express sympathy toward, the Communists.

Bourgeoisie: Originally the middle class, as distinguished from the very wealthy; later enlarged by Lenin to include all property owners. In recent times it has undergone further enlargement to include non-Communist classes even in countries such as India and Ethiopia.

Breathing space ("Peredyshka"): Period of rest in which forces are regrouped in preparation for another offensive against the West, which usually occurs after a Communist advance has been halted and the "enemy" has become alert to further Communist aggression; a period designed to relax the enemy's defenses so as to facilitate the next offensive. "Peredyshka" means "pause."

Class enemy: Any class other than that of the "proletariat" which holds political power, or which stands between the "proletariat" and the seizure of power; also used to refer to anti-Communist elements within Communist countries.

Class struggle: Generally, the "battle" waged by the various classes of society

against one another; stems from the classical statement by Marx and Engels in the "Manifesto of the Communist Party": "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." The doctrine of class struggle in Communist ideology holds that classes in society are unable to live in peace, and hence incessantly seek to destroy one another. The class struggle recedes only when the "proletariat" (Communists) has achieved power.

Cema (Comecon): Council of Economic Mutual Assistance, an economic organization designed to serve as the "Communist Common Market," integrating and coordinating the economies of the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries.

Correlation of forces: The overall "balance" of forces in the world; a specific term coined by the Communists to replace the concept of the balance of power, and used to demonstrate that the correlation stands in favor of communism and against imperialism.

Counterrevolution: The act of impeding the success of a developing Communist revolution, or of threatening an accomplished Communist revolution.

Definition of the epoch: A general statement by the international Communist movement describing the events which will take place within a given period of time, usually of long duration. Hence, the present epoch is defined as the era of "transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale," i.e., the complete victory of communism.

Democracy: Identified with communism in general; as opposed to Western democracy, which is "Fascist," "reactionary," and "antidemocratic."

Democratic centralism: The guiding procedural principle of the Communist Party specifying that debate and dissent may be heard in the ranks on any given issue (the democratic aspect), but that when a decision is made from the top, everyone must adhere wholeheartedly to that decision and toe the line (the centralist aspect).

Development of social contradictions: The process of waging class warfare in non-Communist countries for the purpose of overthrowing established governments or, at a minimum, to weaken the internal social and political structure as an interim measure.

Disarmament: A process in which arms production will be either controlled or discontinued and existing armaments will be abolished, but which does not rule out the use of arms for achieving the overthrow of non-Communist nations. To the Communists it represents a condition in which the ability of non-Communist states to combat Communist offensives is weakened. In 1916 Lenin said of disarmament: "Only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie, can it, without betraying its world-historical task, throw on the scrap heap all kind of armaments in general—and the proletariat will doubtless do it—but only then, and by no means before."

Enemies of peace: Those who oppose communism, Communist policy, and Communist "solutions" to international problems; Includes all madmen, warmongers, and wild men.

Fascists: Term of opprobrium applied to the rightwing generally and bearing litle or no relation to the Western understanding of the word. In Eastern Europe after World War II the Communists applied the laws established by the Allied Forces pertaining to "Facists" to anyone who opposed their drive for power.

Forces of peace: All Communists; those movements which may have aims temporarily coinciding with Communist goals (e.g., the unilateral disarmament movement).

General line: The agreed strategy of the international Communist movement.

Imperialist camp: The non-Communist, chiefly capitalist, group of advanced industrial nations. The leader of the imperialist camp is considered to be the United States.

Just war: Any war which Communists fight. Hence a war initiated by the Communists for purposes of acquiring territory is just, while resistance by the opponent is unjust.

Liberation: The act of establishing Communist rule. Hence Cuba was "liberated" from capitalism by Castro's revolution, as were all other countries now ruled by communism.

Liberation war: Any war designed to establish Communist rule; any "just war"; also referred to as "war of national liberation."

Madmen: Term of opprobrium applied to outspoken opponents of communism and to those who may oppose any specific Communist "peace" proposal. Hence, U.S. opponents of the partial nuclear test ban treaty were declared to be "madmen"; interchangeable with wild men.

Morality: Behavior in accordance with Communist standards; the qualities of a good Marxist-Leninist; the virtue of the Communist cause.

National democratic state: Intermediate political form applicable only to underdeveloped countries which allows them to "bypass" the conditions of advanced capitalism on the road to "socialism."

National liberation movement: The revolutionary and anti-Western forces operating in underdeveloped countries and in colonial areas, which are frequently, but not always, led by Communists.

Neutralism: A condition applicable to underdeveloped countries which weakens and erodes the ability to resist Communist advances. Hence, a nation passing from the anti-Communist camp to a condition of neutralism is viewed as being one step closer to the Communist orbit.

Nonantagonistic contradiction: A problem or difficulty arising between Communist states or parties and which is soluble on the basis of Communuist theory; as distinguished from an antagonistic contradiction. According to both Mao Tse-tung and Khrushchev, the contradiction between China and the Soviet Union is "nonantagonistic."

Oppressed peoples: Any citizens of colonial or non-self-governing areas; also newly independent nations which maintain close ties with former mother countries or who remain in commonwealth status.

Organizers of the cold war: Those who from their official positions in government, have taken strong measures to resist Communist encroachment upon the free world, chiefly the United States and its Presidents since 1945.

Party line: The course of action decided upon by a given Communist Party which must be strictly adhered to by all party members.

Peace zone: A territory or area declared by the Communists to be "off limits" for all activity by Western countries. All Communist countries and many anti-Western countries are within the "zone." Non-Communist countries within the "zone" remain fair game for Communist activity.

Peaceful competition: A specific form of the "struggle" with the West designed to lead to victory; as portrayed by Khrushchev, "the stronger one swallows the weaker one."

Peaceful transition to socialism: Seizure of power and establishment of Communist rule without the application of mass violence or civil war. Concerns only the actual seizure of power, and does not rule out the internal use of violence after power has been taken.

People's republic: A Communist state.

Principal contradiction: The point at which the main forces of the Communist movement must be deployed; normally spelled out by major declaration. (A principal difficulty of the Sino-Soviet split; the Soviets hold that the principal contradiction of the era is between socialism and capitalism, and hence the main forces must be directed toward overthrowing the capitalist system; the Chinese insist that the principal contradiction is between imperialism and the colonial and oppressed peoples, hence implying that the way to defeat capitalism is through the underdeveloped countries).

Progressive: Adjective used to describe anything which forwards the Communist cause.

Proletarian internationalism: As defined by "Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism," "the scientifically confirmed ideology of the community of interests of the working classes of all countries and nations; * * * the feeling of solidarity of the working people of all countries; * * * a definite form taken by the relations between the national detachments of the working class"; in short, a regulating principle reflecting the basic interests of Communists everywhere in achieving power, as expressed by the mutual relationships of the Communist Parties.

Proletariat: Technically the class of industrial wage laborers engaged in the production of commodities; also used to designate the Communists in general, and frequently used to designate all "toilers."

Provocation: Any action deemed inimical to the Communist design. Hence, allied military bases ringing the Soviet Union for the purpose of defending against Soviet aggression are labeled "provocative."

Reactionaries: All-inclusive term applied to opponents of Communist policies, and often used in conjunction with other terms, as in "reactionary warmongers," "Fascist reactionaries," "reactionary imperialist circles."

Reformists: Those who seek to change the fundamental nature of the enemy capitalist society by persuasion and legal methods; those who admit that the class struggle need not be terminated by total Communist victory, but by evolutionary change.

Revanchists: Literally "revenge seekers"; term of opprobrium applied chiefly to West Germany, but also to "certain circles" in the United States.

Revisionism: The ideological "crime" of revising or otherwise changing the content of Communist doctrine. Both the Soviet Union and Communist China have accused each other of "revisionism." The term is rarely used with specific meaning.

Rightwing socialism: The anti-Communist part of the Socialist movement which refuses to engage in common action with the Communists.

Self-determination: In theory the right of nations and "oppressed" nationality groups to determine their own destiny; in practice it has amounted to the "right" of nations and groups to determine the method by which they pass into the Communist camp or to the "anti-imperialist camp" in general.

Sober circles of the bourgeoisie: Those non-Communists who express a "proper appreciation" for the strength of communism, and who strive for "accommodation" with the Communist movement.

Socialism: Communism during its first phase, as distinguished from the final, utopian "Communist" society. No "Communist" country has laid claim to living under the second phase. To be distinguished from Western democratic socialism.

Socialist camp: The Communist bloc countries taken as a unit.

Socialist internationalism: A higher stage of "proletarian internationalism" which governs the relations of Communist states with one another. The principle does not apply to relations of Communist states with non-Communist states, as these relations are based upon hte principle of peaceful coexistence.

Strategy: As defined in "Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism," "the (political) line for

a whole historical stage"; as distinguished from tactics.

Tactics: As defined in "Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism," "implies a political line for a relatively short period of time"; as distinguished from strategy.

Unjust war: Any war waged by the "imperialist camp." Hence, the Korean war, although fought by the United Nations to defend Korea from Communist aggression, was an "unjust war" for the U.N., but was for the Communists a "just war." (See just war.)

Vanguard of the proletariat: The Communist Party, the "most advanced and most class-conscious detachment" of the working class.

Violent transition to socialism: Seizure of power and establishment of Communist rule by means of violence.

War of national liberation: (see liberation war).

Warmongers: Formerly those who opposed any aspect of Communist policy, as in "imperialist warmongers"; now used more selectively to designate proponents of military strength as the principal defense against Communist expansion, especially military leaders of the West and NATO.

Warsaw Pact: Defense pact signed in 1955 by the Soviet Union and East European Communist countries; an "Eastern NATO."

Wildmen: (see madmen).

Working class movement: Generally the labor movement; specifically, the Communist-led or Communist-sympathizing labor movement.

Creative Immigrant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Bridgeport Post has paid fitting tribute to one of its most remarkable citizens, William Carlson, who has been honored as "Immigrant of the Year." Mr. Carlson's achievements are set forth in the editorial which I am pleased to insert into the RECORD:

CREATIVE IMMIGRANT

William Carlson, who was honored Sunday as "Immigrant of the Year," did more than take advantage of the opportunities offered in America He is a man who has shared with others the good fortune he met with in this land He created new opportunities for those who came after him and joined with those who preceded him to forge a great nation

Honoring Mr Carlson at a Citizenship Day party was an inspired way to open the observance of Constitution Week, a period to remind us what a precious possession citizenship is. Mr. Carlson typifies those who do so much with the rights, privileges and duties that go with being an American

To the gift of freedom, he brought the immigrant's adaptability Coming to America from Russia in 1903, he became a wagonmaker. When the horseless carriage made the wagon obsolete, he was willing to change with the times, switching to car manufacturing.

The inventive immigrant and his brother, Philip, founded the Metropolitan Body Co.—an industry that has bolstered the Bridgeport area economy. It was acquired by International Harvester in 1948.

Mr. Carlson's generous nature has led him to support every type of community endeavor. He was named Barnum Festival Ringmaster in 1952, providing that great event with the kind of leadership that has made it better every year. He has worked hard for the University of Bridgeport, which named its library in honor of him and his brother. Their foundation donated $250,000 to the library.

Mr. Carlson has served the City of Bridgeport as a financial advisor. He has supported Jewish causes and community cultural organizations. In business, municipal, civic and religious affairs, he has been a worker and a leader.

Look upon his works, ye humble, and aspire.

It Feels Good To Be Back on This Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, there are not a great many Americans who have the opportunity to gain a new appreciation of our way of life and of our standard of living by comparison with conditions in the countries behind the Iron Curtain. I think that perhaps too many of us are inclined to take our freedoms, our prosperity and all the other blessings of life in America for granted simply because we do not realize the unfortunate lot of human beings who are forced to live under the tyranny of communism.

One American who recently has been privileged to make this comparison, and to thus become aware for perhaps the first time how good it is to be an American, is Ernest Conine. He has recently returned to the Los Angeles Times editorial board as a senior editorial writer after a year abroad covering the Iron Curtain satellite nations out of Vienna.

M. Conine has written a column for the Times entitled "It Feels Good To Be Back on This Side," which appeared in the issue of September 27. I commend it to the reading of Members because, as Mr. Conine states:

An American returning from an extended stay in Communist lands feels something like the war veteran—he has lived through an experience that no one at home can understand.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit Mr. Conine's column for inclusion in the RECORD:

IT FEELS GOOD TO BE BACK ON THIS SIDE
(By Ernest Conine)

Just about everybody from the Presidential candidates on down, is worrying publicly that America is losing her way—that while the Nation grows richer, our moral and spiritual fiber is undergoing a dangerous erosion.

Soul-searching is one of our healthier national pastimes, since it acts as a constant antidote to smugness.

But to a correspondent returning from a year's travel and work in Communist lands, it occurs that this beating of breasts shouldn't be overdone.

The contrast in living standards, here and behind the Iron Curtain, is of course startling.

Despite, a mammoth housing construction program, the average Soviet citizen still lives in a smaller space than the standard set for inmates of Federal prisons in the United States.

While Americans worry about buying that second car for the family, the average resident of Prague rides to work in a crowded, rusty streetcar that frequently breaks down because of the electric power shortage.

The U.S. housewife ponders whether to serve meat or fish for dinner. Behind the Iron Curtain, she often must trek from store to store to find either one.

Although living conditions are gradually improving, it remains true that no Communist country has managed yet to provide a decent standard of living for its people.

More startling, however, is the contrast in the quality and tone of life in the two worlds.

An American returning from an extended stay in Communist lands feels something like the war veteran—he has lived through an experience that no one at home can understand.

How can you explain how good it feels that your hotel room is not bugged? That you can stop a stranger on the street without arousing the suspicious interest of the police? That you can drive from Los Angeles to New York without anyone's permission? That you can leave the country and live somewhere else if you don't like it?

How can you explain that Communist lands are ugly and depressing in a way that almost defies description?

A recent incident illustrates the point.

Shortly before leaving Vienna, this writer drove across the Czech frontier with an American friend who has lived in Western Europe for a decade, but had never ventured behind the Iron Curtain. Like many Europeans, he was convinced that Americans, especially newspapermen, exaggerate the horrors of life under communism.

When we saw dilapidated houses in the Czech city of Bratislava, he pointed out that he had seen worse in Vienna's slums—overlooking the fact we were driving through the Bel-Air of Bratislava.

The people were dressed poorly. But so are many Frenchmen, Spaniards, and Americans. Service in restaurants was lackadaisical—but isn't it everywhere?

After a few hours, however, the wall of preconceived notions began to crack.

As we got into our car outside a restaurant, almost within sight of free Austria, a Czech approached and asked timidly if we had a newspaper—"any newspaper"—from the "outside."

When we drove through the crowded downtown streets, the writer's companion fidgeted uneasily and asked, "Why is everything so quiet?" For, it is a fact that in Communist cities, the hum of life is muted—children play quietly, and their elders exchange few words on the streets.

A little later the visitor added, "Why don't they use a coat of paint, here and there?" The answer is simply that Communist economic planners are interested in production, not in beauty. Paint is an expendable luxury.

Once back in Austria, the American heaved a sigh of relief and said quietly but firmly, "It feels good to be back on this side."

Exactly.

Americans should be concerned to live up to our own ideals. But there should never be any doubt that the superiority of our system over communism rests on something other than shiny tailfins.

Problems and Programs for Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, my district in Baltimore City is far removed from the mountains of Appalachia and only a small portion of our State is within the Appalachian region. Yet we are all members of one great nation and each of us must depend upon his fellow Americans to maintain a decent level of employment, production and prosperity throughout the country.

There is no doubt that many people within the 11 States comprising the Appalachian region are living in poverty to an extent few of us realize. As a matter of fact, I do not believe most people stop to think that this area covers 165,000 square miles and has a population of 15.3 million people.

Decreases in mining and agriculture employment have added several hundred thousand Appalachians to the ranks of the jobless in the last 15 years, and the problems have grown more serious through neglect of concentrated effort in this region. Attempts at solutions to the problems of Appalachia have already been made on four levels; by individuals, by local groups, by communities and by each of the States. However, I think the time has come when we must support a joint effort, spearheaded by the Federal Government, if this area is to reach the degree of productivity of which it is capable. The so-called Appalachian regional development act is designed for this purpose and I am hopeful that the Members of the House will support this measure so that it can be enacted into law before the 88th Congress adjourns.

Mr. Ernest V. Baugh, an editorial writer for the Sunpapers and one of the most distinguished newspapermen in my State, has recognized the merit and desirability of this legislation proposed by the administration. I urge my colleagues to give careful consideration to his excellent commentary on the problems of the Appalachian region:

APPALACHIA IN MARYLAND
(By Ernest V. Baugh)

The Maryland section of Appalachia is not large, in Appalachia as a whole. It contains less than 1 percent of the 165,000 square miles in the mountain region stretching from lower New York to upper Alabama and Georgia. In terms of Maryland, though, it is large; its 1,567 square miles represent more than 15 percent of the State's total area.

In population the Maryland section of Appalachia has slightly less than 1.3 percent of the mountain region's 15.3 million residents. But Maryland's Appalachia accounts for about 6.3 percent of the State's population.

Washington, Allegany and Garrett Counties, which make up Maryland's Appalachia, are not in the Atlantic coast corridor, with its population explosion and economic expansion. Western Maryland in a sense is far away, reaching as it does into the Mississippi watershed. In easy labels, Maryland is a coastal, not a mountain, State and its economy has a tidewater base.

Back in Colonial times and well into the 19th century the people in the urban areas along the coast considered the Appalachians something to get through on the way to new, developing western lands, not a place to settle in.

George Washington's road pioneering through western Maryland was done solely to establish a trade route to the Ohio River. He took the path he did, not because he liked Appalachia, but because the Narrows at Cumberland provided a slash through part of the mountains.

It was to open up the new West that the Federal Government built the National road in the early part of the last century. As for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, their names indicate their goals and those goals were not in the mountains. True the canal did not get beyond Cumberland but only because the railroad could do the job of passing through the mountains quicker and better.

Later came the exploitation of Appalachia's natural resources, primarily coal. This brought people into the mountains to remain, not to pass through. But the boom was based on an extractive economy and when the natural resources were depleted hard times came.

True, there was some industry but not enough to absorb the unemployment pool. People began to drift away; the area generally became depressed, except in a few of the urban spots where manufacturing had flourished. What is the answer?

There has been much talk about turning large areas of Appalachia into recreation centers. Steps toward that end have long since been taken in the Maryland section; witness the big State forests and parks and the development around Garrett County's Deep Creek Lake. However, some of those who have become experts in Appalachia's problems hold that recreation is not the answer, that the best promise rests in an expansion in manufacturing.

Here again western Maryland has not been sitting on its hands. Manufacturing has expanded, particularly in the Hagerstown and Cumberland areas. According to a recent report western Maryland accounts for 8 percent of the State's manufacturing employment, a figure that runs higher than its share in the State's population.

Appalachia, along with the rest of the country, has shared in Federal aid programs; unemployment relief, retraining, forest rehabilitation, attacks on stream pollution, highway construction and so forth. Now, if the House approves the Senate-passed administration bill for a $1.6 billion relief and rehabilitation program, Appalachia will be given a special uplift.

The time is ripe for such an uplift and, parochial though it may be to say so, particularly in our section of the mountain areas. The people up there have done a lot on their own to raise the economic level in the three counties; with a proper boost from the outside they could go much further and much faster—western Maryland is not without assets for development.

Walter Norblad

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, Representative WALTER NORBLAD was a good friend of mine and his wife was a good friend of my wife. We were terribly distressed to hear the sad news about WALTER. He was not only an alert, able, and distinguished Member of Congress with a great record, but on top of that he had a most engaging personality. Just being in his company was a lot of fun. We shall miss him and extend to his family our deepest sympathy.

Tribute to Speaker McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, our Speaker has received many tributes, all deservedly, and I am happy to record one more. On Sunday, September 27, my good friend, Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justice Michael A. Musmanno spoke to a gathering of 4,000 people at the Italian Fall Festival in Mitchellville, Md., where tribute was paid to Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK for action he had taken in saving their parish church, the Holy Rosary Church, from destruction. The Speaker was to have been present himself but other commitments made impossible his participation in the festivities, but Justice Musmanno conveyed the Speaker's greetings to the congregation. I ask unanimous consent to have Justice Musmanno's speech on that occasion printed in the RECORD because, in addition to the justice's remarks on the saving of the church, he spoke of the crusade which the Speaker and he waged from the earliest days against the scourge of communism.

Justice Musmanno's speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, Your Excellency, the Apostolic Delegate Vagnozzi, Father Joseph, pastor of Holy Rosary Church, Father Dominick, assistant pastor, friends: I bring you personal greetings from a great American, an illustrious statesman, a crusader for justice, a lover of humanity, a champion of the Holy Rosary Church and all its parishioners, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. I have known Speaker MCCORMACK for 35 years and I am proud to say that we together were battling against communism long before most of the country realized its menace to American democratic institutions, its criminal conspiracy to overthrow our Government by force and violence, and its atheistic assault on religion.

A Russian astronaut said recently, after a flight through space, that there could be no God because he didn't see Him as he circled the earth. A more arrogantly stupid remark it would be impossible to fashion from the weirdest of imaginations. Why, God was everywhere about him. That capsule of his could never have remained aloft were it not for God's will. As that Russian astronaut hurtled through the celestial vaults at thousands of miles per minute, as he watched the stars, satellites, comets, and meteors whirling in their heavenly orbits, as he witnessed the sunbeams bathing the whole planetary system with golden light, as he took in the boundlessness of infinity with its galaxies, constellations, and astronomical latitudes and longitudes, did it not occur to him that this could not be, except for Almighty God

whose supreme intelligence directs the orderliness of the universe?

I want to join with you in thanking Speaker McCormack for his valiant intervention which resulted in saving your Holy Rosary Church from destruction. Nothing can be more sacred to a devout person than his church. It is more than a house for prayer and worship; it is a ship on which one books passage for the eternal voyage which will reunite him with all the loved ones that have gone before. During the war I saw many churches shelled by artillery, blasted by grenades and razed by airplane bombs. One of the supreme joys for me in the ending of the war was the realization that no longer would churches be crushed between conflicting engines of destruction. And yet, a church can be demolished even in peacetimes, and your lovely church had been condemned to demolition because a highway, known as the Beltway, was to be built right through it.

Speaker McCormack decided to look into the situation. This highway was being built by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia who come under the jurisdiction of Congress. Speaker McCormack called in the Commissioners and, because of what he said and did, the church was saved.

The Commissioners immediately changed the course of the road, the bulldozers slunk away, the wreckers beat a retreat, and our house of God remained serene and untouched in all its architectural grace and spiritual exhaltation.

And so the Holy Rosary Church continues to lift its steeple to the heavens, in benediction to all its parishioners and in expression of gratitude to that defender of churches, that nemesis of Communists, one of the greatest Speakers that ever graced the rostrum in the U.S. Congress, the Honorable John W. McCormack.

The Hayward Morning News Begins Publication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure and pride that I announce the beginning of publication of a fine new newspaper in California's Ninth Congressional District. I am referring to the Hayward Morning News which will serve Hayward, Castro Valley, and southern Alameda County, and is published every day except Sunday. The publisher is Mr. Abe Kofman, one of the most distinguished publishers and businessmen of California. His talented staff includes Mort Kofman, assistant publisher, and Harre DeMoro, editor.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the newspaper is especially fortunate in obtaining the services of Mr. DeMoro as its editor. Although young in years, Mr. DeMoro has enjoyed a productive career as one of our most thoughtful columnists and newspaper reporters.

I have had a number of communications from constitutents living in the area to be served by the Hayward Morning News, expressing their delight and pleasure that Mr. Kofman has commenced publication. It will be a hard-hitting, independent, and progressive journal in the tradition of the great free newspapers of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Hayward Morning News will enjoy success and long life, and I offer the editors and the staff my heartiest congratulations.

Help for Narcotics Addicts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, just 2 years ago, Robert J. Driver, a resident of Solana Beach, in San Diego County, Calif., organized a group of San Diego citizens to stimulate community interest and raise the money necessary to establish a center for the treatment of drug addiction in San Diego.

Driver himself is addicted only by a desire to serve his fellowman. His family background is one of active participation in the business and social communities of the city, dynamic support of their political party and of their church.

At the time of his initial interest in the potentially heartbreaking problem of narcotics addiction, Driver was 24 years old, married to his high school sweetheart and the father of two boys. He was securely employed in an insurance corporation bearing his father's name.

A pragmatically religious man, Driver says he was motivated by an interest in the dynamics of goal-directed groups, but his subsequent involvement indicates an empathy with people and a feeling of personal obligation for their welfare.

Initial investigation of the symptoms of the disease indicated to Driver that medical, penal, sociological, and neuropsychiatric authorities were generally agreed that there could be no lasting cure.

Driver, however, heard of a group of voluntarily withdrawn addicts in Santa Monica who were successfully avoiding the use of drugs or narcotics through a program of self-administered discipline and specifically adapted group psychotherapy. This movement—calling itself "Synanon"—first came to national attention through the interest and efforts of U.S. Senator Thomas Dodd, of Connecticut.

After visiting the group's headquarters in Santa Monica, young Driver was convinced that their program, though still in its formative stage, was of conceivable value to the San Diego community.

It was then that Driver organized the Sponsors of Synanon in San Diego. His first recruits were his sister, Sandra Driver, and an assistant district attorney, Norbert Ehrenfreund.

Driver organized speaking committees within the group as it grew to contact San Diego service clubs and organizations expressing interest. At first Driver filled most of the speaking engagements himself.

Interest in the Sponsors of Synanon was faltering and erratic, but enough money was raised to secure a large house in which the addicted members of Synanon could live and work toward physical and social rehabilitation.

This was a little over 2 years ago.

Today, five houses are used for the various Synanon functions in San Diego. The group has a small fleet of vehicles donated by citizens and service groups at the suggestion of the Sponsors of Synanon. One hundred and fifty addicts are undergoing treatment in San Diego.

The Sponsors of Synanon have raised better than $40,000 a year for the last 2 years to support the program. Some of San Diego's leading citizens are now members of Driver's group, among them Mrs. C. Arnholt Smith, Frank Alessio, and Councilwoman Helen Cobb.

Early next year the Synanon members, guided by the Sponsors of Synanon, will assume the full-time operation of a profitmaking goods and services facility here. They are already engaged in a small manufacturing endeavor, working toward the goal of their founder, Chuck Dederich:

It has always been the feeling that an organization whose philosophy is based on self-reliance must one day be self-reliant.

When this self-reliance occurs in San Diego and throughout the country it will be due in large part to groups like the Sponsors of Synanon, and the dedication of people like Robert J. Driver.

Texas and Peru: Partners for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. J. PICKLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a group of distinguished Texans have just returned from Peru where they represented the Texas Partners of the Alliance for Progress. Along with other States, Texans have alined themselves together in an organization known as the Texas Partners of the Alliance and have associated themselves with a like group from the Republic of Peru to carry out the purposes of the Alliance for Progress on a nongovernmental basis.

On Thursday, August 20, my colleague, the Honorable Bob Casey, inserted in the Congressional Record an excellent article from the Houston Post about this group, and I would like to supplement this insertion by including in my remarks a resolution adopted by the Texas Rehabilitation Association expressing its faith in and its support of the Alliance for Progress:

Resolution of the Texas Rehabilitation Association

Inasmuch as the Texas Rehabilitation Association is guided by the principle of helping troubled people to become self-reliant

and free of the burden of being dependent; and

Whereas the Government of the United States recognizes its obligation to assist underdeveloped areas over the world to achieve economic and personal freedom; and

Whereas the various governments of the Western Hemisphere have recognized a common interest in the needs and the stability of one another and have banded together in an Alliance for Progress to achieve hemispheric stability; and

Whereas a group of citizens of Texas have alined themselves together in an organization known as the Texas Partners of the Alliance and have associated themselves with a like group from the Republic of Peru to carry out the purposes of the Alliance for Progress on a nongovernmental basis: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Texas Rehabilitation Association express its faith in and its support of the Alliance for Progress and express its approval of and a continuing interest in the Texas Partners of the Alliance to the end that hemispheric solidarity may be furthered and the people of the Western Hemisphere may be helped in their struggle for economic and personal freedom.

DAVID WADE, M.D.,
President.

What Democracy Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, each year I sponsor an essay contest for high school students in the Eighth District of New Jersey which I have the honor of representing in this body. This year a young man named Adrian Van Soelen, of Haledon, N.J., a freshman at Paterson Technical and Vocational High School, was selected the winner by a board of judges. The prize was a 3-day trip to the Nation's Capital under my sponsorship. Adrian's essay follows:

WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME

(By Adrian Van Soelen)

To me democracy means freedom to live where I please and to wander and travel without restrictions. I can travel anywhere in the free world in peace and comfort and I can think my own thoughts and say what is on my mind.

To me democracy should mean more than to many others because I have not always lived in the United States. My parents and I are originally from the Netherlands. During the Hungarian revolution in 1954, my father decided to come here in fear that the Communists would occupy Holland like the Germans did during World War II.

I was about 8 years old but I still remember when we arrived in the United States. The first thing I discovered, which I never encountered in Holland, was that the apartment next to us housed a German family; in the apartment below lived an Italian family; in the house across the street lived a Polish couple.

In school and in the streets they would greet us as if we were fellow Americans. Although I could not undertsand them, a language barrier cannot hid a warm, friendly face. Right there and then we had a warm feeling of security; we knew we were wanted and we were not merely foreigners. Thus I realized the value of democracy. I could enter any school I wished and my parents could do any work they pleased.

It is hard to write about democracy because it is all around us. Writing about democracy is like writing about trees; it would get pretty monotonous naming and listing the various kinds, shapes, and sizes.

To me democracy means only one thing. One word can describe it: "freedom." The way God wants it.

One Draftee's Contribution to the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Universal Military Training Act has never been a very popular law, but it is a necessary one to insure that our country has well-trained citizens to protect it in times of war or national emergency.

Thousands of young men are drafted every year to serve their military obligation. Some serve with honor and distinction and still others decide to follow a military career, but most of these young servicemen lead uneventful lives and follow established procedures until they are discharged.

We in Baltimore are very proud of a young doctor from our city who went into the Army with ideas of his own, and has been cited for his outstanding service in Korea. The Baltimore Sun recently told the story of Capt. Stephen S. Leavitt and under unanimous consent I place that article at this point in the RECORD. I think it can serve as an inspiration to other young men who still have their military obligation ahead of them.

The article follows:

FROM BALTIMORE TO KOREA: DR. LEAVITT SHOWED WHAT NEW MAN CAN DO TO IMPROVE THE ARMY

Ever wonder what a young draftee could do to improve the fighting effectiveness of the U.S. Army?

If, like most people, you are of a practical set, you probably say "don't be silly."

A young Baltimore doctor who just finished a tour of duty in Korea, however, did go into the Army with the idea of changing things, and his efforts were both effective and appreciated.

He is Capt. Stephen S. Leavitt, a 25-year-old City College graduate, the son of attorney Robert Leavitt, 100 West Cold Spring Lane.

The young Baltimorean was assigned as a battalion surgeon and medical platoon leader of a unit stationed near enemy lines in Korea.

"His platoon was understrength, short of equipment and working under unsatisfactory conditions," his commanding officer, Lt. Col. Lyle H. Wright, noted in his recommendation for the award.

"He immediately set about to organize * * *," Lieutenant Colonel Wright continued.

Two months after his arrival in Korea, he received the equipment he had requested, including front line ambulances, armored personnel carriers, and other equipment foreign to him.

"He established a training program that enabled himself and his men to learn vehicular maintenance, field operations, and other unfamiliar subjects not ordinarily the concern of a medical doctor.

"He wrote standard operating procedures and other documents that prepared his platoon for duty under garrison or combat conditions.

"All this he did in a magnificent manner while simultaneously attending to the medical needs of approximately 1,100 personnel."

Lieutenant Colonel Wright then mentioned one of the Baltimore doctor's grandest projects, a field medical demonstration that was attended by all commanders and surgeons of the division.

Korean civilians also came to recognize the achievements of Captain Leavitt, his commanding officer pointed out.

FAVORABLE COMMENT

"His attempts to improve the local sanitary and medical standards have been extremely successful and have brought favorably comments from many local (Korean) officials.

"Captain Leavitt's conduct has been such as to set him apart from his contemporaries," the Army document said, noting that "while accomplishing all this, Dr. Leavitt still found time to publish professional articles and conduct research in diseases common to Korea, which will prove beneficial to other medical officers."

Military and civilian personnel who came in contact with him came to call him "the soldiers' doctor."

"His outstanding performance reflects great credit upon himself, the 1st Cavalry Division and the U.S. Army," says the citation.

What does the young Baltimore doctor say of all this recognition?

"I had a very considerate commanding officer."

Congressman John E. Fogarty Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL M. LANDRUM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. JOHN E. FOGARTY, has been cited over the years for his many achievements in health and welfare. The legislative record of his Subcommittee on Appropriations and his personal sponsorship of legislation have identified him with a number of significant advances in these important fields.

Of increasing importance is the work that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has been doing in behalf of the cause of education. As the membership of this body well knows, he has been identified with programs for handicapped children, vocational education, library services, aid to federally affected areas, and the appropriations of the National Defense Education Act. He has been particularly effective in his research program in the field of education. His work in furthering the research and development programs of the Office of Education was recently recognized by the Air Force Association. On September 9, 1964, he received the Citation of Honor presented by the Air Force Association at its 18th national convention held in Washington. I am pleased at this time

to insert the wording of the citation presented to Mr. FOGARTY and also to call to everyone's attention his remarks upon acceptance of this award.

CITATION OF HONOR

Air Force Association pays tribute to JOHN E. FOGARTY, Member of Congress, Second District, Rhode Island, for pioneering efforts and legislative leadership in establishing Federal support for educational research and development as the cornerstone of future progress.

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY, OF RHODE ISLAND, ON RECEIVING THE CITATION OF HONOR OF THE AEROSPACE EDUCATION FOUNDATION

It is with the deepest appreciation that I accept your Citation of Honor here today. I do so with keen awareness that in recognizing my own efforts in Congress on behalf of educational research, you are rightfully recognizing one of the long-needed, long-neglected, and truly essential foundations for the future of American education.

A few weeks ago, President Johnson said that "the first work of our times and the first work of our society is education." He spoke of the present 88th Congress as the education Congress and outlined its many legislative acts for education, for libraries, and higher education, for medical education and vocational training, for teaching the handicapped and reaching the poor, and for research into better ways and means of improving the whole learning process from the primary on to the postgraduate school.

Never has so much been expected of education as today. We seek to educate and prepare our youth for a day of profound technological and social and global challenge. We seek to create in fact the universal education we have long promised ourselves, an equality of educational opportunity for all our people, whoever they are and wherever they live.

But what we expect from education must clearly be equaled by what we give to education, the quality of minds, as well as the quantity of funds we allot to its basic research. No one knows better than you, who represent the most far-reaching scientific accomplishments of history, that we can only take out at one end of the channel what we put in at the other.

In accepting your citation, I wish I could say that educational research is now well underway, that we have fully met our responsibility to support and encourage it. Unfortunately, this is not true. Instead, in educational research we are only at the beginning.

Since the end of World War II we have seen an enormous growth in the research funds of industry and of government. America's industries now devote up to 10 percent of their gross revenues to research—and more than that to product development. Throughout our economy we now spend more than $18 billion on research and development every year.

But what of education? What do we now devote to research and development for the improvement of our schools?

American education today is America's largest enterprise. It embraces 125,000 schools, 47 million elementary and secondary pupils, 1,800,000 teachers. On all levels of education today, we spend $34 billion annually.

Out of these $34 billion we spend on education, we devote only $72 million to research and development—only one-fifth of 1 percent of our educational funds to this task which lies at the heart of knowledge and of human development.

But this is a beginning. Back in 1960, only 4 years ago, our national allotment for educational research was $33 million. It has doubled since then. Back in 1960, one of the most vital areas of basic educational research—the Office of Education's cooperative research program—was budgeted at $3 million. Today, these funds have increased to about $16 million or more than fivefold the 1960 level.

With this modest beginning we are now starting to see new and promising prospects. The cooperative research program is now recruiting some of the best minds in education to examine some of the basic problems which have long hampered education.

It is exploring new ways to detect and discover talented youth in the arts and humanities as well as the sciences.

It is seeking new and better ways to teach our English language in a Nation that can no longer afford illiteracy anywhere or any place.

It is searching out methods of teaching the mentally retarded and the handicapped to the limit of their capacities.

It is investigating better means of teaching and of learning in a day of ever-expanding knowledge.

And it is testing out these findings in new proving grounds for education, at university centers where the best of research may be soundly examined and developed and then transmitted to our schools.

Through this emerging pattern, I see our great opportunity to give to education a prospect of fulfilling the great expectations we have of education in the years to come.

Arizona Publisher Finds Barry Goldwater Wanting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, there is a natural inclination for people to be proud when a man from one's own home State is a presidential candidate of one of the two great political parties.

The candidate receives from his fellow State citizens a little more patience, a little more understanding and a little less criticism than might be extended to a candidate who comes from somewhere else.

It is then highly significant when opinion leaders begin to call for the defeat of their own State's candidate.

This is happening today in Arizona. In August, Lewis W. Douglas, who has served as Arizona Congressman, U.S. Budget Director, and former Ambassador to Great Britain, announced his support of President Johnson. Mr. Douglas had supported his lifelong friend BARRY GOLDWATER for the Senate in 1952 and 1958. And he had supported the Republican presidential nominees in 1948, 1952, 1956, and 1960.

Surveys have revealed there is a good probability that President Johnson will carry the State against native son, BARRY GOLDWATER. Perhaps what is happening is this: No matter how popular Senator GOLDWATER may be as an individual, many citizens of Arizona have waited and listened and have found him wanting as a man who should be leading this Nation from the White House.

In this regard, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the editorial of September 27, 1964, by William R. Mathews, the distinguished publisher of the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson. Mr. Mathews is a fairminded, deeply studious, and tremendously experienced observer of the State, National, and international scenes.

With great care Mr. Mathews has taken the measure of Senator GOLDWATER and President Johnson. He finds in President Johnson outstanding ability for leadership, for understanding, and for hard work. He finds in Senator GOLDWATER a dismaying lack of statesmanship and an inability to come forth with a program to meet the truly challenging problems of today's world.

Mr. Mathews finds himself unable to do other than to call upon the people of Arizona to vote for President Johnson. The editorial follows:

THE STAR ENDORSES FOR PRESIDENT—

(By William R. Mathews)

When Senator BARRY GOLDWATER was nominated as the Republican candidate for President, the Star openly rejoiced that a native son of Arizona, of a family of such humble origin, should rise to be nominated for President by one of the two great political parties of our country. It could not help admiring him for winning the nomination in the face of the opposition of organized finance in the East, organized labor, organized Negroes, organized education, and Santa Claus himself.

As a matter of fairness, the Star decided to wait and see how BARRY would measure up as a candidate. The Star prides itself on being conservative, and a champion of a free society. It hoped that possibly once he was nominated, BARRY would come forth with a true conservative program, not only in the domestic field, but in the field of international relations.

The Star has waited patiently to see some evidence of the statesmanship a candidate for President should show. Although it has openly endorsed L.B.J., it was ready to give the breaks to a friend and a native son of Arizona.

In the Star's opinion BARRY has failed pathetically to measure up to what it expects of a candidate for President. He appears more and more as a synthetic candidate merely parroting the words that some other folks put in his mouth. Of course, he has pleased the old fat cats of the country with his plan to reduce income taxes by 25 percent. Of course, he has pleased millions of Democrats in the South with his civil rights record. Of course, he pleases millions of other people with his cracks at L.B.J. and McNamara.

On the other hand, he has dismayed the Star by confirming what the Star has said for many years, that he is entirely too reckless in foreign policy. He has been downright politically stupid in raising a fuss over who had the authority to use nuclear weapons. He has scared millions of voters with this needless debate over semantics.

He had a chance to come forward and arouse enthusiasm by becoming the Nation's No. 1 champion of a free society, laying a base for Republican Party strategy for all time. But that would have meant that he would have had to educate the public to the duties and responsibilities of a free society, as well as the benefits. Evidently he does not know, and neither does any of the advisers and speech writers that surround him, what a free society is or the responsibilities it calls for.

His record so far furnishes proof that he is lacking in the qualities that a President should have. He is surrounded by a coterie

of advisers who are as ignorant as he is of what it takes to make a free society successful.

The Star has no other alternative than to stick with Lyndon Johnson. Some 10 months ago, when he became President upon the assassination of President Kennedy, he rose magnificiently to meet the desperate situation that faced the Nation. Within a matter of hours he began a record that has won the acclamation of millions of Republicans and has stirred the pride of Democrats. Quickly he won the confidence of the nations abroad. Here was a President unafraid to make decisions.

Faithfully, and with astonishing success, he chose to support and implement the Kennedy legislative program. He became a president of all of the people, regardless of race, color, or religion.

But some folks ask, what about L.B.J.'s record in Texas? The Star's answer to that is that is old stuff. Within the past few weeks there has been a primary election in Arizona where two contenders ran so close that first one and then the other was leading. As recently as September 23 the declared winner won by 75 votes. It took nearly 2 weeks to determine the final official count.

Yes, there is a book written by a Texan on L.B.J. The Star has received four copies of it. It is completely useless to argue about the past life of L.B.J., when he has made a great historical record during the past 10 months. That he has been so successful comes in part because he is a professional politician, just as Harry Truman was one. But such experience would be comparatively valueless unless there were born in him other qualities of moral courage and native intelligence that enabled him to take the country out of a tailspin and make a safe landing.

Never has a President worked harder. In fact, he causes some alarm among his friends, who think he works too hard. Anyway, the country is prosperous, and on the whole, peaceful. The nations abroad have confidence in L.B.J. The only real trouble is in Vietnam, a situation that Jack Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson inherited from a Republican administration. In the past, when Johnson was in the Senate, he made a notable record of supporting the foreign policies of President Eisenhower. His qualities as a statesman, which he shows as President today, have grown in part out of that experience.

The Star believes that the people of Arizona will be wise to vote for L.B.J. for President.

Barry's Hometown in Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following very interesting newspaper article by Mr. Haynes Johnson published in the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, September 29, 1964:

PHOENIX REFLECTS STRUGGLE OF CAMPAIGN

(By Haynes Johnson)

PHOENIX, ARIZ.—From Paradise Valley where BARRY GOLDWATER's desert home, "Be Nun I Kin," stands, to East Broadway, south of the Salt River and the railroad tracks, is only a matter of miles.

Yet measured in terms of attitudes and philosophies of government, it is a million light-years away.

The extreme disparity between these two sections helps to explain the fundamental differences that separate the Goldwater conservatives from their opponents. It also illuminates the deep emotions and the bitterness that lie beneath the surface of the presidential campaign of 1964.

HISTORIC STRUGGLE

Phoenix, in miniature, adds further proof that this national election represents a historic struggle over the very nature of the role of Government in the United States.

North of Phoenix, where GOLDWATER lives, represents wealth, country clubs, gracious entertaining, a devout belief in the tenets of the supposed rugged individualism of the pioneers and a yearning to return to the days of laissez faire.

South Phoenix represents poverty, squalor, poor housing, poor schools, despair, crime and discontented citizens, whose spokesmen demand aggressive Government action.

LOCAL INITIATIVE

The Goldwater supporters, with the fervor that marks their efforts everywhere, say local initiative is the answer to any difficulties. Any other remedy comes close to "socialism."

They point to the example of BARRY GOLDWATER himself. In the rise from merchant to millionaire, the Goldwater family personifies the virtues of free enterprise.

The Goldwaters, one is told, are the kind of people who transformed a desert into a shining modern metropolis. And the dream has not ended—Phoenix continues to grow and prosper.

But with the growth have come problems.

"I always thought of myself as a conservative," said a businessman who came here from the East. "To me a conservative is a man who acts with caution, who operates out of reason with a logical plan which conserves what is best in the past while continuing to move forward.

"NOT MY KIND

"But these Goldwater people aren't my kind of conservatives. They don't seem to believe in any kind of government. And that's just what we have in Phoenix. No government."

He said Phoenix has no urban renewal plan, no housing code, no housing authority.

"I wish somebody would come out here and do a study and really show the country just what the Goldwater brand of conservatism means in terms of government—local government right here in Phoenix," he said.

Then, typically, he asked not to be quoted by name. "I'm not a coward," he said, "but I'm not going to do any good by being identified. I'll just be called socialistic."

The Reverend George Brooks is not so hesitant about being quoted.

Mr. Brooks, a Negro, is the president of the NAACP branch in Phoenix. He lives off East Broadway—the slum section inhabited by the majority of the 25,000 Negroes in Phoenix. In that same general area are most of the city's 65,000 Mexican-Americans.

"THE BIGGEST LIE

"The biggest lie that's ever been perpetrated on America is the lie that Phoenix doesn't have any problems," Brooks said. "We have many problems. Wherever you have poor housing such as you have here, you have problems.

"Mr. GOLDWATER says we have no problems, but indeed Phoenix parades under a banner of conservatism which is a coverup for a system of denials and discrimination and which makes the rich richer and the poor poorer. Why the wage scale in this town is atrocious. There are grown men working for 75 cents an hour."

He had begun speaking very slowly, with long pauses, choosing his words carefully and enunciating precisely. As he talked, his language became louder, his manner more aggressive.

Within minutes he was in a car, pointing out the sights of the slums: Shacks and shanties, litter and junk, dirt roads with ruts and rocks.

At the 40th Street School, the 174 Negro children—there are no whites—were playing in the yard while Mervyn Lakey, 32, the principal, escorted the visitor through the building.

"We need a completely new plant," he was saying, "to include what our leaders here call 'frills'—music, physical education, a cafeteria where the children can have a hot lunch, a library."

At present the students bring their sandwiches and either eat them at their desks or in the yard. A favorite place is inside a large concrete pipe on the grounds.

The school was built by the WPA in the 1930's.

Lakey, tall, light-skinned, spoke without animosity. In this he is typical of so many in Phoenix. Like others, he was lured here from the outside—in his case, Oklahoma—by the prospect of Arizona's storied climate.

Somehow this, too, adds to the soil in which Goldwater conservatism flourishes, for the people here are conservative by nature, even those who will vote for Lyndon Johnson this November.

MIGRATED TO ARIZONA

Without any attempt at scientific selection, the people one talks to all seem to have migrated to Arizona. They are from everywhere in the country, and if there is a common denominator it seems to be of a negative sort: They came here to get away from something.

With many it is the weather. Others come to such retirement communities as Sun City, where they are among their own—a group largely well-to-do—untroubled by such issues as pensions and hospitalization costs for the elderly.

Then there are those who have come out of a sense of protest at the life they knew, or thought they knew.

A businessman, for instance, said with the utmost sincerity that he had left Chicago to escape the Negroes and the high crime rate. That very day the front page of the Phoenix paper carried a two-column box set in boldface type on page 1 quoting the police chief as saying policemen walking their beats on foot have reduced nighttime crime in downtown Phoenix.

"Police have received favorable comments from merchants in the area, who have noticed fewer drunks, vagrants, and associated problems," the chief said. "Strong-arm robberies also have been reduced."

SEEMS TOSSUP

The presidential election is arousing wide attention, but it is impossible to predict the outcome in Phoenix. The most that can be said is that GOLDWATER is by no means universally popular. Here, it seems to be a tossup.

"It's all liar's dice," one man said. "The people won't really tell you how they're going to vote."

When the votes are cast, though, they will give some answers to the political direction of the future. For the real heart of Phoenix and Arizona lies not in Paradise Valley or south of the Salt River.

Like the Nation, it is somewhere in between.

Domestic Water Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, D. E. Skinner, president of the Alaska Steamship Co., recently made an important speech to the Propeller Club of Portland, Oreg. Because I think Mr. Skinner's frank statement regarding domestic water transportation will be of great interest to those in the shipping and shipbuilding industry I am placing the full text of his remarks in the RECORD at this point:

SPEECH BY D. E. SKINNER

You have been kind enough to invite me, representing the Alaska Steamship Co., to discuss with you this evening the current problems of the domestic water transportation industry. I am most appreciative of your interest, and especially to have the opportunity to discuss this subject with an audience as interested and knowledgeable on water transportation problems as this Propeller Club is.

As a longtime member of the Propeller Club of the United States, my company has supported this club's efforts to improve the U.S. merchant marine and tell its story to the nonmaritime segment of the American public. We are particularly conscious of the fine leadership under your national president, Adm. Ralph E. Wilson (retired).

Many of you may not be too familiar with the job performed by Alaska Steam. The Alaska Steamship Co. is the oldest continuous operator in the domestic, noncontiguous trade between Puget Sound and Alaska. We are now in our 69th year. We regularly serve familiar ports such as Ketchikan, Juneau, Seward, and Kodiak. We also serve 60 other ports with more unfamiliar names, such as Egegik, Ugashik, Ouzinkie, Metlakatla, Unalakleet, and Kotzebue. Of these 60-odd ports, other common carriers serving Alaska actually go to a maximum of three—not that they can't serve more if they want to. We have shared in Alaska's progress from territory to statehood, commencing service 18 years before Alaska's first Territorial Legislature. We were providing service during the great eruption of Mount Katmai in 1912. More recently we were directly involved in the catastrophic earthquake and resultant tidal wave last March. One of our vessels, SS *Chena*, a 10,000-ton Liberty, was hurled over the pier at Valdez, and as a direct result of the superior response of her officers and crew, and the man upstairs, the vessel was able to get back to deep water. I merely mention these two incidents to point out that not all of our troubles in Alaska have been involved with labor unions, regulatory agencies, politicians, a seasonal one-way trade, small docks, no docks, winter ice, summer heat, heavy seas, and the sex life of a salmon.

In the interest of time and continuity, I have been asked to limit my comments to the domestic trade generally, and the noncontiguous area of Alaska specifically. Occasionally I must make reference to the more rewarding offshore trade for purposes of contrast only. Much of what I have to say is not new for those of you who have actively participated in this business. However, I would hope to raise some questions and make some suggestions that will cause you to look at the many problems that exist in a different light.

As you know, the bible for our industry is the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 as amended, and certain related shipping statutes. These acts have been passed for the purpose of aiding the development, promotion, and operation of an American merchant marine adequate to carry the Nation's domestic water commerce and a substantial portion of its foreign commerce during peacetime, and capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency. How successful has this policy been?

I do not believe today that the domestic fleet is adequate to carry the Nation's domestic water commerce, and certainly 9 percent does not constitute a substantial portion of its foreign shipments. If what has taken place in the last 28 years continues, I have little hope that this Nation will receive much support from the domestic water carrier in case of a national emergency. Unlike the offshore operators who received $312 million in construction and operating subsidies, we of the dometsic trade do not now, nor ever have, received any kind of financial Government support. This has not been true throughout the years to competitive domestic carriers in the fields of air, highway, or rail.

In order to support the shipbuilding industry in this country, the domestic carrier is prohibited from building or buying any ship built in a yard outside of the United States. This policy may have been necessary 20, 30, or 40 years ago, but I believe that it has outlived its usefulness. We need only to look at what has happened to the domestic fleet in the last few years. Twelve years ago, in 1952, there were five combination freight and passenger ships in the domestic fleet. Today there is one. Twelve years ago there were 154 privately owned freighters. Today there are 89. A total fleet of 159 ships excluding tankers has been reduced to 90, operating in this unsubsidized phase of the U.S. merchant marine. Here is a trade, protected from foreign competition by the Jones Act, which has all but disappeared—and what remains is certainly a second-class fleet.

Some of you may point to new tugs and new barges that have been built to replace outmoded self-propelled vessels. I hardly think that this type of carrier would qualify as being capable of serving this country as a first-class naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency.

Who is responsible for the demise of this industry? It must fall on the shoulders of the Federal Government, management and the labor it employs, and not necessarily in that order. Let us briefly examine each of these for the purpose of arriving at a few hopefully constructive and practical suggestions.

GOVERNMENT

All of the rates and practices employed by the domestic carriers are, as you know, regulated by the Federal Maritime Administration and the Federal Maritime Commission. If the condition of this industry is unhealthy, certainly these organizations share in its sickness. For several years the Maritime Commission has complained to Congress that its staff has not been sufficient to keep current with the demands placed upon it. To this we agree. For example, in 1959 an increase in freight rates was filed by each of the common carriers then operating in the Alaska trade. Three and one-half years and one common carrier later, after many expensive and extensive hearings, Maritime approved this increase as follows:

"The proposed rates, charges, tariffs and regulations herein under investigation are just, reasonable and lawful, and therefore, it is ordered that this proceeding is discontinued."

This decision was rendered on May 6, 1963. On April 21, 1964, 15 days short of 1 year and another common carrier later, the Federal Maritime Commission ordered a reopening of this now famous docket No. 881. I can assure you that actions like this by regulatory agencies are burdensome to the carrier and confusing to the public.

To my knowledge no domestic operator has yet been told what it is entitled to earn on its investment. We are of the opinion that each trade area should be singled out by the Commission and advised of its allowable rate of return.

This rate, of course, would vary depending upon the physical and economic conditions as they vary in each area. Without this information, I fail to see how management in this regulated, or for that matter any nonregulated, industry is capable of intelligently planning and conducting its own affairs.

Since statehood, we of the Alaska trade, who have lived under the jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Commission, are now having to answer to the Interstate Commerce Commission for certain tariffs that involve our company. If life was difficult under one regulatory agency, I am sure it will be even more frustrating, if not impossible, under two. We strongly advocate that the Federal Government determine which one of these two agencies should be responsible for the Alaska area.

All of our rates are meticulously regulated—except the section 22 rates on cargoes of our largest customer, Uncle Sam, where anything goes as long as carriers don't conspire together and as long as rates can be forced lower and lower, even though the result can only be upward pressure on the rates paid by the private businessman. We strongly recommend the discontinuance of section 22 rates.

It has long been accepted by our Federal Government—and most State governments—that when regulation is established for an industry, protection is also established for those regulated, in the form of certificates of convenience and necessity, which impose certain requirements on the industry and in turn prevent the fly-by-night type of competition. This is true of all privately owned public service industries—airlines, rails, trucks, telephone, power, telegraph, intercoastal and coastwise vessels, pipelines, radio and television—except water carriers in the domestic offshore trades. We have the regulation, we alone do not have the certificates.

Last year, then Vice Chairman of the Maritime Commission, now Chairman, Rear Adm. John Harllee, retired, said, "If there is any mediocrity in the maritime fleet today, it is the result of Government lethargy, Government indifference, and labor problems which have beset the entire maritime industry."

LABOR

The primary responsibility, in my opinion, for the group of labor unions with whom we have contracts is to extend its fullest cooperation in the direction of mechanization, automation, or any form of advanced technology that will result in the water carrier again assuming its role of being an efficient and healthy carrier. If management is capable of designing and willing to invest in ships and equipment that will provide for this efficiency, labor is being shortsighted not to encourage it by supporting this effort by action—not merely lipservice.

It is only natural, I suppose, that labor should demand the highest wages and finest working conditions that the industry can afford. It is quite apparent to me, however, that the downfall of the domestic trade is largely due to the fact that labor's demands have forced ship operators to pay wages and fringe benefits that it could not afford. The end result penalizes employer and employee alike. Why has the domestic carrier been unable or unwilling to hold the line? I would be less than candid if I did not express my strong feeling that the wage pattern in the domestic unsubsidized trade is estab-

lished by the offshore subsidized operator with the knowledge and support of the Federal Government that subsidizes him. His willingness to accede to the pyramiding demands of labor over the last 12 years is the most important reason why instead of operating 159 ships employing 6,400 men, the domestic fleet is now comprised of less than 100 ships employing some 4,000 seamen. I fail to see how any segment in our industry has made any substantial gains, and feel quite certain that unless this attitude changes the curve will continue its downward direction: fewer companies, fewer ships, fewer jobs.

MANAGEMENT

What of management? It is by no means relieved of its responsibility in helping to bring about this impossible situation. The unwillingness of ship operators to work together in the interest of stability within the industry is most regrettable. Those managements who allow their traffic departments to do whatever is necessary to get cargo, regardless of harmful effects on the trade, and regardless of the violations to the tariffs, should not be condoned but rather condemned. Backbiting efforts on the part of one operator to create hardships for another, even though they are not serving the same area, are undermining the entire system.

I am sure that if there has been any common reason for the failure of a number of the companies in this trade, it has been because of a lack of ingenuity and willingness to support it. Most of you are aware of the increased movement of railroad cars between the continental limits of the United States or Canada to the State of Alaska. Some of you may remember the effort we made in 1954 to build 2 ships capable of carrying 110 railroad cars plus forty 40-foot trailers. The decision to abandon this project was made after bids had been received and bank financing had been provided which involved an investment of some $23 million. Those ships should have been built in 1954 in U.S. shipyards. Those ships could have been built at that time had we enjoyed a construction subsidy similar to that offered to the offshore carriers. Ten years have passed, and this trade is now being served by a second-class tug and rail barge system capable of an average speed of 8 knots operating out of the United States and Canada, a fleet of World War II built freighters from the United States, and a modern, efficient 18-knot trainship operating out of Canada. The latter, being operated by the Alaska Trainship Corp., you will be able to identify as the *Alaska*. This ship is better known to those of you who read the congressional reports as the *City of New Orleans*. I am still of the opinion that the merchant marine of the United States would be better off if this ship were flying the U.S. flag, rather than that of Liberia. Shipyards in this country claimed that the flag transfer of this ship would have put them out of business. With this I disagree. I fail to see how a shipyard can lose a business it doesn't have. The effort that management has made in this instance and in others involving the use of containers is good evidence of a willingness to do as much as the traffic will bear. Unfortunately this is not enough.

Lest some of you feel that I am against all forms of subsidy, I should like to make the record clear. I do feel the domestic carrier should be encouraged in some way to build new construction with highly automated machinery and the latest in cargo handling equipment, whether it be roll on, roll off, or lift on, lift off. I am definitely against any consideration, even if it were possible, for an operating subsidy. As I have indicated earlier, a subsidy of this kind can only breed inefficiency and lassitude. Many of you are aware of the dramatic strides made by foreign maritime interests. The Japanese are now building several 15,000 ton vessels capable of being manned by 15 men. The Russians contemplate operating a ship in the Black Sea with no one aboard. When the operating subsidy to the offshore operators, which now exceeds $200 million annually, is based on a 15-man crew, not to mention an unmanned vessel, the increase to the U.S. taxpayer will not only be excessive but unnecessary as well.

The rehabilitation or even the salvation of this domestic fleet can only come about through a working partnership made up of management, who must be allowed a fair rate of return on its investment and free to employ the best techniques it can provide; the Federal Government, who must modernize its approach to domestic shipping; and the forces of labor, who must recognize that a few jobs well paid are better than no jobs at all.

New Television Program Depicts Life of Legislator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the public image of the modern politician is not always drawn by a sympathetic hand. Perhaps this is because politics is a controversial area of our society, and its practitioners must expect to be treated harshly from time to time.

It gives me a great deal of satisfaction, therefore, to call this chamber's attention to a depiction of a modern legislator that is at once realistic and sympathetic, that is both fair and discerning. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the first effort of the television industry to dramatize the life of a lawmaker, in "Slattery's People," seen on the Columbia Broadcasting System's television network.

The leading player in this dramatic series is a young actor whose grasp of a legislator's point of view is remarkable. His name is Richard Crenna, a resident of the great San Fernando Valley which I help to represent here in the House. In his role, Mr. Crenna depicts the minority leader of the lower house of a State legislature. The first drama on the series illustrated the conflict that sometimes arises when a legislator must choose between the interests of his own district and the interests of his State as a whole.

The man chiefly responsible for pioneering into this new arena in television is James E. Moser, another San Fernando Valley resident, who created "Slattery's People" after spending more than 8 months researching the program by working beside legislators in the California State capital of Sacramento. This is typical of Moser's exhaustive approach and concern for realism, which first was noticed in the famous "Dragnet" series of several years ago.

I think that this series and the men responsible for it at Bing Crosby Productions, Inc., deserve a great deal of credit for pioneering into this new dramatic field on television. I am pleased that they have taken the high road to show a legislator's life, and have not pandered to sensationalism or unreality to stimulate an audience following. In an industry that has received its share of criticism for the quality of its product, I am happy to extend this salute to one effort that deserves our respect and praise.

Federal Aid Flow Proves Hays' Critics Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, apparently, from what is going on again, some people never learn. Two years ago the opposition in the campaign against me used the big lie technique by repeating all over eastern Ohio that I had not done anything to help my district economically. The result was that 8 months after the election the following editorial appeared in one of the leading newspapers in the 18th Congressional District, the Martins Ferry-Bellaire Times Leader:

FEDERAL AID FLOW PROVES HAYS' CRITICS WRONG

In the last 18th District congressional campaign, the opponents of Congressman WAYNE L. HAYS charged that he hadn't done much for the district, and that he had overlooked its economic problems while concentrating on foreign affairs.

The charge was ridiculous, and the voters were wise enough, as they usually are, to see through it. As a result, the Congressman was elected to his eighth consecutive term.

Let's look at what's happened since then.

Belmont County is just one of the counties in the district. In just the past 8 months, here are some of the projects in Belmont County alone for which HAYS has been instrumental in getting Federal funds.

Martins Ferry industrial planning, $86,065.
Brookside sewage system, $5,000.
Shadyside water improvement, $280,500.
Powhatan Street improvement, $2,210.
Martins Ferry Post Office, $171,703.
Barnesville waterworks, $604,000.
Barnesville Hospital, $157,148.
Belmont County sewer system, $571,000.
Martins Ferry Hospital, $569,000.
Belmont County Sewer District No. 1, $223,000.

In addition, new post offices will be built in Flushing, Bethesda, and Belmont at a cost of approximately $180,000.

The Warren Township Water Authority, which is partly in Belmont County, has received a loan of $115,000.

HAYS didn't do all these things himself. The communities had to qualify for aid, and then he helped obtain approval.

The efforts of HAYS were also a factor in getting the Interstate Route 70 projects, involving an expenditure of some $20 million (90 percent Federal money), advanced 2 years because the county is an economically depressed area.

Since some of the Congressman's critics raised the point of whether he was sufficiently aware of the district's economic problems, this compilation of the projects he has been associated with is in order.

Sort of proves the voters knew what they were doing, doesn't it?

Since the last campaign, the following other projects have been attained through the assistance of my office:

Jefferson County Sewer District No. 1, $6,000.

Columbiana County sewage treatment plant, $270,000.

Lisbon Nursing Home, $200,000.

Adena, Ohio, preliminary planning for sewer facilities, $5,000.

Minerva, Ohio, Carroll County, new topping and widening of streets, $36,500.

St. Clair Township, Columbiana County, sewer facility for several sections of township, $4,780.

Jefferson County sewer facilities, $15,000 advance for preliminary planning.

Flushing, Ohio, extension of water main, relocation of waterplant, new wells, and equipment, $23,000.

Atwood Lake project, Carroll County, three accelerated public works projects totaling grants of $794,000.

Steubenville, Ohio, advance for final planning of sanitary sewerage and draining system, $24,000.

Steubenville housing project, $66,000 advance.

Lock and dam No. 11, Ohio Power Co. located in Brilliant, $125 million project.

Salem City Hospital, $99,000.

Wintersville, Ohio, water pollution control grant, $153,810.

Columbiana County, new sanitary sewerage system for Southeastern Water and Sewage District, $8,710 advance planning.

Belmont Electric Cooperative, St. Clairsville, Ohio, loan from Department of Agriculture, $469,000.

Salem Trade Extension Training School, $7,640.

East Liverpool urban planning program, $86,120 to Ohio Department of Development to aid East Liverpool and Marion in comprehensive planning.

Jefferson County water and sewer projects, Island Creek Township, $3,100; New Alexandria and Overlook Hills, $5,000.

Yorkville, Ohio, flood disaster, $5,830.

The following new post offices either completed or approved for construction:

Bellaire, Ohio; Bloomingdale, Ohio; Dillonvale, Ohio; East Liverpool, Ohio, station A; Freeport, Ohio; Jewett, Ohio; Lafferty, Ohio; Lisbon, Ohio; Mount Pleasant, Ohio; Neffs, Ohio; Richmond, Ohio; Salem, Ohio; Salineville, Ohio; Scio, Ohio; Shadyside, Ohio; Tiltonsville, Ohio; Columbiana, Ohio, addition and remodeling; Steubenville, Ohio, extension and remodeling; Wellsville, Ohio.

Disturbing Reports From Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the recurring reports of a substantial Soviet military buildup in Cuba are most disturbing. I have no private source of information as to the extent, if any, of such increases in Soviet armed forces in Cuba, and I am not privy to the intelligence available to responsible agencies of our Government. The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, however, often has obtained and made available information as to happenings within the Castro regime which later has been corroborated by official agencies, and I note that a recent report made available by that committee through the editor of Free Cuban News, Paul D. Bethel, states that "the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo is surrounded by Russian bases."

This and other reports, if false, merit prompt denial. If they are true, even in part, they present a most serious new threat to the national security of the United States.

I am asking the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense for information as to the truth or falsity of such reports. In the meantime, I include, for information of the House, the material referred to, disseminated by the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, as follows:

INSIDE CUBA—SOVIET BUILDUP IN CUBA INCLUDES UNDERWATER EXPLORATIONS

The Russian military presence in Cuba has been augumented sharply in the past 30 to 45 days. New Soviet military bases are being constructed in Guanabacoa, on the north coast of Havana Province, as well as in the Gonzalo Hills, near the Hershey sugar mill, also on the north coast of Havana Province. Missile silos are being installed, according to the opinion of eye witnesses.

This information has come to light at the time of the arrival of a Soviet naval mission, which will investigate the waters of the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico.

All indications are that the Soviets have embarked upon a heightened military buildup in Cuba which includes oceanographic studies of the Caribbean, and the Gulf of Mexico. The reason for these latter studies, it is believed by competent Navy authorities, is related to finding strata of water in the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico in which sumarines may lie undetected by sonar devices and other means of detection.

The Soviets have taken charge of the Castro navy as well as the Lambda fishing fleet which is under Cuban Navy command. According to the Cuban radio, over 250 Soviet personnel are involved in this expedition, which will last "approximately a year or longer." Private sources, in and out of Cuba, estimate that the actual number of Soviets will be in the neighborhood of 1,000 or more. In addition, the Cuban radio states that an unspecified number of Czechs will join the expedition at a later date.

With regard to the intentions of Castro's "fishing fleet," State Department Aid William C. Herrington testified last January 29 before the Senate that many of Castro's fishing craft are thought to be spy vessels, and said that the numbers had increased over the past year. Other sources, among them the Organization of American States, have established the military nature of Castro's fishing fleet in gun running and infiltrating terrorists into Latin American countries. Units of the fishing fleet, which will comprise a great part of the Soviet underwater expedition, are known to be equipped with electronics equipment in no way related to the task of fishing.

Interest in hostile naval activities just off our shores is now heightened by the announcement from Moscow that three Soviet vessels are towing a drydock from the Baltic Sea to Havana Harbor.

According to military analysts, the apparent backdown by the Soviets during the missile crisis of 1962 was due to the lack of a Soviet naval base to support Russia's military offensive in this hemisphere. The conclusion drawn at the time by these same military analysts was that, should the Soviets remain in Cuba, the preparation of naval facilities in the Caribbean would claim a high priority. This prediction seems now on the verge of fulfillment.

Dr. Osvaldo Aguirre, President of the Speleological Society of Cuba, now a refugee in Miami, relates Soviet marine studies to the military use of sea caves.

Dr. Aguirre notes that the Cuban Government announcement states that the Soviet expedition is to initiate investigations. Yet, Dr. Aguirre reports that those explorations have been going on for "more than a year and a half."

The Cuban cave expert elaborated on Soviet military activities in the following statement:

"Information sent to us from our own sources inside Cuba indicates that the Soviets now are preparing to construct secret underwater bases in Cape of San Antonio and at the Ensenada de Guadiana.

"Large perforations are being made underwater from near Cape Buenavista onward toward the port of Mariel in Pinar del Rio Province. This has been going on for 14 months.

"Cuba has quantities of underwater caves of various sizes and shapes—some more than a hundred yards wide and of great depth. They are spacious enough to serve as submarine pens where the submarines can hide undetected."

From the Isle of Pines comes corroborating evidence. Li Chih, a Chinese-Cuban reported over a year ago on the use of sea caves in that area:

"The Soviets have taken over all major hotels, and the place is swarming with Russians—mostly in uniform.

"The belief among the Cubans in the area is that sea caves are being converted into 'natural' submarine pens."

On land, a new shipment of arms from Russia arrived at the port of Matanzas on August 11. They were unloaded from four Soviet ships of various tonnage under the bynow familiar security precautions.

Included in the cargo are amphibious tanks of undetermined number, security cargo, and new military trucks and trailers. One convoy unloaded from the ships contained 12 enormous 26-wheeled truck trailers.

Still another convoy, larger than the first, carried cylindrical objects which were covered with tarpaulins. They are believed by the underground to be missiles. Each truck contained two Russians, and the convoy, like the previous one, was escorted by Soviet soldiers in jeeps, and by truckloads of Cuban militia. All entrance roads to the highway were blocked by security guards armed with machineguns. The route of the convoys took them to the south of Las Villas Province, east of Matanzas.

The use of the port of Matanzas for the introduction of missiles has been reported on previous occasions. (See "Intermediate-Range Missiles in Cuba, States Intelligence Report," FCN No. 8, vol. 2, Aug. 10, 1964.)

On the heels of these reports come others: Russian youths of 17 and 18 years of age, newly recruited into the Soviet Army, are being sent to Cuba. They are in camps at Torrens, and Guajay-El Chico, Habana suburbs.

General headquarters of the Soviet Army of occupation has been located in the Kohly section of Havana. The building housing the Russian general headquarters in Kohly is known to the Cubans, ironically, as the "White House."

The few remaining Cuban families in the Kohly section have been removed. Their

houses have been reconditioned for occupancy by newly arriving Soviet personnel.

More Russians and their families have been located in the section called Plaza del Medio Dia, where 1,000 houses have been put at their disposal.

Another area is being readied for the arrival of more Soviets. The section is the beach of Vista del Mar, between Quiebra Hacha and Mariel on the north coast of Pinar del Rio Province.

Soviet soldiers are busily constructing underground bases in a hill near Guanabacoa, on the north coast of Havana Province. This work which commenced 6 months ago, followed the destruction of pre-1962 obsolete Soviet military emplacements.

Eyewitnesses, among them Victor Alegria Torres, former secretary of Foreign Affairs of the now Communist-captured Cuban Confederation of Labor, believe that missile silos are being constructed in that area.

He reports that the familiar 26-wheeled truck trailers arrived at the site of construction bearing hollow cylindrical objects. Sections of these tubes, or objects, were then lowered vertically into the ground by heavy duty cranes and assembled by Russian crews. The diameter of these sections is described as between 6 and 8 feet, large enough to silo an IRBM.

The entire area is camouflaged by grass and shadow-casting eucalyptus trees.

Commenting on the Soviet missile potential in Cuba, Fidel Castro's sister Juana, who defected last June, had this to say in an interview printed August 18 in the Brazilian newspaper "Tribuna":

"Cuba is militarily very strong, said Juanita, the Soviets help the country to arm itself. This help does not extend to the economic field. In Cuba there are long-range ballistic missiles which are well camouflaged."

Spokesmen for the United States insist that there are no missiles in Cuba. Castro obviously does not agree with that assessment. He bluntly refused to answer a question as to whether ballistic missiles are in Cuba, put to him by Barnard L. Collier, of the New York Herald Tribune, thus adding to mounting circumstantial evidence that the Soviet-Cuban base is more, not less, dangerous than it was in 1962.

SOVIET BASES THREATEN GUANTANAMO

The U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo is surrounded by Russian bases.

Soviet soldiers have built a system of military establishments which is intended to "destroy the U.S. base at Guantanamo." This is the most recent information on Soviet military activity in Cuba, and was brought out by a former employee of the Cuban high command. The intelligence on Soviet fortifications surrounding the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo, given out by Jose Luis Nunez Hernandes, is corroborated by another escapee—Juan Bennedetti Lopez.

Nunez Herrera traveled extensively to various military establishments in Cuba. He did so as a medical aide to high officials of the Cuban general staff, and states that military matters often were discussed in his presence. Among them were those related to the Soviet encirclement of the U.S. naval base.

According to Nunez Herrera, Soviet officers and military technicians have been supervising the construction of a solid horseshoe of military emplacements around the naval base. Guantanamo Naval Base is under permanent lease to the United States, and is used almost exclusively as a training base for U.S. personnel.

Nunez Herrera states that the Soviet fortifications include a vast underground network carved into the hills and mountains, and that they are manned almost entirely by Soviet soldiers. Cuban militia are used only as security guards, and are stationed outside the Russian bases.

In conversations held between Soviet officers and Minister of Defense Raul Castro, the former medical aid learned that the Soviet construction was considered inadequate for defense purposes. Their conversations indicated that they will be used to strike first to inflict the greatest possible damage on the U.S. base.

Juan Bennedetti Lopez, an escapee from the city of Guantamano, supported the testimony of the former medical aid. In a separate interview, Bennedetti Lopez not only spoke of the Soviet buildup in the hills, but claimed that such construction included bases for missles.

"All of the hills surrounding the U.S. naval base are filled with every type of armament. The armament includes missiles of various sizes, including those of long range. Russian officers are in complete command."

The escapee spoke of the construction which the Russians have been carrying on near a small town called Yerba Guinea:

"Near the small town of Yerba Guinea, the Russians are working ceaselessly on underground fortifications. Enormous truck trailers carrying large cases covered with tarpaulins constantly move into the hills behind the town where the Soviets are working. There is a great number of Russians in the area, and the military traffic is so great that Cubans are not permitted on the highway."

Neither of the Cuban escapees would venture an estimate of the number of Soviet troops in the area. However, Bennedetti Lopez inferred from the amount of supplies sent to one small base that the numbers must be great. He stated that six large Russian trucks came to the city of Guantanamo once each week and left completely loaded with meat, rice, canned milk, and canned Soviet hams. This was for one of the lesser establishments. The larger bases are supported by truck convoy from Cuba's second largest city, Santiago.

Questions regarding the number of Soviet and Soviet bloc troops moving into Cuba were given heightened emphasis by the testimony of Jorge Rodriguez Echemendia. The 24-year-old worked at the Havana Airport of Rancho Boyeros where he witnessed the arrival of large numbers of Soviet and what he described as Chinese military men. He identified the flights as those that arrive in Cuba from Prague. None of the passengers was subjected to customs examination, and they moved in and out of the airport in semi-military formation, though dressed in military clothes.

Echemendia's information checks with that of several other escapees interviewed by the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba. All agree that the numbers of Soviet troops, military technicians, and others of similar description have not diminished over the past year or more. Of some 45 persons interviewed in the past 6 weeks, not one agreed with an assessment that the Communist bloc personnel in Cuba are preponderately in the category of civilian technicians. They are, according to those interviewed, 90-percent military and 10-percent civilian.

Hon. Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I feel regretful that my friend, Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico has decided to retire from the House of Representatives at the expiration of his present term.

I do wish Dr. FERNÓS many, many years of happiness and success in the Puerto Rican Senate where he will serve together with Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following editorial published in the Washington Post of September 25, 1964:

ENVOY TO CONGRESS

For 18 years, an unpretentious and likable physician has been the voice of Puerto Rico in the U.S. Congress. It is true that Puerto Rico's Resident Commissioner, Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, has earned no gaudy celebrity in that time. His methods have been those of quiet persuasion, and he has eschewed hucksterism and humbug. But his record is impressive, he has an enviable reputation for sincerity and fairness, and as he prepares to return to Puerto Rico, he deserves a warm "well done."

When Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN arrived in 1946, his own post was appointive and his country bore the melancholy reputation of being "the stricken land." Since then, the island's wealth has tripled, hope has supplanted despair, and Puerto Rico has become a self-governing Commonwealth within the American Union. The Resident Commissioner, it should be added, has been an elective office since 1948.

This quiet nonvoting delegate to Congress has played a key role in framing the legislation that has altered the island's destiny. Now he is returning to run for the Puerto Rican Senate (along with his retiring chief, Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín), where his experience may further benefit the island. His likely successor, the nominee of the dominant Popular Democratic Party, is Santiago Polanco Abreu, Speaker of the Puerto Rican House. But before the guard changes, a group of friends of Puerto Rico will gather on Saturday to express their affection and respect for Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN. He has surely earned both.

United Steelworkers of America Resolution in Support of the ARA Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the United Steelworkers of America AFL–CIO, in recent convention passed many policy resolutions, one of which stated its support of the ARA program.

Although the district which I represent may be eligible for this program only 6 more months, other areas do need the legislation and I thought my colleagues would find the views expressed in the following resolution both informative and interesting:

SECTION 9. AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

President John F. Kennedy signed the Area Redevelopment Act into law on May 1, 1961, 6 years and two Eisenhower vetoes after organized labor had begun the struggle on Capitol Hill.

Five months later Congress appropriated money for its operation, and after a great

deal of necessary preliminary work, the ARA's job-creating money began to flow into the distressed areas on the Nation.

Although the ARA program provides new Federal assistance, communities must organize representative committees—labor, management, educators, agriculture, private organizations, public officials—to participate in the program.

Members of the United Steelworkers of America in distressed areas have an opportunity to cooperate with other civic groups in this community endeavor. By serving on and participating in local development committees, steelworkers have helped in restoring Dunkirk, N.Y., Wheeling, W. Va., and other communities to economic health. Such efforts to provide new jobs deserve our firm support.

Our members can help safeguard their own interests by seeing that these programs protect local labor from exploitation. We of the steelworkers union have raised special problems (particularly involving investment in reinforcing bar manufacturing facilities), with the Area Redevelopment Administration. As a result of our efforts, an industry-wide study was undertaken by the ARA of working and marketing conditions. Based on the findings of this study our union and ARA have agreed that ARA should concentrate its financial assistance to those sectors of this industry which, by expanding, create new and permanent jobs with wage levels commensurate with accepted industry standards, and will not add capacity doomed to ultimate idleness.

Future investments by ARA in this industry are to be governed by the following guidelines, outlined by ARA pursuant to our joint discussions:

"1. ARA will not accept for processing projects which will compete mainly with existing domestic iron and steel capacity until the industry has maintained a fairly consistent and measurable degree of recovery.

"2. Projects offering the promise of import displacement will be considered only after the applicant has demonstrated that the project's cost of production and geographic position will insure its successful operation with a minimum of competition with the domestic steelmaking facilities which normally serve the area.

"3. In determining the reliability of an applicant's proposed cost of production, ARA will examine:

"(a) the cost of raw material and, in the case of steel scrap, will not accept cost projections based on a continuation of currently depressed prices;

"(b) the wages to be paid, and will not accept cost projections based on wages below the average wage levels for the industry.

"4. In processing such projects, ARA will obtain information on capacity from BDSA and will utilize BDSA in reviewing all such proposals submitted for ARA consideration.

"5. No ARA loan for steelmaking facilities shall be approved by the ARA unless the ARA shall first find that the proposed project is economically feasible and unless the ARA shall find that no domestic iron and steel producers are now supplying to the area proposed to be served by the applicant, any substantial quantities of the products to be made by the applicant, and furthermore, that the operation of the proposed facility will not reduce the employment at any of the domestic plants currently serving said territory, giving the basis for such finding in reasonable detail."

The United Steelworkers of America has supported the area redevelopment program because its purpose is to meet the job needs of the unemployed without jeopardizing job security of employed workers. We believe that the ARA has fulfilled this task admirably in the face of unwarranted criticism by those to whom the plight of unemployed Americans is only a statistic and not a reality.

The accomplishments of this new agency are impressive. By July 1 of 1964, ARA has approved 507 projects involving industrial loans and public facility assistance and will have created 70,000 jobs directly and 45,000 more indirectly—when completed a total of 115,000. Another 210 propects involving 27,000 new jobs have been received by ARA, but are not yet finally approved. Behind these an additional 316 projects involving 30,000 potential new jobs are in the planning stage for submission to ARA. Further, 753 retraining programs have been approved under ARA involving over 33,000 jobless workers, of whom almost 20,000 have completed retraining with a reported placement rate of over 75 percent. New production methods, research and development projects, engineering studies and other activities designed to combat unemployment and create new permanent jobs have been aided financially through the technical assistance program of the Area Redevelopment Administration Act. In the Cuyuna and Mesabi regions of the Minnesota iron ore ranges, ARA assisted specifically to find new processes for the utilization of low-grade iron ores. Some of these new processes have proved themselves so useful that, once they are fully exploited, we can expect a possible regeneration of the Minnesota iron ore industry.

The effectiveness of the ARA program is illustrated by the halt, indeed reversal, of the trend toward higher rates of unemployment in depressed areas. A broad sample of 79 major depressed labor market areas show that, from 1961 to 1963, unemployment declined from 11 percent to 7.6 percent, a rate of decline faster than that for the Nation as a whole. Even hard-core areas have shown improvement. For example, the number of unemployed in West Virginia dropped to a 10-year low in 1964.

A year ago it became evident that additional funds would be required to carry forward the ARA program. The agency expects to create 190,000 jobs with its original authorization when all its moneys are committed. Therefore, legislation to amend the act and increase its authorization was introduced in June of last year. A proposal has been approved by the Senate, 65 to 30, but was defeated by 5 votes in the House of Representatives. A scaled-down version of the bill is now awaiting clearance by the Rules Committee and it is hoped that the House will approve it during this current session of Congress. Early action will be needed by the Congress to insure continuation of this vitally necessary agency, as the present act expires on June 30, 1965.

Economic development of depressed areas must not fail. Too many of our members are in once-booming depressed areas, which because of technological changes and market shifts have become desolate.

Therefore, the United Steelworkers of America asks that Congress evaluate this promising program in terms of its great contribution to the forward development of America's economy, and urges speedy passage of the amendments to the Area Redevelopment Act in order to make available this vital assistance to areas with high unemployment. We urge prompt action by the Congress to continue and strengthen the area redevelopment program for an additional 4 years, so that we can do more and learn more about solving the economic dislocations that go along with an expanding and technologically advancing economy.

We further urge that the ARA continue its rigorous enforcement of its congressional mandate to reject projects which would merely result in the reallocation of jobs or job opportunities from one area of the United States to another.

President Johnson Dedicates Lake Eufaula Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, September 25, was a day of great historic significance for Oklahoma and the entire Southwest.

On that day, more than 50,000 Oklahomans and our friends from nearby States gathered at Lake Eufaula for the dedication by President Lyndon Johnson of the Eufaula Dam.

Completion of this great reservoir is the greatest milestone of this century in Oklahoma's march of progress. I think it was most fitting that the dedication speech was delivered by one of the all-time congressional champions of water resource development—President Johnson.

As the years have gone by, the Eufaula project more and more has come to be a bipartisan undertaking with support by both Democrats and Republicans in Congress. This is the way we would like to have it.

However, history will forever record that Eufaula Dam and Reservoir was initiated by Democrats in Congress, it was authorized for the first time by a Democratic Congress, and appropriated for the first time by a Democratic Congress over the very determined opposition of a Republican President.

President Lyndon Johnson on the other hand has been a stalwart champion of the Arkansas River from its very inception and he continues to be a champion today.

We in Oklahoma are proud of President Johnson for his great record as a leader in water resource and natural resource development. He is not afraid of the future. President Johnson knows that money spent in developing our great inland waterways is truly an investment in the future of America and the dividends far exceed the investment.

In addition to President Johnson, Oklahomans were fortunate to have on hand another great champion of natural resource development, the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN. We were proud to have Congressman KIRWAN share our joy on that historic day.

Eufaula Dam and Reservoir is a vital link in the multipurpose program of developing the Arkansas River. With this great dam now dedicated, we look forward to the completion of navigation on the Arkansas River and we are ready to go on with the work to complete the entire project.

Oklahomans shall long remember the words President Johnson spoke at the dedication ceremonies. His message has significance for all Americans. At this time, I wish to insert into the RECORD the complete text of the President's remarks:

The PRESIDENT. Governor Bellmon, Senator Monroney, Senator Edmondson, Governor Connally, of Texas, Congressman Albert, our great Majority Leader, Ed Edmondson, and other distinguished members of the Oklahoma delegation to the Congress, all of whom are making a great contribution to our country—and I want to say on behalf of all the people of this Nation that we, the people of the United States, are deeply in the debt of the people of Oklahoma for the quality of the men that they send to the U.S. Congress. I could talk about your Senators, MONRONEY and EDMONDSON; I could spend days talking about your House delegation, particularly your majority leader; but I want to say that none of the things that we have accomplished this year, and this is one of the finest years, one of the finest hours of the U.S. Congress, could have happened except under the leadership of the Oklahoma delegation, and particularly that fine, young Majority Leader, CARL ALBERT.

This is a great day for the Sooners. I thank you for letting a Texan have a little slice of it. But Texans and the people of Oklahoma alike share the memories of the days before dams like this remade the earth. I grew up on land like this back in Texas. I am going back to it when I finish here this evening. That land is thin soil, scrub oak and blackjack trees. The Pedernales River that runs in front of my little farmhouse was just a trickle in the dry season, but when the rains came down from the hills, the Pedernales always drowned all of us.

Many of us remember those days. We remember the want and the despair, the devastating cycle of flood and drought, the ruined crops and the Dust Bowl. Worst of all was the great waste, the waste of resources, the waste of crops, the waste of men and women.

I went to Washington then to serve in Congress under a great leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Over the years of progress which he began, we have seen our States change from brown to green, from dry, eroded country to grassy land dotted with lakes and pools. We saw a nation afraid become a nation of hope. We saw a people divided become a people united, and to the memory of that progress, and to the determination that our children will never suffer that neglect, I have come to the great State of Oklahoma today to dedicate this great dam to you great people.

I have devoted much of my 30 years of public career to the conservation of America's natural resources. So have MIKE MONRONEY and HOWARD EDMONDSON and CARL ALBERT and ED EDMONDSON. So did our great beloved friend, the giant of them all, Bob Kerr, who is watching down on us today. This dam was one of his dreams, and I only wish that he could be here with us.

You know, in 1940, after I had been in Congress several years, I looked up the number of homes with electric lighting in my State, and we had 59 out of every 100. Today we have 100 percent rural electrification. In Oklahoma they had 55 percent of their homes electrified in 1940. Today they have 100. In Louisiana they had 49. Today 100. In Arkansas they had 33, today 100. Arkansas had 45 percent of its homes that had running water in 1940. Today it has 72. Louisiana had 44 with running water. Today it is 87. Oklahoma had 46; today it is 89. Texas had 56; today it is 91.

The percentage of homes that use wood for cooking, 76 out of every 100 in Arkansas in 1940. Louisiana had 50; today it has 4. Oklahoma had 32—32 homes out of every 100 used wood for cooking. Today only 2 out of every 100.

In the number of autos, Oklahoma had 387,000 autos in 1933. Today she has 982,000—3 to 1. Arkansas had 155,000; today she has 589,000. Louisiana had 190,000; today she has 1,042,000. Texas had 1,015,000 in 1933. Today she has 4,000,011.

The percentage of homes with refrigerators, Texas had 36 in 1940, per hundred. Today she has 98. Oklahoma had 31; today she has 98. Louisiana had 24; today she has 98.

The percentage of farmer-owned occupied farms, Arkansas had 37 that had homeownership out of every 100. Today she had 76. Louisiana had 33; today she has 75. Oklahoma in 1930 had only 38 out of every 100 farms owned by the man that lived on them. Today not 38 in Oklahoma, but 80. And Texas was 38 in 1930, and 78 today.

So you can see the progress that we have made with the help of men that you have sent to Congress in that period of 20 or 30 years in homeownership, in lighting our homes, in improving our standard of living, and to the memory of that progress and to the determination of the people who led the way, I salute you today.

Our very first President, George Washington, looked at the vast possibilities of harnessing our great rivers and prayed, "Would God that we may have the wisdom and the courage to improve them." Improve these rivers as you have done. For years we ignored his warning. Reckless exploitation and ruthless plunder lay waste the rich earth. But then some farsighted men, men of every party and of every section, men like Theodore Roosevelt, men like Franklin Roosevelt, men like John F. Kennedy, men like Robert S. Kerr, men like Mike Monroney and your House delegation, all began to act and to protect and to develop the natural resources, not only of Oklahoma, but of all the Nation, and the result has been a fuller and a richer life for all of our people, and a much better life for those people that will grow up. These men knew that conservation was not a "pork barrel," that it was not make-work, that it was not a giveaway. It was an investment in the future of America. It was the best kind of economy. In this way we could assure our children the natural resources.

I remember coming to Oklahoma to help dedicate Bob Kerr's book, "Land, Wood and Water," on which the strength of our Nation and the prosperity of our people depended. The Government has a responsibility never to waste taxpayers' money, but the Government also had a responsibility never to waste the Nation's resources. The real wasters, the real spendthrifts, are those who are neglecting the needs of today and destroying the hopes of tomorrow. Our country just cannot afford this kind of waste.

Only 35 years ago we began to open up the Ohio River Basin. Then men of little vision cried out against this as "pork barrel." They were against this progress. Well, we ignored their warnings. We moved ahead. Since World War II alone, over $21 billion of new industry development has taken place in the counties along the Ohio and its navigable tributaries, and one of the great statesmen of Ohio is here today. He not only participated in developing the State of Ohio, he has been one of the ringleaders in developing the State of Oklahoma. I want to call his name. His name is the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN, Congressman from the State of Ohio. Stand up, MIKE.

New jobs and new business, and a steadily improving life, have come to all the people of the area. Men like Congressman KIRWAN have not been content just to look after their own State or their own section. They have been men with national vision. As a result of their national vision you have the monument here to them today.

So that is the story of the development of the United States, and that is the story of the development of the Arkansas River Basin. The Eufaula Dam is a key part of the development of the Arkansas River. It will provide a new link between the Southwest and our industrial heartland. It will provide relief from devastating floods and give us electricity to homes and businesses. It will mean new industry, new jobs, and new opportunities for the people. It will mean a stronger Oklahoma, a more prosperous Oklahoma, a richer Oklahoma, and a stronger United States.

That development will go ahead, and as President, I am here to promise you that it will go on schedule.

I just had to break my budget one time this year. I had a very prudent budget. I had $1 billion less in the budget this year than last year. I was determined to keep it that way until MIKE MONRONEY, CARL ALBERT, JOHN MCCLELLAN, and all this bunch of highjackers from Oklahoma came down there and pounded that Cabinet desk one afternoon and it cost me $14 million, but it got your Arkansas River development back on schedule.

But I would like to look beyond the celebration of today to the challenge of tomorrow, especially to your growing need for water, for this is a land which knows the meaning of water. By the year 2000 more than 300 million Americans will require 888 billion gallons of water a day. This is three times what you are using now. We cannot meet that challenge by looking backward. We cannot meet it by finding things wrong with our Government. We cannot meet it by complaining.

We must meet it by dreaming and executing those dreams. We must meet it by looking forward to the real, and to the men of tomorrow. We must meet it first by going full speed ahead at every level of government in the comprehensive development of our river basins. We cannot approach the problems of water conservation and flood control and recreation and navigation on a piecemeal and divided basis. We must develop river basins as a whole, to use all of our resources while preserving scenic values.

Second, we must step up our efforts to fight the destructive cycle of flood and drought. We have increased flood control programs by more than 50 percent, but we cannot rest on past achievements if we are to rescue our land from the ravages of nature.

Third, we must develop a national policy to attack the pollution of our water, and the pollution of the air that we breathe. This must require research, this will require increased construction of treatment plants and better methods of control. Polluted water is wasted water, and America cannot afford such waste.

Fourth, we will continue to press ahead with weather satellites, deep sea nuclear weather stations, and other scientific advances so that we can understand the weather and so that we can become its master.

Fifth, I am asking for early passage of the Water Resources Planning Act to help us look ahead to future patterns of water needs, to look ahead to plan our projects so that supply will be ready for demand.

Sixth, we will begin to draw fresh water from the oceans before very long. We already have plants in operation that are converting salt and brackish water into 2½ million gallons of fresh water every day, and within a few years desalted water will be an actual reality for millions of Americans.

Three things, and three things only, sustain life on this planet. They are—a thin layer of soil, a cover of atmosphere, and a little rainfall. This is all that the good Lord has given us except one thing: He has given us a choice of what we will do with it. We can waste it. We can pollute it. We can neglect it. Or we can conserve it, and we can protect it, and we can develop it, and we can pass it along to our children, more promising, more abundant than we found it when we discovered America.

I know, I think, what your answer wants to be. I think I know what you ought to do about it. I think your answer is here in this great dam that was built because of your confidence, built because of your support, built not only to make life more pleasant and more productive and more prosperous for you, but for your children and for your grandchildren.

The West was not settled by men who looked back. It was not settled by men who called a halt to progress. It is not held by such men today. Let me say just one thing more:

It was about 10 months ago that we had a great tragedy in Dallas, Tex., and the awesome responsibility of being President of all the people of this country fell into my lap. Although I had spent 33 years in Washington as a clerk, as a Congressman, as a Senator, as a minority leader, as a majority leader, as Vice President, I still felt inadequate to the responsibilities of leading 190 million people and trying to provide hope and leadership for the other free people that live in a world that is made up of 3 billions.

I asked for God's help and for yours. I have done my dead-level best. I have worked with everything that God gave me. I have spent all the energy that I had. I have tried to be careful and prudent. I have tried to be fair and judicious. I have tried to be farsighted and foresighted. I have tried to look forward and not backward. I have tried to develop the land that I would be proud of, and my children would enjoy living in. I found that we had much to preserve and much to protect.

We have the greatest system of government in all the world. We have the highest standard of living of any people anywhere. We have a minimum wage that says to our workers they must pay you this minimum and they must work you this maximum, and in just the short period that I have been in Congress we have gone from 25 cents minimum to $1.25 minimum. Just the short time I have been there we are working less hours per day and less days per week, and less weeks per year. We have more time for recreation, more time for the luxuries of life than our fathers and grandfathers had, to come out to lakes like this and dams like this.

We have a social security system that will give us a modicum of income when we reach our maturity and are no longer able to stay in the labor market. We are proud of the farm programs that we have had that have raised the income of our tenant farmers, that have raised our homeownership, that have brought us rural electrification. I flew over this afternoon from Muskogee and looked at all the little ponds that were filled with water that had been built here in just the last few years. I said to Senator MONRONEY he must be mighty proud of the efforts that he and other Congressmen from Oklahoma had made because that was a tribute not only to them, but to their people, that they had made this soil better, through their own efforts.

Well, there are voices that have questioned me about minimum wage. When I voted for the first bill it was 25 cents an hour, and they told me it would ruin me and they said it would ruin the labor organizations, too, but we are all here, and it looks to me like we are doing better at $1.25 than we were at 25 cents.

I remember before I was elected when I was just a kid secretary talking to my Congressman about voting for social security, and I heard all the scare arguments and all the fright that they tried to put into men. They said it is socialistic, it is compulsory, it is evil, it will destroy our form of government. I think we are better for it. I think we are stronger for it. I think we are richer for it. I don't think many people would like to do away with either our minimum wage or our social security.

As your President, I deal every day with the problems that affect your freedom and affect the peace of the world. Those problems may be remote from this peaceful site out here this afternoon. Not many of you get waked up in the night about Cyprus, of Zanzibar, or Vietnam, but I never send a reconnaissance mission out about 11 o'clock, with our planes and our boys guiding them to take a look at what is developing, and realize they have to be back at 3:30 in the morning, but what promptly at 3:25 I wake up without an alarm clock, because I want to be sure my boys got back, and sometimes they don't come back. There are those that say you ought to go North and drop bombs, to try to wipe out the supply lines, and they think that would escalate the war.

We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys. We don't want to get involved in a nation with 700 million people and get tied down in a land war in Asia. There are some that say we ought to go south and get out and come home, but we don't like to break our treaties and we don't like to walk off and leave people who are searching for freedom, and suffering to obtain it, and walk out on them. We remember when we wanted our freedom from Great Britain, and we remember the people that helped us with it, and we'll never forget them. So we don't want to run out on them.

So what are we doing? We're staying there and supplying them with some of the things that we have, some of the things that the richest, most powerful nation in the world has developed. We have some tanks, some planes, and some helicopters. We have 20,000 men out there advising and helping them, and we're hoping that some way, somehow, these people that are invading them and trying to envelop them and trying to take their freedom away from them will some day decide that it's not worth the price and they will leave their neighbors alone and we can have peace in the world. But we are not about to start another war and we're not about to run away from where we are.

Now, our hopes for the future, our hopes for peace, rest on our strength, and I can look you in the eye and I tell you in truth and sincerity today that we are better prepared than we have ever been prepared in our lifetime, and we are prepared because of the strength that you are building here and the qualities that you bring to your work.

I ask each of you to look back to your own lives. Remember not too far back. Just look at the 1930's that I was talking about a moment ago, or the early 1940's, and see if there are any of you, if there's one among you, who are better clothed, doesn't make more money, doesn't pay more taxes and doesn't live in a stronger, a richer, a better, and finer nation.

Now, what we have in the future and how we rank in the world will depend largely upon you people. If you invited me down here this afternoon and expected me to tell you all that was wrong with your country, and how we have failed, and how everything was in a mess, then you invited the wrong fellow. Today we have more fellows working than we've ever had in the history of the United States. They're living in better homes, they're eating better food and more of it. They are wearing better clothes, they are driving better automobiles, they have got more savings, they have got higher wages, they have got better income, their children are better educated, their health is better, their doctors are better, their hospitals are better, they have more of the pleasures of life.

The strength of America today, the strength of America in the years to come, will depend upon you and you must build that strength, because it depends upon the vision of the people, and on their willingness to look to the future and not to the past. Here's your look at the future. That's what you dreamed, that's what you want, that's what you have. Aren't you proud of Oklahoma? I am.

If any of you have martyr complexes, you are going to be disappointed. If any of you are distressed and depressed with yourself and expect me to come down here and feel sorry for you, you are going to be disappointed. I'm proud of you. I recognize what you have done. I recognize what this Government has done with your help, and I want to tell you we not only have much to preserve and much to protect, but we have much to learn.

If you will just go back to the Good Book and practice some of the teachings of the Lord, if we will just follow the Golden Rule and do unto others as we would have them do unto us, if we just engage in a little introspection and look where we were and where we are, we won't be unhappy very long. We won't feel sorry for ourselves very long.

We have done mighty well. We have a lot to be thankful for, and one of the things that I am thankful for at present is the prayers and the support and the good will and the faith of God-fearing men and women like you, and like this great delegation that you sent there to help me. We are not out of the woods. Some of our friends talk about a crisis a week. Well, sometimes I don't think they know much about the Government until we have a crisis a day and a crisis an hour, and we're always having crises. But we're not going to be crybabies. We're going to stand up like men and face them, and we're going to win.

We're going to win because we have faith and because we have the support of people and because we're builders and because we look forward to leaving this world a better place than we found it.

Thank you for inviting us here. I wish I could stay all day, but I have two other engagements along the road down here in Arkansas and back in Texas tonight, but if you will invite me back sometime, I'll bring my boat and we'll have a good sail together.

Thank you.

Developing an American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent previously obtained, I offer for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the September 26 issue of the Marine Digest. The editorial points up the critical importance of our developing an American Merchant Marine:

RACE FOR WORLD TRADE ROUTES

Now and then we read of Soviet plans for developing her merchant marine as part of her ultimate goal of world economic domination. But, very few of us have any realization of how great her ambition is in this area and how she intends to bring it to reality.

Writing in the September issue of the Atlantic, Hanson W. Baldwin, long the military editor of the New York Times, tells the story as he sees it under the grim title "Red Flag Over the Seven Seas." After citing a wealth of facts and figures, he says this: "The startling objective of the Soviet maritime program is a seagoing merchant marine totaling somewhere between 20 million and

27 million tons of shipping in the 1975–80 period, the largest maritime fleet in the world."

Then, later in his article, after presenting more impressive sets of figures, he writes: "There can be only one major reason for such grandiose aims. Russia, already trading with some 60 foreign countries, is engaged in a race to capture the trade routes of the world."

Mr. Baldwin is somewhat critical of our own merchant marine in certain aspects. But the controversies such criticisms arouse must not be allowed to obscure the overall need and problem. The war between the Soviet Union and the free world is being fought with economic weapons, and in all probability it will continue to be—neither power seeks to raze the globe. In this war, our merchant marine is a vital and basic weapon. The use we make of it—and the support we give it—will have much to do with our ability to meet the determined Soviet challenge. For, as Mr. Baldwin writes at the end, "Soviet wings over the seas cast a shadow over tomorrow * * * Russia's challenge already is formidable, and it will grow." And that is why the United States must do all in its power to encourage the growth of a second-to-none merchant marine.

Duke Endowment 40th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to hear a magnificent address by Henry C. Alexander, chairman of the board, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., at the Duke Endowment 40th Anniversary Banquet, Charlotte Country Club, Charlotte, N.C., on Thursday, September 24, 1964. I commend this timely and superb address to the attention of the Congress and the people of this Nation:

ADDRESS BY HENRY C. ALEXANDER, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, MORGAN GUARANTY TRUST CO., AT THE DUKE ENDOWMENT 40TH ANNIVERSARY BANQUET, CHARLOTTE COUNTRY CLUB, CHARLOTTE, N.C., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1964

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cocke, Governor Sanford, Governor Russell, Mayor Brookshire, Mrs. Semans—beloved by her fellow trustees of the Duke Endowment and by all her friends as "Little Mary"—ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy to be here tonight for a number of reasons. One is my great respect for James Buchanan Duke, a pioneer of American industry and of American philanthropy. In a very real sense, he is the guest of honor here tonight. It is a pleasure for me to join a group of friends and admirers of Mr. Duke, and of the enterprises and institutions that are even today the best witness to his achievements.

It is an honor to be introduced by Norman Cocke. He and his very able successor at the helm of Duke Power Co., Bill McGuire, have had a large part in fulfilling the great ambitions which Mr. Duke cherished for that company and for this entire area.

My heart is gladdened by the opportunity this occasion affords me, a Southerner by birth, to come to this beautiful and charming city once again. Ancestors of mine once lived here, so I have a warm feeling for Charlotte and Mecklenburg County.

Those of you who have studied the history of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence may recall that six men bearing the name Alexander were among the signers. Some of the Alexander family later moved on from Mecklenburg County into Tennessee. As a descendant of that branch of the family, I can assure you that they carried with them, and handed down, a deep pride that they had been here and had joined in that bold stroke for freedom.

I do not wish to add further confusion or controversy to the scholarship surrounding the Mecklenburg declaration, but I am tempted to share with you a bit of family legend. No scrap of historical evidence supports it, and I volunteer it here, not as part of the Mecklenburg chapter in American history, but only as a matter of fair warning to this audience.

This family legend has it that after the declaration was signed on that Friday night in May of 1775, one of the Alexanders was chosen to ride with a copy of it to Philadelphia, where the second Continental Congress was in session. At that point the legend trails off into anticlimax. He did not get to Philadelphia. In fact, he was never heard from again.

In the privacy of the family we sometimes speculate as to what fate may have befallen him. Perhaps Indians, perhaps Tories or British, perhaps a wrong turn in the road. But the real moral of this little piece of family folklore may be that, if you want a message delivered, you ought not to pick an Alexander to do it. That may also be the conclusion you will reach before I have finished my remarks here this evening.

Another reason I am happy to be here is that I have come at the invitation of my good friend, Tom Perkins. Tom, as a director of the bank where I work, is one of my bosses, and it is always pleasant to receive an invitation from the boss.

Twelve years ago your own Dr. Rankin gave an address on the life of Mr. Duke. He had been an intimate friend of Mr. Duke for many years and was closely connected with the Duke Endowment from its beginnings. Still he felt obligated to open his memorable tribute with an expression of personal modesty which is a classic. I would like to quote from it. Telling how he had come to accept the invitation to make the speech, he used these words:

"The trite warning that contrasts the impetuosity of fools with the circumspection of angels rang the bell of caution in the belfry of my cranium when the importunities of overconfident friends prevailed over sounder judgment and accumulated experience."

You may soon wish that, in similar circumstances, I had been more circumspect and less impetuous.

The occasion that draws us here is the 40th anniversary of a remarkable creation, the work of a most remarkable man. Many of you know far more about the Duke Endowment than I can hope to learn, for you have seen in your own communities the flow of benefits which it generates. I would not presume to recite to you the details of this unique legacy. Nor am I qualified to enumerate the ways in which James Duke's business genius, through the enterprises he built, has continued to invigorate and enrich this vital Southeast. As an example, the Duke Power Co. is spending $70 million to expand and improve its facilities this year. This is seed money for further economic growth throughout the Piedmont area. It represents the same kind of constructive foresight that the company's founder displayed so consistently throughout his business career.

We all know that Mr. Duke set out early in life to make a great fortune, and that he succeeded admirably. Throughout his life, however, he made it quite plain that, to him, wealth was less an end than a means. The keynote of his financial philosophy was that money should serve men, not the other way around.

No episode from his life better illustrates his essential qualities than one that occurred very late in his life—in his last year, in fact, and during his last visit to this city. It was the summer of 1925. This area was suffering a severe drought. Water was low in the Catawba and the other rivers that drove the hydroelectric plants of the Duke Power Co. Factories shut down, or ran on short hours. Men were laid off their jobs. Whole towns and industries were affected.

Mr. Duke had planted his powerful turbines on those streams in the confidence that they would be an unfailing source of energy to the communities they served. Until that terribly dry summer, they had justified his faith. But now they were faltering and he decided something must be done.

With characteristic decisiveness, while he was in Charlotte that July, he determined to build enough steam generating plants to insure an ample supply of electricity if water power should ever fail again.

At age 68, he threw himself into this project with the same energy and dedication he had brought to bear on problems throughout his life. On his orders, sites were selected, engineers were put to work surveying and designing, financing was provided, and plans were drawn.

In the midst of this, he was stricken with a severe illness. Confined to his bed under the constant care of doctors and nurses, he insisted on keeping in close touch with the major work he had launched. Finally, against all orders of his doctors, he summoned to his sickroom the engineers and company officials—all the key people concerned with the project. He went over their plans and figures in detail. When he was satisfied that the plans were sound, that they met the need he had seen, he gave the order to go ahead at full speed.

That was the kind of man Mr. Duke was. His sense of responsibility to the community would not let him rest, even in sickness and pain, until he knew that the necessary was going to be done.

When Mr. Duke died, that same year, he was saluted in hundreds of newspapers in all parts of the country. The New York Herald Tribune pointed out that he had been a benefactor to his native State in "a double sense."

First, the editors noted, he contributed to its growth and prosperity through his achievements as a businessman. Second, he turned back a large share of his wealth to give the State trained leaders in the learned professions and to help people help themselves in many other ways.

He was, in other words, a double-barreled philanthropist. And the volleys he fired from both barrels have been and still are heard not only in his native State but around the world. Both his business life and his benefactions were aimed at the goal which always seemed his first concern—the improvement of human resources. He sought always to make the most of men and to help men make the most of themselves.

Tonight we mark the 40th anniversary of the instrument he created to give continuity and permanence to the work he had begun. The mere statistics of those 40 years can only hint at the thrust of the force he set in motion—grants totaling $125 million to four splendid institutions of learning: Duke University, Furman University, Davidson College, and Johnson C. Smith University; $59 million to churches, hospitals, and child-care institutions in the Carolinas; $1½ million to retired clergymen and their families.

These are only figures. To understand what they mean, we have to look at them in the terms James Duke always had uppermost in his mind—human terms. We have to think of the thousands upon thousands of people whose lives, in one way or another, have been touched by this constructive force.

We have to consider the minds that have been enriched, the lives that have been saved, the pain that has been eased. Who, I would ask, can draw up an earnings statement or a balance sheet that would adequately set forth the scope of the enterprise conceived and launched by this inspired man?

Perhaps none of us can hope in these days to follow Mr. Duke's example on the scale which he set. All of us who respect the same values that he cherished, however, can serve them in a way appropriate to this time. Over and above what each of us may be able to give of personal means, I believe there is a question that demands our urgent consideration. What is to be the future place of private giving within the total humanitarian effort in this country?

In the 40 years since the establishment of the Duke Endowment, the amount of private charitable giving in this country—including gifts to churches, schools, hospitals, and all kinds of welfare activities—has risen from about $1 billion to about $10 billion per year.

This is very impressive growth—about a 900 percent increase. However, let us compare it with the increase that has occurred in the annual expenditure for health, education, and welfare by all levels of government. Here the growth has been from about $3 billion in 1924 to about $65 billion this year—a rise of more than 2,000 percent.

I suggest we should not be hasty in deploring the sheer size of this figure for public expenditure. It would take a good deal of analysis, which I have not performed, to support a judgment that the amount spent is too large. Some programs may be questionable, but for the most part the things that Government does in this field seem to be things that people want done and are willing to support with their tax money. About one-third of the total, for example, goes for public education, an investment with which not many are likely to quarrel.

I do believe, however, we should be uneasy that public philanthropy is growing so much faster than private. In recent years we have seen Government agencies assume a major role in health research. We have watched enrollments in tax-supported colleges and universities press past those in private institutions, even while private and corporate giving to higher education has been increasing very sharply. We hear expert projections which suggest that, by the end of this decade, nearly three-fourths of all college and university students may be enrolled in tax-supported schools.

Is this trend, in education and elsewhere, heading toward monopoly? Will government's growth in health, education, and welfare reduce private philanthropy to an inconsequential role in those fields, or force it out of them althogether? Thus far, private and tax-supported institutions have proved able to exist side by side. I hope this will continue to be so. But, we must admit, in most instances that come to mind the private sector is now far smaller than the public.

Why should we be concerned about maintaining a duality in these matters? Why do we need private philanthropy when government appears so willing to take on all responsibilities and simply levy taxes to meet the cost? Wouldn't this be much simpler, and more efficient, than the splintered, fragmented multitude of private agencies, with all the agonizing, duplicative fundraising they go through year after year?

The strongest answer to these questions is that we need private institutions in the fields of health, education, and welfare to provide leadership, encourage innovation, and guard the standards of quality in the administration of humanitarian measures. We need them also to keep the human quality of charity itself from succumbing to the dead hand of government control.

If generosity were ever to become a monopoly of the state, a part of the human spirit would die. Many of those who need help would be less humanely aided. Those who gladly give help would be less humanly ennobled. When all giving is to the tax collector, and all receiving is from some official bureau, the meaning will have gone out of being one's brother's keeper. This is repulsive to every tradition of mutual help that has come to us from the earliest days of this country. It is hard to imagine it could ever happen here.

Yet we would be foolish to ignore a campaign of pressure that presently is trying to put private giving on the defensive. This is the aggressive drive that is being waged against features of the tax law specifically designed to encourage private charitable endeavors. The theme of this attack is that charitable trusts and foundations, by their tax exemption, are depriving the Government of dollars rightfully belonging to it.

Proposals have been made in Congress that would seriously retard the ability of individuals and corporations to support charitable and educational causes. These proposals appear to rest on a belief that any charitable contribution, by giving rise to a tax reduction, takes money away from all taxpayers; and that tax exemption for the income of charitable foundations does the same thing.

This argument completely overlooks two facts. First, it overlooks the fact that the donor gives up the full value of his contribution. Even if he is in the highest tax bracket, the gift still represents a net cost to him. Whatever the tax consequences, he is poorer—in material terms—after making it than he was before. In spite of the folklore that has been woven about this subject, you cannot make money by giving it away.

Second, and more important, it overlooks the fact that a person or company making a charitable contribution is giving society a greater amount than is lost to the public treasury through the tax deduction. In the case of income earned by a charitable foundation, the benefit to society from the use of that income at least offsets—and very often exceeds—the loss to the public through the tax exemption.

This, of course, is the reason why the tax law provides deductibility for contributions and exemption for charitable foundations. With income tax rates as high as they are, private philanthropy would be doomed if the law did not do so. Any attack on this principle is a direct attack on the whole concept of voluntary support of humanitarian works.

There are, undeniably, abuses of tax exemption among foundations. But the solution to that is not to penalize all foundations or, as has been recommended, to suspend the establishment of new ones. If the present law is being violated, the offenders can and should be punished and the improper practices stopped. If the law has loopholes, they can be closed by setting standards more rigorously to insure that a foundation's purpose is truly and legitimately philanthropic if it is to qualify for exemption. It is not necessary to chop down the tree to get rid of the bad branches.

In marking the 40th anniversary of the Duke endowment, I have so far asked you to turn your attention back to beginnings, to review briefly events and accomplishments that have filled the intervening years, and to look about at some features of the current scene. On a 40th anniversary, I believe it is inevitable that we also look forward and indulge in some conjecture as to how things may appear when the Duke endowment completes its 50th year.

Perhaps the easiest thing to predict that far into the future is that the four educational institutions which principally benefit from the endowment will have gone through a period of challenge unlike anything in their long and distinguished pasts. The educational demands of our society and our economy are rising rapidly. James Duke made the meeting of needs a guidepost of his life, and it is fitting that his benefactions will be helping these four schools respond to the Nation's educational needs.

It is dangerous to project figures in a straight line, but if allocations of the endowment are continued at the 1963 level, almost $100 million will go to the four schools between now and the golden anniversary in 1974. On the same assumption, some $40 million will go to hospitals and child-care institutions in the Carolinas.

The prospect of receiving benefactions on such a scale places a heavy responsibility on these major beneficiaries of the endowment. They must be sure their institutions are prepared to utilize the funds with maximum effect. At the same time they must avoid the too-comfortable complacency that may result when support is assured. Wisely, the trustees of the endowment have established a committee on educational institutions to deal specifically with these problems.

The dominant purpose of Mr. Duke's generosity—his insistence on helping men to help themselves—has a special meaning for the years of this coming decade. We are in an age of brimming prosperity for our Nation as a whole, but of increasing uncertainty for many individuals in our society. The onrush of science and technology is changing the ways of work. Some have lost their jobs as a result; others fear they are going to be displaced. And there is general concern as to the availability of work for the waves of young people who will be coming into the labor force each year.

We hear with increasing frequency the suggestion that automation is going to make unemployment a permanent problem of steadily growing proportions. The only alternatives open to us, according to this view, are either to hold back the pace of technological change by artificial curbs, or to "settle up" with unemployment by breaking the connection between income and work and guaranteeing an annual payment to everyone.

I instinctively feel that these are counsels of desperation, and that they are wrong. Automation has not yet shown itself to be essentially different from the process of change that has continuously transformed American industry over the past century. Every major improvement in productive processes was deplored in its time as a destroyer of jobs. Each time it turned out to be a creator of more jobs than it had eliminated. I am not yet ready to give up faith in the promise of progress.

With progress, however, come problems of adjustment and adaptation. Institutions supported by private philanthropy can help solve those problems and alleviate the hardships they may cause in particular cases.

As a member of the business community, I would stress that business too must be concerned with the social problems that result from rapid technological progress. Just as it cannot leave them all to government, it cannot simply dump the problems into the laps of private philanthropic institutions along with a financial handout and be on its way without concern. It must turn its own best minds and talents to the working-out of difficult new adjustments, because these are business problems as well as social ones.

This, I think, was the business philosophy of James Buchanan Duke. With it he earned brilliant success in his lifetime. Faithful to it, the endowment he created has earned brilliant success in his memory. The lesson he taught is one we all need to study and learn.

Thank you.

Peaceful Coexistence—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to continue at this point the presentation of material from the important study of the strategy of international communism as presented by the standing Committee on Education Against Communism of the American Bar Association under the title "Peaceful Coexistence: A Communist Blueprint for Victory," as follows:

Khrushchev feels that the West for some reason deliberately misunderstands the nature of peaceful coexistence, and stresses that, whether or not we understand it, communism will continue to attack:

"In the West they do not want, or at least pretend they do not want to understand, that peaceful coexistence between states with differing social systems does not mean peaceful coexistence in ideology. * * * We Communists have never accepted and never will accept the idea of peaceful coexistence in ideologies. There can be no compromise here. * * * In this grim struggle between two uncompromising ideologies, the socialist and the bourgeois, which is underway in the world, and no one will deny this, we are attacking and will attack, asserting Communist ideas." [1]

Under normal circumstances it could be assumed that two ideologies would be able to coexist without being engaged in a grim struggle, since the two would not be mutually exclusive. But because the Communists insist on their understanding of peaceful coexistence, their ideology must attack that of the opponent, and must not relinquish the attack until the enemy ideology has been vanquished. The critical point here is that the process of combat is continuous and unrelenting on many levels, since the only way it can be brought to an end is for the class which creates the bourgeois ideology; i.e., all non-Communists, to be eliminated. In other words, the combat ends when communism has won in the fullest sense of the word.

"Peaceful coexistence naturally has nothing to do either with the legalization of, or reconciliation with, imperialism. Being a form of proletarian class struggle, peaceful coexistence is directed toward making social progress easier and accelerating the inevitable collapse of imperialism as a result of its defeat in the economic struggle with socialism. In other words, it is peaceful coexistence that creates the most favorable conditions for struggle against imperialism in all its forms and manifestations." [2]

The offensive nature of the Communist attack is often muted by the insertion of a qualifying phrase, as is the case with the above quotation, which speaks of the defeat of imperialism in the economic struggle with communism. Such qualifiers appear when a particular effort to relax the situation gets underway. When the situation deteriorates, or when it appears to be advantageous to act with particular firmness, the qualifier disappears, leaving the structure of the formula intact and more threatening.

Will the systems always be irreconcilable? Khrushchev's answer is that "no treaties and agreements between states can overcome the radical contradictions which exist between the two coexisting social systems." [3]

The remark of an official commentator underscores the dimensions of the gulf which separates the two systems:

"Bourgeois ideology and propaganda are built on hate of mankind, lies, and slander. That is why we cannot reconcile ourselves to bourgeois ideology, that it why we speak a different language and will never find a common one." [4]

The irreconcilability of the two systems, capitalism and communism, is therefore not a Western contrivance; it is rather an integral part of Soviet doctrine and practice, an axiom which will for the foreseeable future guide the conduct of Communists in their affairs with the non-Communist world.

WILL THE TWO SYSTEMS CONVERGE?

If capitalism and communism are irreconcilable in terms of the present makeup of each system, is it possible that they can move together to meet at some mutually acceptable middle ground? Much speculation on the possibility of convergence has arisen in the West because of the rapid industrialization which is taking place in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Some have even contended that the pressures which such industrialization will generate will inevitably have an impact upon the policies of the Communist regimes, thereby moderating the radical demand for control of the world.

In its simplest form, the argument for convergence holds that the United States will drift leftward to socialism and perhaps beyond, while the Soviet Union will gravitate toward a measure of capitalism. It is argued that with the passage of time such trends, which have already begun on a modest scale, will become more noticeable. In the meantime, it is contended, a community of interests between West and East will arise, in which the basic interests of each will find expression, and by means of which the security of each will be enhanced and insured.

While convergence attracts attention among some in the West as a conceivable way out of the present discomforts of world tensions, it is denounced and ridiculed as absurd by a Communist spokesman:

"One of [the] strong arguments in favor of supporting the views about the possibility of a convergence, for instance, is the development of electronics and computing techniques. The rational methods of economic planning and industrial management based on these techniques will * * * oust both the capitalist free market and the centralized Soviet system of management. As a result of this * * * the United States and the Soviet Union will within a few decades 'grow so similar or at least so reasonable that hatred between them will cease.'

"A dream, perhaps a sweet dream, but one that will not come true. First, they ignore the fact that the social structures of these two countries are diametrically different." [5]

With respect to the possibility of a world government, it is stated that "the development of the weapons of mass annihilation, and simplification of their manufacture, will impel the two systems to seek points of convergence and agree to international inspection which will gradually grow into a world government placed above the still raging cold war.

"This, it appears, is the end aim of convergence, this is the path to salvation suggested by the apologists of capitalism.

"The concept of a future in which capitalism and communism will converge on an equal footing is utopian through and through. The time will come, of course, when there will be a world government, but it will be the government of a world Socialist community in which there will be no place either for free enterprise or for the monopolies. Neither research nor the subtle sophisms of the apologists of capitalism can save it from the death predestined for it by history." [6]

In recent times there have been few stronger statements than this clear-cut declaration of the Communist view of the future, a future in which there is no room for an opposing system nor for divergent personal views. It is well to note that "life will always smash the adovcates of ideological comprises and their bleak illusions and attempts to find a third way in the struggle of the two systems." [7]

Rather than prolong the illusions of the Western World, Communists provide a form of definite assistance:

"Our Socialist world is definitely helping capitalism in one thing: to dig its grave the more quickly. Such are the facts of the fruitful competition of the two systems." [8]

THE ROLE OF WARS

If the systems of capitalism and communism are diametrically opposed, if there is to be no reconciliation and no convergence between them, and if the Communist goal of world domination remains unchanged, will war be the only logical alternative? The question of war is perhaps the most vital of our time. Never before has mankind possessed so many weapons of such great destructive power—hence the possibility that colossal damage on a world-wide scale will result if a nuclear war should occur remains firmly fixed in the minds of many people.

There is no question that the people of the free world in general and the people of the United States in particular do not want war; but what is the attitude of the self-declared enemy?

"The Soviet Union does not want to go to war with anyone. We do not need anyone's territories, anyone's wealth. How could we covet anyone's wealth, considering that the Soviet Union possesses vast natural resources, a highly developed industry, wonderful cadres of scientists, engineers, technicians, workers, agriculturists?" [9]

If it were merely a question of natural resources and industrial plants which divided the free world from the Communist world, there would be substantially fewer obstacles barring the way to peace. But we know that the key question is one of power, of Communist power over the rest of mankind. Hence such statements by Khrushchev and other Communist leaders are much less credible when viewed within the framework of their design for the world.

From the very day of the inception of the Soviet Union, Communists have attributed to the West a desire for war. The technique is still employed, and is in keeping with the Communist tradition of accusing the enemy of what they themselves are about to do:

"The Communist movement believes that if the imperialists unleash a war, this would mean the final downfall of the rotten order of capitalism. But the Socialist revolution does not need to have the road cleared by atomic or hydrogen bombs." [10]

And again:

"There can be no doubt that a new world war would lead to the final collapse of capitalism as a system. However, this does not at all imply that a war is needed for the further development of the world revolutionary process, that the peoples must go into a world thermonuclear conflagration to culminate the struggle against imperialism." [11]

As long as the Communists can accuse the West of wanting to start a war, they are able to engage in saber-rattling remarks designed to intimidate the opponent. At celebrations of events connected with the military as well as at cocktail parties and diplomatic receptions, the Communists are free with accusations concerning the Western mania and lust for war. In 1963 they began to make more liberal use of the term "madmen" to accuse those who expressed doubt concerning Soviet intentions, and spoke

Footnotes at end of speech.

specifically of certain American and free world leaders as madmen.

Such accusations are also used to provide an opportunity to stress their own capabilities. These statements are by the Minister of Defense and a leading military theorist, respectively:

"In developing the military might of our armed forces and raising their military preparedness, we must vigilantly follow the intrigues of the imperialists and study all their habits. And if they still impose a war upon us, let the imperialist gentlmen then blame themselves. Soviet armed forces will crash down upon them with their entire all-crushing might; it will be the last war, one in which the imperialists and their whole system of capitalism will be buried once and for all.[12]

* * * * *

"I would like once again to recall a remark by Defense Minister Malinovskiy that we will retaliate for the number of missiles threatening us with a simultaneous salvo of several times that number of missiles * * * and completely wipe out the countries that have allowed their soil to be used for American war bases." [13]

The Soviets thus leave little doubt of their intention to wage all-out war should the occasion arise. Whether they will launch such a war to achieve their objectives or whether they will rely on nuclear blackmail to attempt to force the non-Communist world into a series of concessions are matters of speculation for even the most skilled students of Communist affairs.

Regardless of who starts a war, it must be judged according to the goals for which it is fought:

"Developing Marxist teaching on war and the army, V. I. Lenin, in a number of his works, set forth the opinions which became the substance of the principles of Soviet military doctrine. Most important of them is the proposition that war is a continuation of politics by means of force. This proposition permitted discovering the content of wars according to the goals for the sake of which they are waged and according to the role which wars play in the life of society. The doctrine of just and unjust wars was the result of this." [14]

From this it follows that if war results from the expansionist politics of Communist countries, then one must judge it not from the point of view of who is the aggressor, but rather on the basis of the aims of each belligerent. And, since imperialism by definition would fight a war for the purpose of maintaining its own system, even if that war were fought in defense, the goals which it would seek would be declared immoral.

At this point the classical definition of "just" and "unjust" wars as interpreted by the Communists is applied:

"A world war between the camp of imperialism and the camp of socialism * * * would be an aggressive, predatory, and unjust war on the part of imperialism, but would be a war of liberation, a just war, a revolutionary war on the part of the states of the socialist commonwealth." [15]

To the non-Communist accustomed to judging events by the traditional standards of morality and fairness, such a subjective and one-sided doctrine is repugnant; but when taken in the context of Communist morality and objectives, it is not novel.

But while the Communists may not desire a world war, they are quite explicit concerning their attitudes toward other kinds of war:

"Liberation wars will continue to exist as long as imperialism exists, as long as colonialism exists. These are revolutionary wars. Such wars are not only admissible but inevitable. * * *

"Can such wars flare up in the future? They can. Can there be such uprisings? There can. But these are wars which are national uprisings. In other words, can conditions be created where a people will lose their patience and rise in arms? They can. What is the attitude of Marxists toward such uprisings? A most positive one. * * * These are uprisings against rotten reactionary regimes, against the colonizers. The Communists fully support such just wars and march in the front rank with the peoples waging liberation struggles.[16]

Any uprisings directed against imperialists and reactionaries are therefore deemed just and progressive, and Communists are bound to support them. The least violent form of such an uprising is considered to be a mass protest or a strike, while the most violent would be an all-out civil war. The Communists feel that under such conditions there is little likelihood of a direct confrontation with the imperialists, and hence do not hesitate to take a direct and overt part in leading an insurrection.

As the Communists have stepped up their activities in the less developed countries, they have relied increasingly upon guerrilla warfare as a means to the seizure of power. That guerrilla warfare does not have mere local and limited aims is clearly stated by "Che" Guevara:

"This form of struggles is a means—a means employed to achieve an objective—of seizure of state power. It is necessary and inevitable objective for all revolutionaries. * * * The guerrillas are the people's armed fighting vanguards operating in a certain area of a certain place. They aim to carry out a series of combat activities for the sole, possible strategic goal: the seizure of state power." [17]

The Cuban specialist on this form of violence sketches the progress of a guerrilla war as follows:

"A guerrilla war or a liberation war generally covers three stages. It begins with the stage of strategic defense, when the fast-moving and quickly disappearing small units will now and then take a bite at the enemy, but do not retire in a small area for passive defense. Their defense means launching every small-scale attack that can be made. This is then followed by the stage of stalemate when there will be activities by both the enemy and the guerrillas. Later on it will come to the final stage of the collapse of the repressive army. The guerrillas will now capture the big cities, fight large-scale decisive battles and wipe out the enemy thoroughly and completely." [18]

The following passage from the leading Soviet monthly, International Affairs, is reproduced at length to impart the flavor of the small bites taken by Venezuelan guerrilla forces:

"Nothing except the chirring of the cicadas broke the slumbering silence covering the Venezuelan state of Zulia. Suddenly a few bright flashes pierced the tropical darkness, the sound of explosions tore the air, and tongues of flames leaped skyward. For the sixth time this year guerrillas had blown up the Ule-Amuay oil pipeline belonging to the Creole Petroleum Co., an affiliate of the Rockefeller-owned Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. That attack on the night of September 19, 1963, was made by a group of patriots, men of the Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN).

"It is hard to list all the operations carried out by the intrepid Venezuelan patriots even for the short period of 1 month. They include the blowing up of oil and gas pipelines, setting fire to factories and warehouses owned by North American companies, and clashes with army patrols, raids on police headquarters,[9] and the homes of army leaders, seizure of radio stations for the purpose of broadcasting a message to the people. * * * The tactical combat groups * * * often engage in regular battles with the police in the heart of the Venezuelan capital.

"At the same time members of these groups carry on extensive propaganda, distributing anti-Government leaflets and posters, explaining to the people the aims of their struggle. * * * Tense days of struggle and the tremendous difficulties of underground work, which require not only great courage but real revolutionary self-sacrifice, have made the members of these groups seasoned town guerrillas. Houses and streets are their trenches, and residential areas their field of battle. The war they are waging is in effect a war of political exhaustion of the enemy."

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] N. S. Khrushchev's replies to questions by I. Petra, director of the Italian newspaper Giorno, Current Soviet Documents, May 6, 1963, pp. 17–18.

[2] D. Y. Melnikov, "Coexistence and the Struggle Against Imperialism," International Affairs, No. 8 (August 1963) p. 23.

[3] N. S. Khrushchev's speech at the reception in the Kremlin, Current Soviet Documents, Aug. 19, 1963, p. 5.

[4] A. Solodovnikov, "Speaking Different Languages," International Affairs, No. 11 (November 1963), p. 53.

[5] Solodovnikov, International Affairs, p. 47.

[6] Solodovnikov, International Affairs, p. 48.

[7] Solodovnikov, International Affairs, p. 52.

[8] Solodovnikov, International Affairs, p. 49.

[9] Nikita S. Khrushchev, speech of Aug. 6, 1961. Such statements evoke interest when compared with the actual progress of Soviet industry and agriculture.

[10] Dona, Peaceful Coexistence, p. 29.

[11] N. Inozemtsev, "On Peaceful Coexistence and the World Revolutionary Movement," Pravda, July 28, 1963.

[12] Marshal Rodion Malinovsky, speech at the Kremlin Palace at the Soviet Army and Navy 45th anniversary meeting, Feb. 22, 1963.

[13] Col. Gen. Vladimir Tolubko, "McNamara Boasts of Nuclear Supremacy," radio Moscow, Nov. 20, 1963.

[14] N. A. Lomov, "Soviet Military Doctrine" (Moscow: 1963), p. 5.

[15] Marshal V. D. Sokolovskiy, "Military Strategy" (Moscow: 1962). English edition (New York: Frederick A. Praeger), p. 178. While this definition of "just" and "unjust" wars is of recent vintage, the concept has long been a key element of Marxism-Leninism.

[16] Nikita Khrushchev, "For New Victories of the World Communist Movement," "Kommunist," pp. 64–65.

[17] Ernesto "Che" Guevara, "Guerrilla Warfare: A Means," Cuba Socialista, September 1963.

[18] Guevara, Cuba Socialista.

Speech of Simeon Booker, at the Khayyams Klub, Cleveland, Ohio, September 26, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 26, 1964, Mr. Simeon Booker, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Johnson Publishing Co., delivered an address before the Khayyams Klub at the Hotel Carter. The Khayyams Klub is a group of young leaders in the business and professional community of Cleveland.

The stimulating address by Mr. Booker follows:

SPEECH OF SIMEON BOOKER, AT THE KHAYYAMS KLUB, CLEVELAND, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 26, 1964

After being introduced as a White House correspondent, you expected a celebrity with a Brooks Bros. suit, a dapper, flashing smile and a halo stuck on his head. You've been fooled. The last time I saw L.B.J. was the same time you saw him—on TV. To be frank, I have not interviewed L.B.J. or Senator Goldwater, but did have the pleasure of interviewing Ike and Nixon months after they left the jobs. So you see, I'm no "hot shotter."

In America, a Negro's hometown is the place from where he migrated or got chased from to go somewhere else to find work and take care of the family. That's why the best location (for whites) in the Nation is my hometown. I left here some 15 years ago as a symbol of unequal opportunity. I return tonight with great appreciation for the clubmen who have brought me here, stashed me in the first suite I have ever stayed in, and shepherded me about the city as if I have some formula to get rich quick. Well, I do—buy my book, "Black Man's America," so I can retire.

Unlike some of my distinguished friends in Washington who have made headlines by being the first Negro appointed to this or that job, I don't come here telling you to quit demonstrating, picketing, boycotting, or protesting discrimination—until after November 3. This is always a question in my mind about whether these VIP's are thinking of your future or their continued prosperity—a fine home and riding a limousine in one of the highest income cities for Negroes in America.

There is much talk of a white backlash, and the need for us to be quiet, docile, and hidden in some corner of American cities when major political candidates come around this year. We're supposed to stay out of the way and let the major parties appeal to the white citizenry since we are only a tenth of the population and a less percentage of the voters. On November 3, we're supposed to vote a certain way.

In regards to the white backlash, we have felt the sting for 350 years of the backlash, the side lash, the front lash, crooked lash, the vote lash, the Dixie bomb lash, the police bashlash, the leather lash, and even the lynch lash. We have survived. In regards to the Negro communities being "off limits" to major politicians this year, we need to say, "those who come to visit us, visit our areas, speak to us as friends, and pledge support in building a better America will win our vote and those who stay away and condemn us before the world, will feel the wrath of our vote."

We should make clear that our vote—the largest in history because of a huge mobilization—can easily bring victory in the important Northern States and some Southern States. What other minority, with more than 6 million votes, boast leaders who are advising our people to "lay low" during these critical times instead of insisting on firm, well-publicized goals. Who is going to insist on more and higher positions in Washington—including a Negro in the Cabinet, on the Supreme Court, and in diplomatic roles? Who is going to insist that the Agricultural Department which has robbed Negro farmers of millions of dollars, denied them credit and quotas, denied our schools money for courses and programs, be integrated to improve the economic lot of our people in the South? Who is going to insist on a fair shake in the antipoverty program, the antijuvenile delinquency programs, the housing and business programs, and the medicare programs? Who is going to insist that Congress appropriate sufficient money for application of the civil rights law, that the new administration appoint an aggressive Attorney General (in the make of Robert Kennedy), and that the National Government take greater steps to end mob violence and defiance of law in the South?

This election, it seems to me, is a critical election—not of whites versus black, or State versus Federal, or South versus North. This is an election which could determine the future of our great land, whether we will remain a democracy for white people or whether, in the original sense, America can become truly the melting pot of all of the oppressed who seek its shelter—including the ones who were here before the European immigrants got here. Americans want this country to grow, to prosper with a growing economy and a growing sense of racial harmony. Our role is to take leadership and give direction, not succumb to the fright and panic which could only guarantee another century of mass poverty and violence for our children and grandchildren.

My subject tonight is, "The New, New, New Negro, Esq." I didn't pick this subject. The press gave it to me. Every few years or so, there's a wave of articles on something new about us and nobody has stopped to compile the various shifts and trends since we came here some 350 years ago as slaves. So tonight I thought I would do the job—in a few minutes.

The first step was the "beat down" stage when we were tagged with the label of Negro, black, nigger and what have you. We were slaves auctioned off on blocks, sold like pigs, bred like horses, hit in the head like cattle, called morons and imbeciles. These 250 years were the most inhumane period in American history and what we went through few historians write about. The history books extoll the magic of Christianity which influenced the white folk to cleanse their souls and free us eventually—after a war. Read some of the gripping accounts of slavery conditions and you'll begin to understand the horrors and cruelties your forefathers and mothers survived. This was the period during which few Negroes thought for themselves. We were forbidden to learn to read or write by law. We were put in the hands of masters; we were toys and love partners at the impulse of our guardians. We sacrificed, we slaved, we died like fleas. We bowed low, said "yas'm" and we suffered from worn out knees, bad backs and heart trouble induced by being around savage white men. But we struggled on.

The second step was "the beat up" period. We'd been freed and promised a mule and 20 or 40 acres. We really got to thinking we were on freedom road when Negroes for the first time sat in Congress and the Senate and served as State Governors in the South. We shouted, thanked the Lord while politicians in Washington stripped us of most constitutional rights, including the right to vote. We became freed slaves, unable to work, denied education, housing and welfare. We were exploited, victimized, murdered, slaughtered and starved to death. We were tenants, peons, and convicts. But we witnessed one of the biggest double-crosses in history. An emancipation which turned into slavery again and gave us a century of mass misery. We couldn't vote in Mississippi, then, either.

This brings us to the "beat out" period. The next years, we struggled to live, to exist, to keep a little flame of freedom alive. Aw, it was rough, baby. Hitler was a freshman compared to what happened in America's South. But few writers tell about the horrors. The big Negro leaders were the one who knew how to properly carry their hats in their hands, bow low enough to touch the floor, and say "yes, sir" the loudest. You can grin but that was the way it was, and had to be. The leadership in this period was accommodative. Can you imagine college presidents who had to know how to pray and sing, or do a soft shoe shuffle to get money for their schools, and many of them could not add or subtract? Can you imagine the big Negro in a community being the headwaiter at a country club or hotel? Well, baby, this period was rough. When we went to college, Negro college, that is, we had to preach or teach—take our choice—and by the time we got out, we'd have to do both to make ends meet. In Mississippi, we still didn't vote.

Well, we come to the "beat in" stage. While we were running like hell to get out of the South and escape the cruelties, we were packing into old houses in northern cities and running down communities. We moved in—on and on, and bigger and bigger, and wider until we got a sizable vote. But we had a sizable everything else—a sizable headache, too. Rural families unused to toilets. Families in one room. Commonlaw marriages. Crime, low morale, delinquency, a sense of hopelessness, just think of something unfortunate and we had it. But despite this mountain of despair, we managed to support civil rights groups fighting for legislation and recognition and we managed to get Negroes on Capitol Hill. Then we started to do something about schools—letting Negro kids get some education, like white folks said they needed. The only thing, we wanted education at the other schools. There was the legal channel, and the NAACP successfully used it. It took the case several years to reach the U.S. Supreme Court, giving bigots the chance to fire a few hundred teachers and kill some race leaders. Negroes were getting bolder. We even asked for old books used by white kids in Mississippi, but we didn't win the right to vote there.

The "beat it out" stage was the most thrilling. It was climaxed in 1963—the centennial of our emancipation—and it happened because Rev. M. L. King, Jr., made the decision to march in Birmingham, Ala., when the police warned him not to, when the courts ruled against his marching, when white leaders tried to throw every roadblock. We have waited long enough, thought Reverend King. Segregation must go. With scores of sit-in demonstrations in the few years before, 1963 became the year of the Negro—his freedom year, the year of the march on Washington, a quarter million strong—white and black, we brought a great Nation to its knees; we touched the conscience of a multitude of Americans. We demonstrated in every city of America. And we prodded a great President to press for passage of a major civil rights bill, an action which politicians said couldn't happen.

For the second time in American history, we were legally freed. The children of the children of the children of bondage finally saw the sun slowly coming over the hill. But too few Negroes see the sunshine. Two-thirds of us are poor. Most of us live in ghettos with poor schools with poor housing and poor paying jobs. We are blinded by the ravages of disease, stunted by the horrors of slum living, hungry on starvation diets, and discouraged by the continual thump, thump, thump of oncoming poverty and bankruptcy and disaster.

This is the "beat out good" stage today despite the glory and might of the publicity releases of government. The problems we face today are great, much more harassing and distressing, much more intricate and complexing to solve than merely winning passage of a civil rights bill or marching in the street. We have serious problems in housing, education, employment, and welfare which will require the best brains and knowhow.

Who is the "New, New, New, Negro, Esq." to help erase this backwash of 350 years of neglect, of deprivation, and of fourth-class citizenship?

Is he the Negro, two paychecks and a mortgage ahead on a new home, who explains: "Look, I'm not interested. I've got mine. Negroes are not my concern or my business. I'm happy. They should be happy." Aloof from his people, this Negro is interested only in belonging to downtown organizations, in mingling with only a handful of us, and in appearing at a bargaining table against us. He is a product of overintegration, overexposure, and has become a loss to our total improvement.

Or is this selection the slick-talking Negro, who's given up the fight to win a place in America, and who has become the black nationalist, spreading race hate and bigotry as well as discouragement to the masses? His message is one of emphasizing the defects, inequalities, and the faults. His philosophy is one of turning black against black and black against white and calling for a Jim Crow state and a back-to-Africa excursion.

No, the new, new, new, Negro is not a member of either of these two groups. He or she is a Negro who thinks of his people and his Nation, serving as a brother and a neighbor. He's one who's not ashamed to walk into slums and help his people, emphasizing the vote, home care, and the value of an education. He's able to properly represent his people in every area of a city, an ambassador, a symbol, and a citizen. He is an ardent supporter of integration, always willing to lead his people in this direction, but he insists on quality and efficiency in Negro institutions and undertakings.

He's a Negro who can say "baby" or "sir," enjoy chitterlings or soft shell crabs, drink bourbon or wine. He's one who carries no racial chip on his shoulder, but is quick to defend the rights of his people. He neither panics nor becomes frightened at the perilous journey we have yet to go in America, but constantly inspires, encourages an even greater number of our people to join in the freedom march. The future of our people will depend upon the firmness and militancy, but yet the constructiveness of our program. And it will depend upon the balance of the "New, New, New, Negro, Esq."

So many people ask me how I can get so involved in so many civil rights crusades—even to bring one of the passengers on the first freedom ride a few years ago in Alabama—and not get angry, or blinded with passion. This how I explain it. Several years ago, I spent many weeks in Little Rock when they integrated the schools and came home a pretty banged-up guy—just in time to take my youngest son on his first day of school. My kids go to a parochial school in Maryland and they have to walk several blocks through a white neighborhood to board the bus. That morning, I was angry, giving whites hell. As I stood beside my boy with a growing number of white kids, getting angrier all the time, a little white girl came up to me and said, "Mr. Booker, you don't have to stand there. I'll take Jimmy to school and I'll look after him." I went home an embarrassed man, a bigot.

The nation we want to live in is not our Nation or their nation—but a together nation. We have millions of white Americans as allies. We have come too far to turn back now.

National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events of the National Gallery of Art for October 1964:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, OCTOBER 1964

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Collections: Paintings and sculpture from the Andrew Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are on the main floor. The Garbisch American primitive paintings, Kress Renaissance bronzes, and Widener decorative arts are on the ground floor.

New exhibitions: Drawings of the 15th and 16th centuries from the Wallraf-Richartz Museum, Cologne. Central gallery. October 4 to November 1.

William Blake: poet, printer, prophet. Illuminated books of William Blake and color facsimiles. Ground floor. October 25 through November 22.

New publications:

"An Exhibition of the Illuminated Books of William Blake: Poet, Printer, Prophet." A commemorative handbook; 56 pages, 12 inches by 9 inches, with a study by Geoffrey Keynes, and a foreword by Lessing J. Rosenwald, 26 color plates and 1 black-and-white illustration; $3 postpaid.

Catalog. Drawings of the 15th and 16th centuries; 116 pages, with foreword by Horst Keller, director, Wallraf-Richartz Museum, Cologne; 70 illustrations; 75 cents postpaid.

New reproductions: 11 inches by 14 inches color reproductions. Sassetta and assistant, "St. Anthony Distributing His Wealth to the Poor"; Pissarro, "Peasant Woman"; Daumier, "Advice to a Young Artist"; Boucher, "Venus Consoling Love"; Rousseau, "The Equatorial Jungle"; 25 cents each. Orders under $1, add 25 cents handling charge.

Lectures: A series of Sunday lectures on drawings, presented in connection with the exhibition from the Wallraf-Richartz Museum, will begin on October 4 and continue through October 18.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28 THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 4

Painting of the week: Kalf. "Still Life"; (Chester Dale collection), gallery 49. Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2. Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: History painting; rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday, 1. Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection; rotunda. Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3. Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "German Drawings." Guest speaker: Horst Keller, director, Wallraf-Richartz Museum, Cologne. Lecture Hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Alfonso Montecino, pianist. East garden court 8.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 5 THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 11

Painting of the week: Homer, "Breezing Up"; (gift of the W. L. and May T. Mellon Foundation), gallery 65. Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2. Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: The art of the picture frame; rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday, 1. Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection; rotunda. Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3. Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "A Drawing by Leonardo from Cologne." Guest speaker: Jacob Bean, curator of drawings, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Lecture Hall, 4.

Sunday concert: William Shores, Baritone; Richard Tetley-Kardos, pianist. East garden court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

Inquiries concerning the gallery's educational services should be addressed to the educational office, 737–4215, extension 272.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 12 THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 18

Painting of the week: Renoir, "Madame Henriot" (gift of the Adele R. Levy Fund, Inc.), gallery 69. Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2. Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: German drawings from the Wallraf-Richartz Museum. Central lobby. Tuesday through Saturday, 1. Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection; rotunda. Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3. Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Flemish Drawings." Guest speaker: Winslow Ames, author. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra; Richard Bales, conductor. East garden court, 8.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 19 THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 25

Painting of the week: Rembrandt, "The Mill" (Widener collection), gallery 45. Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2. Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: Italian and Flemish drawings from the Wallraf-Richartz Museum; central lobby. Tuesday through Saturday, 1. Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection; rotunda. Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3. Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "William Blake, Bookmaker." Guest speaker: S. Foster Damon, professor of English, Brown University, Providence. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra; Richard Bales, conductor. (Program in honor of United Nations Day.) East garden court, 8.

The Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents, Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama, has recently given me information in respect to the foundation which I feel would be of interest to my colleagues. This foundation has done commendable work in improving the health of the peoples of the world and promoting the establishment of peace, and has honored a great number of our country's distinguished leaders with the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and diploma in recognition of their service to mankind. Some of the most eminent recipients of the Grand Cross include former Presidents Dwight Eisenhower, Herbert Hoover, and Harry Truman, the late President John F. Kennedy, President Lyndon Johnson, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, Senator Everett Dirksen, Senator Jacob Javits, Gen. Omar Bradley, Adm. William Halsey, Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman, Gen. Lucius Clay,

and Dr. Milton Eisenhower. I, too, was likewise honored on October 17, 1960, when the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross was presented to me by Dr. John Maurice Keesing, international provost.

Dr. Bayern was originally honored with the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross, in recognition of his efforts to promote world peace through prayer, originated by the late Honorable Herve L'Heureux, a former outstanding member of the Foreign Service of the United States. Former Chief Judge Albert Conway conferred this honor on Dr. Bayern on February 19, 1963. Thereafter, he was named the American provost.

Diplomas have been received from the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation granting the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross to the following:

Former Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Hon. Robert S. McNamara, Hon. William Warren Scranton, Hon. Carl Hayden; Hon. Paul R. Douglas, Hon. Everett McKinley Dirksen; Hon. John J. Williams, Hon. John V. Lindsay, Mr. Eugene Gillis, Hon. Harrison Brody, and Hon. Lawrence Wood Robert, Jr.

The following individuals having been recommended for the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross, the board of dignitaries of the foundation have approved the following persons:

Rev. John Brett Langstaff, B. Litt., Oxon, past grand prelate, Grand Commandery Knights Templar, State of New York, Rev. Dr. Richard A. Dizon, Dr. Gustav Erlanger, John H. Adam, Hon. Robert Bernard Anderson, Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, Hon. Lister Hill, Hon. John L. McClellan, Hon. J. W. Fulbright, Hon. Michael J. Mansfield, Hon. Eugene J. McCarthy, Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, George Levy, post potentate, Mecca Temple, and an honorary 33d degree Mason, Hon. John J. Sparkman, Hon. Harry Flood Byrd, Hon. Ogden Rogers Reid, Hon. James Roosevelt, Hon. D. Johnston, Hon. Elmer J. Holland, Hon. John G. Pastore, Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Hon. Leslie C. Arends, Hon. Warren G. Magnuson, and Hon. Joseph S. Clark.

It now gives me pleasure to insert for the information of my colleagues excerpts of the story of Eloy Alfaro, citizen of the Americas, 1842–1912, edited by A. Curtis Wilgus, director of inter-American studies, University of Florida.

ELOY ALFARO

("There is no redemption without sacrifices; these are the solid bases of progress." —ELOY ALFARO.)

Eloy Alfaro, soldier, patriot, statesman, and martyr, the centenary of whose birth was celebrated on June 25, 1942, was a citizen not only of his native Ecuador; he was a citizen of America. The personal integrity, the unwavering defense of the principles of truth, justice and friendship among nations, the self-control and self-sacrifice that marked almost three-quarters of a century of unflagging service to his country and to America extended his sphere beyond the confines of his own country, awakened unbounded admiration in distant lands, and brought him unsought but richly deserved fame and honor in far places as well as at home.

* * * * *

The future soldier, statesman, American, was born at Montecristi, in the province of Manabí, Ecuador.

* * * * *

Following the abortive revolt at Manabi, Eloy Alfaro established himself in Panama. It is a strategic location for one with the burning vision of uniting the Americas. As Switzerland is the logical seat for any joint European movement, so Panama, where North and South America clasp hands, is the logical site from which to draw together the two hemispheres. This fact was also taken into consideration in selecting Panama as the headquarters of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation.

* * * * *

Alfaro was the disciple of an Aptostle of Pan Americanism—the great Ecuadoran author and American, Juan Montalvo. With the inspired writings of Montalvo to support him in the face of his enemies, and the ideal of the Liberator to guide him, Eloy Alfaro ever widened the boundaries of his laudable ambitions for the Americas.

* * * * *

While Eloy Alfaro lived a life devoted to the struggle for liberty and American unity, in the minds of Americans he is most revered for two almost unprecedented acts on his part. Both were undertaken because of his love for freedom and for Bolívar's ideal of American unity which the great Ecuadoran took as his own.

* * * * *

The humanitarian good will of Alfaro's attempt to settle the Spanish-Cuban struggle without further bloodshed is attested not only in the letter to the Queen itself, but in a paragraph of a letter he subsequently wrote to the Cuban patriot Merchán:

"In the message to Spain I did my duty as an American. I deplore the fact, naturally, that a weak nation like Ecuador cannot make her voice heard with the efficacy the case requires." He thought and acted on behalf of the American people; Pan Americanism was for him a living thing long before the present emphasis now placed on what he then recognized as a natural hemispheric policy.

Of even more profound significance is a step which the Great American took in the same year of 1895. As we have noted, Alfaro was inspired in his American thinking by the ideas of the Liberator regarding united action by the American nations.

A true disciple of Bolívar, Alfaro realized that next to Bolívar's successful fight for independence for South America, Bolívar's most valued contribution to America was the precedent he set in the minds of Americans in the underlying thought of the unsuccessful Panama Conference of 1826. The great Ecuadoran statesman determined to try once again to bring about a unity of thought, a homeogenity of action and a continuity of agreement which would enable the American people to free themselves from all but sentimental attachments to Europe.

Accordingly, on December 26, 1895, the Minister of Foreign Relations of Ecuador, Ignacio Robles, upon the instructions of President Alfaro, sent out an invitation to the Ministers of Foreign Relations of the other American nations, calling upon them to meet in an international Congress at Mexico City.

* * * * *

The Congress was convened at Mexico City on August 10, 1896, 70 years after Bolívar's congress. Regrettably it was not wholly a success. Yet, in the larger sense, it was successful inasmuch as it served to further point the way toward inter-American cooperation. Just half a century later the act of Chapultepec was adopted by the 21 American Republics in the same city of Mexico, in the same Palace of Chapultepec where at the invitation of Eloy Alfaro that other congress was convened for exactly the same basic purpose.

* * * * *

One is almost tempted to believe that Alfaro sought to realize the same aims incorporated by Bolívar in the acts of the Conference of Panama. The pattern is the same although the material was somewhat changed. The spirit of the leader had not changed, only his identity.

* * * * *

History cannot truthfully say that any one of these farsighted men was successful in his efforts to realize his vision. Can we say truthfully that any one of them failed wholly to impress Americans with the necessity of acting together as democratic peoples? If that were so, no Pan American Union would exist today, no Pan American Conferences would be called, no peace would reign on our continent.

* * * * *

We have seen that one of the underlying motives of both Bolívar and Alfaro was a groping after democracy for all Americans. In his own country, during those years when he had the power, Alfaro undertook to accomplish reforms which would free the Indians from oppression, spoliation and cruel treatment. He abolished the subsidiary labor tax.

* * * * *

Behind his every act in Ecuador, as indeed throughout all the Americas, lay a profound conviction that Americans were the inheritors of freedom and democracy. Through education, through social reforms, through international relations, Alfaro sought to raise the level of the great mass of Americans. By the example of his own country and people he hoped to influence other American countries and peoples.

* * * * *

The boundaries of his mind were farflung. His concept of liberty was not local, not national, but international; he viewed the American continent as the field for honest effort and sincere friendship of mankind, as a vast theater for the fruitful work of peace. He loved independence; he recoiled from the thought of aggression. He believed in democracy; he advocated American unity as a safeguard for the common liberty. He devoted his life to the creation of a better world in which he and his fellowmen, their children and their children's children, might live in harmony and concord. He was truly a citizen of the Americas and so he may justly be revered by the people of all the Americas as the prototype apostle of Pan Americanism.

Material expressions of appreciation both at home and abroad began to be offered Eloy Alfaro even during his lifetime. In the years since his death, such homage has increased. An incomplete list of tributes rendered to this preeminent citizen of the Americas, whose life was dedicated to the realization of the highest and best ideals of Americanism, will be found as an appendix to this work.

Kudos From Roscoe Drummond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to commend to the attention of

our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the September 18, 1964, edition of the New York Herald Tribune. After all the brickbats that have been hurled at the Congress in the recent past it is good to have this well-deserved bit of praise.

The article follows:

"DO-SOMETHING" CONGRESS: SOME PRAISE AND ESTEEM

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—This has certainly been a "do-something" Congress.

Its record of achievement merits the praise and esteem of the whole Nation.

It has accomplished more useful things during the last 9 months than during the previous 3 years. For two reasons: the skillful prodding of President Johnson and the remorseful impact of the tragedy of President Kennedy's assassination.

Viewing the 1964 session as a whole, it seems to me that what is most impressive about this Congress is that:

1. It dealt constructively with the really urgent and central problems of the country, even when they were deeply and emotionally controversial. Example: civil rights law.

2. Both parties put aside partisan politics and stood overwhelmingly united when Congress was dealing with the most critical matters. Examples: the tax cut and civil rights.

3. The record of this Congress adheres substantially to the center of American political thinking and at most points reflects a very broad national consensus.

4. The Congress has been remarkably responsive to the leadership of President Johnson—more responsive than any Democratic Congress has been to a Democratic President since the first 100 days of Franklin Roosevelt.

Just look at this cross-section of what Congress has done:

Tax cut: Here is a measure which is a tremendous boon to taxpayers and business alike. It does more to free private enterprise from the shackles of depressing tax rates than anything the Eisenhower administration dared offer.

Civil rights: A bold step to redress grievous injustices. Too long delayed but finally passed overwhelmingly. Supported more strongly by Republicans than by Democrats in both Houses of Congress. The civil rights bill deserves no ideological label. It reflects the kind of justice and equal protection under the law which most Americans want. It corresponds to a basic conservative premise that human rights and property rights are part of the same garment and that failure to protect one jeopardizes the other.

Antipoverty program: It is ridiculous to suggest that President Johnson is running on a prosperity-and-poverty campaign. The degree of unemployment and poverty which has continued for a decade in the midst of wide and sustained prosperity in the United States has been a grave concern throughout the Eisenhower and Kennedy-Johnson administrations.

The antipoverty program is criticized by some as inadequate, as just picking at the problem. It involves little additional spending. It mostly pulls together a variety of measures already separately administered. It involves no intrusive extension of Federal power. Local communities and States must initiate programs and ask for Federal assistance, and the approval of the Governor is required. It is not a handout program. It aims to help individuals help themselves by getting at the root causes of poverty—inadequate schooling, inadequate job training, poor health, etc.

This Congress has also acted in the field of mass transportation, conservation, and wilderness preservation. It has rightly raised the congressional and executive branch salaries.

There have been shortcomings—the fiasco of the Bobby Baker investigation, the unjustifiable blocking of the TV debates, the shortsighted effort to prevent better redistricting of the State legislatures.

It is always easy to attack Congress collectively. The best reply is for Congress to do its job. While congressional reforms are still needed, the Congress has done a notably good job. It shows representative government working well.

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—Government Agencies and Programs, III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in an earlier part of this report, I indicated that the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, of which I am the chairman, was deeply concerned about the apparent lack of meaningful information relating to one important part of our Government's effort in the cold war.

We knew, of course, what our Government was doing on the economic plane because the foreign aid program and our foreign trade policies are subject to a systematic, regular review by the Congress.

We knew, also, what our Government has been doing to meet the Communist threat on the military plane. Our national defense budget and our military assistance program are studied each year by the appropriate congressional committees and debated at length by both Houses of the Congress.

We did not have readily available, however, similar information about the total U.S. Government effort on the ideological plane: an effort designed to counter the Communist ideological offensive and to provide support abroad for our foreign policy through oversea information programs, exchanges of persons, strategic psychological operations, and related activities.

There was no single document, congressional or executive, no single source, which contained adequate information about the full range of these activities—who was doing what, why, and at what cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

And we had to have this information before we could begin to study these activities and reach some judgment about their worth and effectiveness.

In order to meet this need, the subcommittee directed its staff to prepare an inventory of governmental programs operating in this field. The inventory was to be brief in order to be suitable for quick and easy reference. Also, it was not to contain any material with a security classification. Such material could not be published but had to remain in appropriate files, available to Members of Congress and other authorized personnel.

In cooperation with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, the work on the compilation of the inventory began in May 1963. Dr. Allan S. Nanes, analyst in U.S. foreign policy in the Legislative Reference Service, prepared the document under the supervision of the subcommittee and its staff. It was published on January 3, 1964, as a committee print, entitled "The U.S. Ideological Effort: Government Agencies and Programs."

With the publication of this document, the subcommittee and the Congress as a whole had available to them an extremely useful reference work which contained the answers to the basic questions: who was doing what, under what authority, and, generally, at what cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

I shall not attempt at this point to describe the inventory in detail because it is readily available to all Members of Cnogress. I would like, however, to comment on its three main features.

First, the inventory revealed that over 20 Government departments and agencies are currently engaged in conducting programs which are neither strictly military nor strictly economic in character but which can provide support for U.S. foreign policy.

Second, it indicated that the annual expenditures on these programs are in excess of $500 million per year.

Third, it pointed to an area of apparent weakness in the U.S. ideological effort: lack of adequate coordination.

This third point became the subject of the next step in the subcommittee's inquiry.

Having inquired into the nature of the challenge confronting our foreign policy on the ideological plane;

Having brought together information about governmental programs operating on this plane;

The subcommittee was now ready to take a closer look at the programs themselves. And we began at the top by inquiring into the direction and the management of the U.S. ideological effort in the cold war.

The Press Supports Lyndon Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, editorial support for the program and policy of President Lyndon Johnson is spreading throughout the length and breadth of America. Last Friday, September 25, 1964, the Cleveland Press militantly announced its support for President Lyndon B. Johnson on the basis that he deserves election on the record of his achievement. This newspaper endorsed

Lyndon Johnson 4 years ago and now restates its support on his demonstrated qualities of leadership.

The editorial follows:

THE PRESS SUPPORTS LYNDON JOHNSON

President Johnson deserves election on his own.

The Cleveland Press (and the other 16 Scripps-Howard newspapers) refrained from making a hurried judgment in the presidential campaign until BARRY GOLDWATER had been accorded a fair chance to state his case.

Now he has done so. Although the press admires his energy, courage and frankness and considers him an attractive man, this newspaper does not find his arguments sufficiently persuasive and does not think he has shown the required qualifications for the Presidency.

It will come as no special surprise to readers that the press thinks well of Lyndon Johnson.

Four years ago this newspaper endorsed Lyndon Johnson for the Democratic presidential nomination, saying: "The times call for a man in the White House who has demonstrated qualities of leadership, who has experience and judgment, a man of vitality and courage, and patriotism that rises above partisanship."

In these 4 years, Johnson has enhanced all those qualities. In his 3 years as Vice President, and especially in the 10 months he has been President, he has grown taller in meeting responsibilities with calm confidence and competence.

The times still call for proved qualities of leadership. And this paramount consideration makes Johnson a natural choice.

There is no better way to judge a man than on his performance record.

Johnson has shown he knows how to handle the job of President. He can make hard decisions and act decisively in foreign crises, without being brash or provocative, as he demonstrated in the Panama riots and the Gulf of Tonkin incidents.

He is a unifying force—proved by the manner in which he has enlisted the growing support of divergent elements of our population. When he says he wants to be President of all the people, he means it—and he works at it.

He knows how to get things done, as he has shown in winning from Congress a sweeping program of legislation which Congress previously merely studied.

The kind of President Johnson has been could have been charted by the type of Democratic leader he was for 6 years in the U.S. Senate.

The White House, in those years, was occupied by a Republican, General Eisenhower. A small-minded partisan in Johnson's place could have frustrated President Eisenhower's every move, causing confusion in a party-divided Government.

Johnson chose, instead, to cooperate with the White House on constructive legislation, preferring the good of the country to the immediate advantage of the party.

There were two outstanding examples of this: the "sputnik" crisis indicating the United States had lagged dangerously behind Russia in space exploration, and the U–2 incident which brought U.S.-Soviet relations to the ragged edge.

Here were chances to reap partisan profit by loading all the blame on a Republican President. Instead, Johnson used his powerful influence and great political skills to calm the storm and get America to work on a course that since has caught and passed the Soviets.

Lyndon Johnson has impressive credentials, a long record of constructive national leadership. He has earned our country's confidence.

The press urges his election.

Wake Up America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Don Brown, editor of the Waseca, Minn., Herald, is among many editors in the Second Congressional District who have taken a strong stand against the State Department handling of the Otto Otepka case, and its refusal to fire William Wieland. I insert Brown's level-headed assessment of the situation in the RECORD for the benefit of its readers:

WAKE UP AMERICA

It is high time that the people of this Nation wake up to the manner in which we are being sold down the river by a tiny band of devout liberal extremists. Wake up America before it is too late.

Let's look into a situation which exists today. A matter that is now in the hands of Secretary of State Dean Rusk. The decision is in his hands and it shouldn't take him 5 seconds. We repeat it should not require 5 seconds. If you think us wrong we ask you to read on.

The question is this: Should William Wieland be ousted as a security risk or restored to full rights as a Foreign Service officer. Here is the evidence.

In 1961 the Wieland security case was up for decision. Otto Otepka, who has been in the doghouse with his superiors in the State Department, said there was laxity in the handling of the Wieland case. As early as 1961 Otepka was not certain about Wieland. He was of the opinion that there was not enough evidence to say that Wieland was disloyal but that Wieland had given incorrect information to Government officials on several occasions.

What was this correct information? Wieland said that he had been with Castro on two occasions. Now this was very important at the time for security division investigators found evidence that Wieland had been with Castro on at least a half dozen occasions.

Knowing that Wieland had lied Secretary of State Dean Rusk cleared him. If that shocks you listen to this. Rusk was about to assign Wieland to a highly sensitive post in Germany. It was more than FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover could stand and he went to Attorney General Robert Kennedy. We all might thank God that in Kennedy the Nation had a man of action. He issued an order blocking the Wieland assignment.

Now let's go back to the time that Fidel Castro was coming into the picture in the Latin Americas. This Nation could not risk the rise of a Communist to power in Cuba—but was Castro a Communist?

During the late 1950's Wieland held Embassy posts in many Latin American countries including Cuba. Then came that period when the FBI filed voluminous reports on Castro's Communist connections. Some information said he was a Communist.

What happened to this important information? It stopped at the desk of Wieland in the State Department and did not go to higher officials. Just think of that. A Communist outpost 90 miles off our shores could have been averted but for Wieland.

Wieland was able to keep this important information from President Eisenhower, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and his successor, Christian Herter, by pigeonholing the reports in his office. And Secretary Rusk is piddling away precious time deciding whether this man should be fired.

President Eisenhower acted and Dulles reviewed the situation with FBI Chief Hoover.

New evidence against Wieland has since developed and last March security officials recommended that Wieland be dropped from the State Department. Even this was 6 months after Otto Otepka had been removed from control of the security evaluation division for insubordination. His insubordination constituted telling the truth to save his country. He should have a hero's medal. He will not get one for we have sunk so low in this Nation that high officials discharge or demote an honest man to protect anyone under suspicion of being a lover of communism. Should Rusk spend 5 seconds on this decision, we ask you? Wake up Americans, before it is too late.

Beech's Viet Victory Formula: Bomb North—Veteran of Delta War Weighs Pros and Cons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the continued lack of U.S. leadership in the Vietnamese crisis and the series of tragic miscalculations on the part of our State Department and administration leaders such as Secretary of Defense McNamara, an article by the Chicago Daily News columnist, Keyes Beech, is especially apropos. I include this article in the RECORD, feeling it is a very thoughtful analysis of the situation in southeast Asia:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Sept. 29, 1964]

BEECH'S VIET VICTORY FORMULA: BOMB NORTH—VETERAN OF DELTA WAR WEIGHS PROS AND CONS

TOKYO.—What time is it in South Vietnam? Late, but not too late to win.

If things are allowed to go on sliding downhill as they are now, then defeat is inevitable.

This will not happen tomorrow, the next day or next month. But it could very easily happen next year.

There will be no sudden collapse of the South Vietnamese armed forces, or stunning Communist victories. What is more likely is that one day the American official community in Saigon will wake up to find that a neutralist government has taken over, ready to make a deal with Hanoi.

Some Americans complain that this is a war without end. So it is, under the present ground rules. But imagine how the Vietnamese peasant feels. He hasn't known peace for 20 years. He knows little or nothing about communism and the same goes for democracy.

All he really wants is to be let alone. So why not trade war for peace, even if it means the Communists will ultimately take over the whole country?

This need not happen if the United States takes the bold and decisive action that is necessary—and some of our top American officials know that it is necessary.

No one can accuse me of optimism in reporting the Vietnamese scene. Over the last 10 years I have seen that country go through too many ups and downs to venture any prediction beyond the next 24 hours—and that with fingers crossed.

But I do know that when the situation seems most desperate it can change for the better overnight. It can also change for the worse.

There is very little we can do about the dismal political mess in Saigon—despite all the high-priced help we have there—except hope, pray, and persuade.

But there are some plus factors. And there are some cards that haven't been played.

In military terms the war is by no means lost. The army, for all its shameful blunders with needless loss of life, still is an effective fighting force. In some respects it's a better army than it was a year ago.

The hamlet defense forces, which bear the brunt of the war, fight like tigers because they are fighting for their lives and their families.

The Vietcong, despite some claims to the contrary, are not 9 feet tall. They, too, are Vietnamese or they would have done a better job than they have.

They are tough. They are elusive. But their military capability is limited. They cannot meet the army head on and hold their own. They cannot take and hold cities.

They are a threat everywhere. But they do not, contrary to some reports, hold the entire countryside. A Canadian friend of mine recently traveled 10 days through the Mekong Delta, accompanied only by an interpreter, and returned unscathed.

If we have problems, which Heaven knows we do, so do the Vietcong. There is every indication that the enemy is suffering from a manpower pinch. A great many Vietcong have been killed. Their reservoir of recruits in the south is not inexhaustible.

Rank-and-file or part-time guerrillas complain about the youth and immaturity of Vietcong cadres. A much more important indicator, however, is the massive infiltration of native-born North Vietnamese into the south.

INFILTRATION ADDS A NEW DIMENSION

Top U.S. commanders in Saigon are at last beginning to accept what their Vietnamese counterparts have been saying for months—that the increased scale of infiltration from the north has added a new dimension to the war.

And this underlines a point that should be emphasized. Even if we have political leadership in Saigon there could be no end to the war so long as Hanoi is allowed to feed fresh bodies into the south as they are needed.

There is little or nothing that South Vietnam can do about this infiltration. But there is a great deal the United States can do about it—if it has the will to act.

The infiltration route from North Vietnam through Laos—called the Ho Chi Minh Trail—is well known. We have excellent aerial photographs of Communist troops and supply movements along this freeway. They have few secrets from us.

But we haven't done anything about it.

What could be done?

U.S. military experts say it would take at least two divisions to block the infiltration routes. South Vietnam doesn't have those divisions to spare. One U.S. marine division might be able to do the job. But that means committing U.S. ground troops to what might well develop into an interminable jungle war.

There is an alternative. We could bomb the Communist supply line. This would make things more difficult for the enemy but it wouldn't stop him.

One of the more costly lessons of the Korean war was that airpower is highly ineffective against primitive human pack trains.

REMAINING STRATEGY IS GREATEST RISK

There is another course of action that holds far greater promise and as a consequence far greater risk. That is to bomb North Vietnam itself. There is nothing new or original about this proposal. We've already done it once and we could easily do it again.

The provocation for our August air strike against North Vietnam was a torpedo boat attack against two American destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin.

But this isolated attack was nothing compared to the impact on South Vietnam of a constant flow of fresh bodies from the north. And the war is being fought in Vietnam, not the Gulf of Tonkin.

Hanoi has had a taste of what American airpower can do. Neutral travelers from the Communist capital reported that nothing has had such a sobering effect on the Reds as the August strike against their torpedo boat bases.

"What seemed to surprise them most was that you knew exactly what to hit," said one visitor to Hanoi. "They don't want it to happen again."

Indeed they don't, which is precisely why it should happen again. Hanoi knows very well that American airpower can wipe out in 24 hours what it has taken 10 years to build. They also know by now that there is nothing their chief backer, Red China, can do to help.

Next to U.S. air power the Hanoi regime fears most a "protective" Red Chinese invasion. One thing all Vietnamese have in common, whether they are Communists or anti-Communists, whether they live in the north or south, is a fear of the Chinese.

U.S. bombing of North Vietnam, on a highly selective basis, might very well bring the Chinese across the border into the northern half of the country. Which is another excellent reason for putting the squeeze on Hanoi in this fashion.

TWO VITAL EFFECTS OF AIR ATTACKS

Air strikes on North Vietnam would not, of course, end the war in South Vietnam. But it would have at least two important by-products.

1. It would provide a tremendous and much needed boost to South Vietnamese morale. This was demonstrated by the August strike. It would also arouse fears in Saigon of Communist air reprisals.

In view of U.S. air superiority, it's doubtful if any Communist plane could get that far south. Even if one did it might be a good thing. It would convince the Saigonese that there is a war going on.

2. More important than the effect on South Vietnamese morale would be the impact on the Vietcong. The fountainhead of the Communist insurrection in the south is Hanoi. Vietcong forces in the south get their inspiration, their political guidance, and their military orders from Hanoi.

The knowledge that their privileged sanctaury was under attack would inevitably have a disheartening if not a demoralizing effect on the Vietcong. It would create what one expert on Vietnam—Prof. Bernard Fall of Howard University—has called the "endless tunnel" complex.

To be sure, there are risks.

The Red Chinese might come in on the ground. This is extremely doubtful since Peking has more than enough problems at home without risking a military confrontation with the United States.

Assuming the Chinese did come in, we would have to bomb China, too. That's another risk, but then the world is full of them.

And perhaps it's better to take the risk of winning than the certain road to defeat.

Senator Humphrey's Speech to Polish-American Congress Convention, Chicago, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, the highpoint of the Polish-American Congress Convention which was held in Chicago 2 weeks ago, was the speech of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY.

The depth of feeling which swept the hall of the convention as the Senator strode to the podium and the genuine affection and esteem which resounded throughout the chamber in the standing ovation he received from the thousands of people present made the occasion one of the most memorable I have ever witnessed.

Senator HUMPHREY is a man whose life and record as a public servant personify his belief in American democracy. He continues to express his goals and ideals in terms of positive accomplishments and his enthusiasm for the United States is readily communicated to all those he meets.

Because he does care so deeply about this country and all her citizens, I should like to bring the text of his remarks before the Polish-American Congress Convention to the attention of my colleagues. The speech was interrupted again and again by thunderous applause. At the conclusion the entire audience burst into a spontaneous rendition of a Polish folksong, "Stolat" which, loosely translated, means "May He Live to 100 Years."

As a citizen of the United States who is privileged to serve in the House of Representatives, it is a signal honor to be a member of the same Democratic Party as those responsible and distinguished Americans, President Lyndon Johnson and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. Our country is fortunate that we can draw upon the wisdom, dedication and prudence of such men to meet the enormous challenges of this generation.

Mr. Speaker, following is the text of Senator HUMPHREY's speech in Chicago, September 19, 1964:

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S SPEECH TO THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS CONVENTION, CHICAGO, ILL., SEPTEMBER 19, 1964

No nation has a unique claim to America—but no people from other lands can claim to have made a greater contribution to our society than those who came here from Poland.

America has always been a land of opportunity, and none have understood this better than those who came to these shores from Poland.

And it was a great Polish patriot over 150 years ago who eloquently stated that opportunity in America means opportunity for all. A statesman of compassion, a soldier of courage, he had received from our Government a large land grant in gratitude for his valor in fighting for American freedom. When he returned to his native land—again to fight for its freedom—he left this testa-

ment with Thomas Jefferson. Let me read its inspiring words:

"I, being just on my departure from the United States, do hereby declare and direct that, should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States, I hereby authorize my friend Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole thereof on purchasing Negroes and giving them liberty in my name; in giving them an education in trade or otherwise; in having them instructed in their new condition in the duties of morality, which may make them good neighbors, husbands, and wives, in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and of their country, of the good order of society, and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful; and I make the said Thomas Jefferson the executor of this."

This paper bears the signature of "Thaddeus Bonaventura Kosciusko."

General Kosciusko was the brilliant leader who walked 160 years ahead of us—50 years ahead of Abraham Lincoln—in the cause of extending freedom and opportunity to all Americans. You Americans whose forebears came from Poland, you have an unusual number of heroes in your ranks, but none greater than Kosciusko. And his heroism in battle, against big armies or bigoted minds, is both an inspiration and a challenge to those of us who follow him.

I share your pride in him. I have a warm feeling that today when we are challenged to make opportunity available to all Americans by protecting the human rights of all Americans, Kosciusko would be proud that we have succeeded in passing a law that guarantees equal freedom and equal opportunity to all.

One month ago the newest of our nuclear submarines was commissioned the *Casimir Pulaski*. So we honor the name of the young Polish nobleman who gave his life to help our Nation win its independence. But although this ship will carry inside her more destructive power than all of the explosives used in World War II, her purpose is still the defense of liberty and the cause of peace across the globe. We must always remember that America is a land of peace as well as a land of opportunity. Peace is our preeminent purpose in the world today.

Nineteen sixty-four marks the beginning of the thousand-year anniversary of the existence of Poland as an independent state and a Christian nation. Despite today's conditions of temporary subjugation, the fires of liberty have not been dimmed in Polish hearts. And Poland shall be free again.

We trust the Polish people. We understand well their bravery. As President Johnson has said, "We know the unswerving dedication of the Polish people to the goals of liberty, equality, and independence. That is why our policy is designed to help the Polish people so that they may increasingly help themselves."

Americans are offered a choice this year on how best to serve the cause of Poland, and the cause not only of Poland, but of all Eastern Europe.

We can continue to be friends of the people of Poland through bridges of trade, ideas, visitors, and humanitarian aid. Or we can consider them sworn enemies of ours because they are under Communist domination—and coldly reject the claims of nourishment and brotherhood.

We can accept the commitment of the Polish people to their long Christian heritage. Or we can reject the people of Poland as a godless people because the Marxists in control have betrayed the religious traditions of a thousand years.

Almost exactly 4 years ago that gallant warrior in the cause of freedom, John F. Kennedy, spoke to this congress here in Chicago. He said:

"Our task is to pursue a policy of patiently encouraging freedom and carefully pressuring tyranny—a policy that looks toward evolution, not revolution—a policy that depends on peace, not war.

"We must never—in any summit, in any treaty declaration, in our words or even in our minds—recognize Soviet domination of Eastern Europe. Poland's claim to independence and liberty is not based on sentiment or politics. It is deeply rooted in history, in culture, and in law—and no matter what pressures the Soviets may exert, we do not intend to see that claim abandoned.

"We must strive to restore the traditional identification which Poland and Eastern Europe have had with the European community instead of the Soviet empire. For Poland back through the centuries has belonged to the European tradition of freedom and national independence. It has been a part of European culture, of European economy, and European history. And even the Soviet Union cannot rewrite that history."

This policy stated by John F. Kennedy in 1960 continues to be the policy of this Government and the policy to which I am personally committed.

Let me make it clear right now that only a political charlatan can talk of instant victory over communism, or instant liberation of the captive peoples held in Communist subjugation.

We cannot imitate those of an earlier era who talked grandly of liberation—but when the Hungarian people rose in heroic revolt, stood mute on the sidelines.

No, the possibility of instant victory vanished with the coming of the era of instant annihilation. So we must pursue the more challenging course, the only sane course, of devising a policy that will achieve freedom without obliteration—not only for the Polish people, but for all peoples wherever tyranny and dictatorship rule.

We are convinced—unlike some narrow-visioned defeatists—that time is on the side of freedom. That is, if we put time to good use. We are completely confident that Poland and its people will be restored to the family of free nations.

And we intend to use time as a tool, not as a couch. We intend to build bridges to the Polish people—bridges which may now be obstructed at the other end but which will be there to be opened wide when the day of freedom dawns.

We have already begun. The United States has initiated a new and constructive policy toward the Polish people and the oppressed nations of Eastern Europe. We have recognized the deepening divisions in the Communist camp. We have encouraged those divisions, and we have made use of these divisions for helping these people to regain their freedom and independence.

We have strengthened the economic and cultural ties between Poland and the United States. We have expanded trade. We have assisted the Polish people to build their economy. We have encouraged exchanges of students and scholars. Through the efforts of Congressman CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, of Milwaukee, and myself, the U.S. Government has provided more than $10 million for the construction of a 300-bed children's hospital and research center in Crakow. We have sold American agricultural products for Polish currency which, in turn, we have been able to spend in promoting valuable projects of friendship. We have encouraged the Poles to assert their independence and to pursue a course of action based on Poland's national needs and interests. For example, in the agricultural sector they have repudiated the disaster of collectivization. Today in Poland 85 percent of the land is privately owned.

There is much more to be done. We must continue to open doors and windows in the Iron Curtain. The Polish people must never have reason to believe that we have forsaken them.

Yet there are some within our Nation who would close these doors and windows—who denounce our efforts to build bridges to the people of Poland. Such men seek instant answers to long-range problems. We are dealing "with the enemy," they bellow. We are following a "no-win" program.

But when Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski deals with Gomulka, is he engaging in a "no-win" policy? When Pope Paul concludes a diplomatic agreement with the Hungarian Communist regime—as occurred this very week—is he capitulating to the atheists?

To ask these questions is to indicate the absurdity of the issue. Pope Paul and the Primate of Poland have as their first charge the spiritual welfare of their pepole. When they negotiate with the enemy, it is from an impregnable bastion of principle which has stood for almost 2,000 years.

It is Gomulka who runs the risks in dealing with the church—2,000 years of Christianity and the Catholic church will survive two decades of communism and dictatorship.

It is the Communists, not we, whose power is being eaten away by the corrosive impact of freedom—by the knowledge among their people that the United States looks upon the people of Eastern Europe as friends who have temporarily been denied the right to assert their friendship and their common dedication to liberty.

The Goldwater extremists may cry that in sending food to hungry people behind the Iron Curtain we are aiding communism. But the people who receive this food know its American origin and do not thank their Communist bosses for the nourishment it brings.

Some people denounce our aid and trade in nonstrategic goods. But you know and I know—all the rest of the American people know—that such aid and trade is instead an assertion of human solidarity against the forces of inhumanity. The Polish people know this too. And so do the men and women in the other nations of Eastern Europe.

Having provided the life-giving substance of hope, the Democratic Party under President Johnson will not now turn its back. As President Johnson has said: "The objective of the United States is—and will continue to be—to see freedom returned to Poland and the other nations of Eastern Europe. We know the years of darkness have not extinguished the light of freedom in Poland. And the masters of darkness know that."

The Soviet leaders in the Kremlin do indeed know that. The nations of Eastern Europe are no longer the satellites they were. In being forced to lengthen their leash, Mr. Khrushchev has been forced to admit that they "are getting too big to spank." Soon they will be too strong to chain.

The process may not be swift. But we shall prevail. In spirit, Poland never left the West. In full political freedom it shall return.

The same Goldwater faction that distrusts people abroad, distrusts people here at home. And, characteristically, it distrusts the same people.

I was shocked to hear that Senator GOLDWATER'S runningmate—whose ancestral boat presumably came in only a few lengths behind the Mayflower—has recently condemned the Johnson administration's proposal to revise the immigration laws. He says that he opposes "opening the floodgates"—but what an incredible distortion. What is really at issue is not floodgates at all. What is at issue is "fairgates"—gates which are fair, which do not open only at the knock of an Anglo-Saxon hand.

The Johnson proposal, which is similar to the proposal made earlier by John F. Kennedy and myself, is designed to end the stigma which was imposed by the Republican

administration and platform in 1924—that insulting statutory endorsement of the principle that Poles, Italians, and other Eastern European and non-European peoples somehow belonged to inferior breeds.

The immigration bill, which President Kennedy sent to Congress shortly before his tragic death, opens no floodgates. But it would correct this burning inequity and a disgraceful discrimination against peoples. It will end the quota system which sought to maintain a mythical racial and ethnic purity by apportioning immigration visas among the nations of the world in proportion to the ethnic composition of our population in 1920.

In its 1960 platform, the Republican Party pledged to do something about it, too. But the Goldwater platform of 1964 purged this concession to decency, and now the temporary Republican leadership has added the insult of disdain to the injury of neglect.

On Wednesday of this week, Senator GOLDWATER's handpicked national chairman, Mr. Dean Burch, welcomed Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, to the Goldwater party with the statement: "The Democratic party has forsaken the people to become the party of minority groups."

Now what would your grandfather have said of all this? You will recall, I am sure, that your grandfather belonged to that courageous group of men and women in Eastern Europe who dared to pull up their roots and move their families in search of justice and liberty in another land. They fled from tyranny to be welcomed to our shores in one of the great tides of immigration that invigorated our country in the middle of the 19th century and the early 20th century * * * like my own grandfather and those of so many millions of Americans.

But I tell you this in astonishment and wonder: Your grandfather could not come to America under our present immigration laws. Your grandfather could not come to America under the legislation BARRY GOLDWATER supports. Your grandfather would have found our gates barred to him and to his family—barred by BARRY GOLDWATER and those who share his views on immigration.

And what would your grandfather have done? He would have had to remain in a Communist state in Eastern Europe, hoping and yearning for the light and air of liberty, his eyes turned toward America in quest of friendship and reassurance. Yet what would he have found if America were ruled by BARRY GOLDWATER? I tell you what he would have found—and Senator GOLDWATER has made clear what he would have found: a closing of the windows we have opened to bring light and air to the people of Eastern Europe—an end to our programs of educational and cultural exchange, our food-for-peace program, our information program. Your grandfather would have to suffer in darkness because of the policies of BARRY GOLDWATER.

President Johnson has stated the truly American position on the question of immigration. "In establishing preferences, a nation built by immigrants of all lands can ask those who seek admission: 'What can you do for our country?' But we should not be asking: 'In what country were you born?' "

America is a great land. Yet we are on the threshold of the possibility of more progress by the end of this century than ever before achieved in a century.

The comforts of many will be extended to all.

Our people, who are living longer, will also live in dignity and health.

Our cities that have grown big will also come to know beauty.

A great society is possible for America in which every man will have the opportunity to provide a decent life for himself and his family—regardless of race, creed, or nationality.

We need leadership, however, with vision to match our potentialities. We need a President who heads divisions between people—at home and abroad—who will help put salt in peoples' bread, not pour it into their wounds.

By the grace of God, we have such leadership in America.

Let us continue—with Lyndon B. Johnson.

The Role of Private Enterprise in Urban Renewal

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the intent of Congress in enacting the Housing Act of 1949, and subsequent housing legislation in the urban renewal field was to encourage the use of private enterprise to the greatest extent possible. This involves both the encouragement of private enterprise within a project area through rehabilitation and renovation, and the business community as a participant from without in rebuilding the slums and blighted areas of our cities.

A recent statement by Milford Vieser, the president of the Commerce and Industry Association of Newark, N.J., delivered on September 18, 1964, before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Committee on Construction and Community Development, reveals the role that private enterprise has played and can play in urban development. He points out the need for complete cooperation between local government and labor, business, and the people within the community in order to achieve a successful urban renewal plan. Mr. Vieser also stresses the need to avoid the endless delay which has plagued so many projects throughout the country.

The proper roles of the Federal Government, local officials, and private enterprise are a fit subject for congressional inquiry and debate. Mr. Vieser's statement is a valuable contribution to this dialog.

The statement follows:

URBAN RENEWAL: A PROGRAM FOR PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

(By Milford Vieser)

It is time that the American businessman recognized that the Federal urban renewal program is, above all, a program for him.

The basic purpose of urban renewal is not to compete with private enterprise—it is to clear the way for private enterprise; to create the conditions in which private interests can continue their traditional role as the builders of our cities.

Urban renewal is the program of the city to improve itself through the elimination of slums and blight, to remove their causes, thereby preventing their recurrence, and to rehabilitate and conserve the existing inventory of housing. Its role is not only to provide housing. It is also to provide commercial and industrial structures, better transportation, and cultural and educational facilities. Simply stated, it is a program to make our old, tired cities better places in which to live and work.

As businessmen, our particular interest in urban renewal is not in public housing, except as it is the solution to part of the complex problem of renewing our city. Had we not had a public housing program in this country to start the slum clearance bill rolling, there would be no opportunity today for private enterprise to take the leadership in urban renewal. I know that in Newark public housing prevented living conditions from declining to the point where no one would have invested $1 of private capital in a renewal effort, with or without Government participation. Our role in public housing is to review its record to determine better methods of providing housing for our lowest income group.

However, our natural interest as businessmen is in that portion of the program which provides for the purchase and clearance of blighted urban properties to make way for the private development of new private housing and new commercial and industrial facilities.

To those who think that the job of urban renewal can be accomplished by private enterprise alone, without the assistance of Government, I can only say that it is time we stopped deluding ourselves. The plain, indisputable fact is that most blighted urban areas are far too expensive to acquire and clear to allow any private developer to take on this obligation and still hope to make a profit.

Without Government participation, a badly blighted area deteriorates still further. The result is the opposite of economic growth. It is economic stagnation. It is poverty, with new social problems which bring new financial burdens to the municipality, which in turn bring still higher taxes. It is all the things that are bad for private business.

With Government participation, on the other hand, it is possible to bring into play the constructive power of private enterprise. Let us take one of those blighted urban areas which no private developer would be able to buy and clear. Government participation means an investment in the future of that land parcel, an investment in the form of the expense of purchasing and clearing the land. The next step brings the first return on that investment. The Government sells the land to a developer, and part of the public expense has already been defrayed. Now the forces of private enterprise are able to take over. The developer builds his project. New commercial activity is generated, both inside and outside the project area.

The activity which results from an urban renewal project not only brings new opportunity for private enterprise. It reimburses both the local and Federal governments, which helped start the ball rolling in the first place. Property taxes from an urban renewal project area normally exceed greatly those which were realized from the slum area before the project was undertaken. The expense to the municipality for police and fire protection and for social services in a renewal area usually is cut substantially. Moreover, the enlivened business community generates more revenue for government at all levels. Ultimately, an urban renewal area more than pays its debt to government. It is simple arithmetic—the arithmetic of urban renewal.

Urban renewal is a local program. It is locally planned, administered, and executed. Except for the buying, clearing, and readying of the land it is financed by private capital. A successful urban renewal program requires the complete cooperation of local government, labor, business, and the people.

The cooperation of business is especially vital to the success of urban renewal. No community in our Nation has had a successful program of rebuilding without business leadership. This is a program to which businessmen interested in the future of private

enterprise must give total support, both at the local and Federal levels.

It was 10 years ago that the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co. embarked on a program of new construction in the downtown area of Newark. We erected a modern, 20-story home office structure for our company. This building has become one of the symbols of the renewal program in Newark. We also constructed four other office buildings and we hope to start on still another within a reasonably short period of time. When we complete our complex of buildings we will have built 6 imposing structures and an 1,100-car garage.

What Mutual Benefit has done provides a dramatic example of something I referred to earlier—the arithmetic of urban renewal. Before we undertook our rebuilding program, the properties which we are developing returned to the city of Newark a total of $77,000 a year in tax revenues. When we complete this redevelopment work, those same properties will produce $1,500,000 a year for the city treasury. Moreover, the city will have realized this gain without having to provide new schools, or any other new service facilities. Our company benefits as well as the city, for our policyholders are receiving an excellent return on the investment.

For about 30 years prior to the start of Newark's urban renewal program there was almost no construction in the city of private housing, commercial, and industrial structures. The only building during that time was public housing. Newark was on the downgrade. Its pride and spirit were at a low ebb. Now, a decade since we started renewal activities in the business center of our city, private enterprise has greatly altered the appearance of our downtown business area. In addition to the Mutual Benefit complex, the Prudential Insurance Co. has built a new head office and several commercial structures. The National State Bank, National Newark & Essex Bank, Fidelity Union Trust Co., United States Savings Bank and Carteret Savings & Loan all have invested heavily in our main street by building new quarters for themselves or refurbishing established facilities. The Robert Treat Hotel has constructed a major new addition, and a large new Holiday Inn motel has been built. So have several medium-sized new commercial structures—all on that same street.

To support the expanding Newark economy, our utility companies have spent millions on new facilities. Public Service Electric has constructed a new power distribution center, and N. J. Bell has invested in an expanded switching center. Both our newspapers, the Newark News and the Newark Star-Ledger, are building new plants within areas earmarked for renewal under the title I program. Our breweries are expanding. Ballantine recently opened a multimillion-dollar distribution center as its most recent improvement, and Pabst is engaging in a major expansion plan.

Two chemical companies, Pitt Consolidated and Dixon, have spent huge sums on new plants in Newark. Engelhard Industries, the largest platinum company in the world, opens a new building almost every year. Tung-Sol has improved its home office in Newark, and Western Instruments, formerly the Daystrom Corp., recently moved its home office to our city. Liberty Optical Manufacturing Co., a leading manufacturer of eyeglass frames, has moved from its old quarters in Newark to an ultramodern building at another location within the city.

The city has made its own major contribution with a vast, self-supporting underground parking garage. There is a new spirit in our city. While the problem of rebuilding is complex and at times frustrating with delay, we have good reason for faith in our future.

We are proud of what has been accomplished in Newark, but the investment which has been made places upon us the responsibility of making certain that it is not wasted.

Like all older and larger cities in this country—including many which aren't nearly as old as Newark—our financial problems are serious. As a result of the migration to the suburbs of the middle and upper income groups, as well as some business, major cities have been losing population for the last two decades. The middle and upper income groups have been partially replaced by the low-income workers.

This has brought about a sharp rise in police, fire, school, and welfare costs to the cities. As a result, taxes keep going up.

One of the principal solutions to this problem is the rebuilding of our slum areas, and this means urban renewal with the participation of the Federal Government in the purchase and clearance of blighted areas.

As supporters of urban renewal, we must strive to find a solution to the most pressing problem facing this program—the problem of endless delay—of red tape.

My own city of Newark offers an excellent example of how endless procedures at all levels of government has slowed progress on a job which private enterprise is anxious to get on with.

During the 10 years in which we have had a resurgence of private activity, only one federally assisted urban renewal project—the Colonnade Park Apartments on North Broad Street—has been completed.

Incidentally, this project offers another excellent example of the highly favorable arithmetic of urban renewal. The land on which the Colonnade stands, together with some adjacent land now occupied by public housing, returned $178,000 a year in property taxes to the city before any renewal work was undertaken.

Today that same sector, including the land on which public housing was built, produces for the city $550,000 a year in property taxes. What is more, the cost to the city of servicing that area has been greatly reduced by the renewal work. Estimates of the annual savings, which have resulted for the city through the sharp reduction in police, fire, social welfare, and other service costs, are over $500,000 a year.

However, many of our slum areas still lie untouched. Others have been cleared, but nothing has yet replaced these slums that the city wants for the new ratables that new development would bring.

The biggest single reason for this lag has been endless procedures and red tape. We have had private developers more than anxious to get started. What has held them up has been the agonizing process of getting approvals and clearances from agencies of all sorts, at all levels of government—approvals which must be acquired before the Federal Government can participate financially.

It was only 4 weeks ago that Jack Parker—potentially our largest private developer—was able to break ground on a renewal plan for our city. It was 5 years ago, however, that he announced his plan for a vast multimillion dollar renewal project in Newark. At that time his proposal brought new enthusiasm and hope to everyone interested in the redevelopment of Newark.

Mr. Parker, who has built more than $75 million in high-rise apartment housing in New York City alone, was prepared to start work on his project in Newark within a year of the time he made his proposal. However, because of the endless stream of steps required between the announcement of a plan and the actual start of work on it, Newark was unable to give the go ahead to Mr. Parker until this year.

An exciting plan for the reclamation of about 2,000 acres of stagnant meadowland for industrial and commercial use—a project which would be a boon to our city and to private enterprise—was announced nearly 2 years ago and given top priority in Newark. Yet, more than a year was needed just to accomplish 40 separate steps required by various government agencies at all levels before it was even possible to hold a blight hearing—still an early step in any renewal project.

Delay of this sort simply means that private enterprise must wait until some future date to do a job it is ready and anxious to start today. As businessmen, I am sure each of us can appreciate the cost of unnecessary delay—the cost not only to the public but to private enterprise. If private enterprise is really going to step in and do the rebuilding job in our cities that it wants to do, we must streamline the process by which a sound renewal plan is turned into reality.

On thing which would help us achieve such a streamlining, I am sure, is less centralization of this program in Washington and greater reliance on the know-how and talent at the municipal level. Too often we must wait seemingly interminable lengths of time while an agency in Washington duplicates study and planning which already has been accomplished by highly capable people working for the city.

I don't suggest that Washington, which makes such a heavy financial investment in urban renewal, should merely give automatic approval to any renewal plan it receives.

I am sure that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States can do much to help bring about such a streamlining. The active support of the chamber for any step or any measure which tends to substitute action for delay in the urban renewal program would represent a distinct service, not only to our cities, but to private enterprise as well.

This country has rapidly moved away from its agricultural past toward its present high degree of urbanization and advanced technology. By 1975 we expect that about 80 percent of the population of this Nation will live in urban areas. Already, 90 percent of our New Jersey population lives within the urban sectors of our State.

Obviously, we cannot afford to ignore the problems of the urban segment of our society. We must not only work to correct the problems we face today, but also strive to prepare for the future, when we will be even more urbanized. Urban renewal is the only real tool we have at our command in preparing for this future. It must be sharpened and made as effective as possible.

In Newark, the commitment of the business community to urban renewal is already complete. We have been participants on our own. But we also recognize the need for a many-pronged attack on urban problems in which private enterprise and government at all levels work together for solutions.

We recognize the need to expedite the program at the local level as well as at the Federal level. Toward that end the Commerce and Industry Association of Newark has formed an Urban Renewal Committee of leading Newark businessmen under the chairmanship of Mr. S. Westcott Toole, senior vice president of the Prudential Insurance Co., a recognized expert and a longtime leader in these affairs.

I would like to quote to you the sentence in which we described the purpose of this committee at the time it was formed. It is "To exert helpful pressure, wherever appropriate, to achieve a quickening of the pace at which Newark's renewal program is moving, and to maintain a continuing review of our urban renewal process so as to make it a more effective tool in the rebuilding of our city."

May I suggest that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States consider the formation of a similar committee of businessmen of nationally recognized stature. The

function of this national urban renewal committee, I would hope, would be to help speed the pace at which the national renewal program is moving, and to help make it as effective a program as possible.

I assure you that private enterprise would be among the principal beneficiaries of such an effort.

The Clergy and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column by Robert G. Spivack, which appeared in the September 27, 1964, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Spivack's answer to the pronouncement of a prominent Washington clergyman should be read by all fair-minded people.

Mr. Spivack's column follows:

CLERGY AND POLITICS
(By Robert G. Spivack)

No politician is likely to argue with a minister, least of all one so eminent as Dean Francis P. Sayre, of the Washington Cathedral. But to leave unchallenged Dean Sayre's pronouncement that the Nation faces "a sterile choice" in the Presidential campaign gives consent to a doctrine of neutralism in public affairs that could have consequences far beyond 1964.

The Dean expressed his distaste for both the President and Senator GOLDWATER in language that may satisfy those who look upon politics as a sordid business unworthy of superior men with higher moral values. I think he has been unfair to both men, particularly the President.

I make no brief for politicians as a breed, having spent a large part of my adult life as a reporter, and the rogues I have known would fill many galleries. But one must learn to distinguish between politicians, how they started their careers, what happened as they went up the ladder, whether they changed and grew and, especially as in the case of Lyndon B. Johnson, what happened when they crossed the threshold of the White House.

Perhaps the most unsatisfactory portion of the sermon is that Dean Sayre does not seem to understand the role of a politician in a democratic society, or for that matter the nature of American politics. When a man becomes President, we expect him to function as leader, teacher, commander-in-chief, unifier, or pacifier. We look to the challenger to see how he may perform some of these functions.

But any President must be judged on what he has said and done as President, not on what he may or may not have done as a youth, or Congressman or even as Vice President.

Or let's take the case of Dean Sayre's grandfather, President Woodrow Wilson. According to author John Morton Blum in "Woodrow Wilson and the Politics of Morality," President Wilson never openly took issue with the Jim Crow laws of his day and, indeed, restored a degree of segregation in Federal employment that had been banned since the Civil War. Are we to damn President Wilson on these grounds?

Or do we look at the entire record of Wilson, Kennedy, and Roosevelt before handing down moral judgments?

Lyndon B. Johnson had 1 hour to become President of the United States, to effect the transition after the assassination, for which other Presidents are allowed 3 months after a regular election. How has he measured up, as a man, as a leader, in his dealings with Congress, with our allies and with our adversaries? Do the results outweigh his ownership of a TV station in Austin? If Bobby Baker was as crucial as some make it appear, how has the President managed to function without him?

One may prefer Senator GOLDWATER's approach, or agree with the late President Kennedy's candid comment during the 1960 California primary that, "Of us all, Lyndon Johnson is the best qualified for the office."

Boston Herald Urges Congress to Consider American Ombudsman Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, 1963, I introduced H.R. 7593, to establish an Administrative Counsel of the Congress. The Administrative Counsel would be an adaptation of the highly successful Scandinavian institution of Ombudsman.

An editorial in the Boston Herald recently urges that the American Ombudsman proposal be given close scrutiny during the 89th Congress:

OMBUDSMAN FOR AMERICANS?

In Sweden, Finland, Norway, Denmark, and—most recently—New Zealand, the national legislatures have established the office of the ombundsman, or grievance man, to look into complaints from private citizens.

Would such an arrangement work well in this country?

Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, suggests, in an article in the New York Times magazine, that it might—in modified form.

REUSS would not have the governmental grievance officer directly answerable to individual citizens, as in Scandinavia and New Zealand, but to Members of Congress. If individuals could approach the office of the grievance officer directly, the Congressman feels, it would become "yet another impersonal bureaucracy," and at the same time the traditional political relationship between Members of Congress and their grievance-bearing constituents would be badly diluted.

But the grievance officer—REUSS would call him the administrative council—could serve to relieve the individual Congressman and his staff of much time and effort by looking into each complaint and reporting back on his findings. The Congressman, in turn, could pass the report along to his constituent—or pursue the matter further on his own if not satisfied.

"In a typical week," REUSS says, "I get at least 300 letters, visits, or phone calls from my constituents asking me to mediate for them with the Federal bureaucracy. My staff of seven spends most of its time on these matters and some become my personal concern. As a result, only a small fraction of my staff's work can be devoted to helping me on substantive legislative matters."

The Wisconsin Congressman has filed a bill to establish the office of administrative counsel, but it has remained dormant in the Committee on House Administration since July 1963.

The next Congress should give this measure close scrutiny. The bureaucratic treatment of citizens by Federal governmental agencies is a serious and continuing problem. So is the weighing down of our national lawmakers with duties which have little if anything to do with the business of making laws.

Will Americans Go the Way of the Passenger Pigeons?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, readers of the Rock County, Minn., Star-Herald are privileged to have as their editorial writer one of the finest country editors in America—Alan C. McIntosh. Al McIntosh repeatedly hits the verbal nail on the head as he does when he writes:

We cannot survive if America's yardstick turns to what's in it for me instead of "My country T'is of thee."

There is much to think about in the latest McIntosh offering, which I insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

WILL AMERICANS GO THE WAY OF THE PASSENGER PIGEONS?
(By Al McIntosh)

Once upon a time, when Columbus stepped foot for the first time in the new world, there were nearly 5 billion passenger pigeons in America. So many they formed one-third of the total bird population in America.

For 200 years the passenger pigeons, who thought nothing of roaming several hundred miles for food, blanketed the skies. James Audabon, the naturalist, witnessed one migratory flight in 1813 when the skies were full of the birds. They were so numerous that during the day it was as completely dark as though there was an eclipse of the sun.

On a 55-mile journey near Henderson, Ky., Audabon saw pigeons passing overhead all day long. The migration continued 3 straight days. Audabon estimated that the pigeons in one flock a mile wide, flying overhead for 3 hours, contained over 1,115,130,000 pigeons. And that was just 3 hours of the 3-day flight. That flock alone would consume 8,712,000 bushels of nuts per day.

The flock, tremendous as it was, was but a small part of the 3-day migration.

In one nesting, near Petosky, Mich., after several days the dung covered the ground below like snow to a depth of over 3 inches.

Yet—within two decades after that great nesting the passenger pigeons were all but gone.

Meat hunters slaughtered them. Maybe a good thing with the march westward of agriculture for they would have devoured crops faster than farmers could have planted them.

The last wild passenger pigeon was shot by a boy in 1900.

Today if you want to see a passenger pigeon you will find one, "Martha," in the Smithsonian Institution's museum in Washington. She was hatched in a Cincinnati zoo. She died September 1, 1914.

Her tag, on the exhibit, reads: "Martha, last of her species, died at 1 p.m. September 1, 1914, age 29, in the Cincinnati Zoological Gardens. Extinct."

Meat hunters caused the passenger pigeon to disappear. But how could hunters wipe out a total of over 5 billion birds? It seems that in nature there are minimum limits to population if species are to survive. When the population reached that figure, even though there were several billions left, the passenger pigeon was doomed.

You have to see the last of the passenger pigeons in a museum.

Which raises the eery thought will there be a case in some museum marked "American—1620–1974" because our country might be destroyed?

Seemingly there is no limit to America's future.

A seemingly bottomless pit of most of the world's gold buried at Fort Knox. Physical resources beyond counting.

But—there is no guarantee of the permanence of America. We have been prodigals with our boundless resources, squandering them with no heed for the morrow.

We've polluted our rivers and our streams.

We've chopped down our forests.

We've allowed our lands to be raped of the precious topsoils which have washed down to the Gulf of Mexico.

It was probably a good thing for agriculture that the passenger pigeons did not survive.

But will we survive?

Have we enough integrity to survive?

Have we enough old-fashioned faith to survive?

Have we enough moral courage to survive?

Have we the toughness of moral fiber to survive?

Will be have the resources left to survive?

Have we the selflessness this Nation needs for us to survive?

Do we really care enough to want to pay the price to survive?

Above all—do we deserve to survive as a nation?

We cannot survive if we allow the cancer of moral decay to grow unchecked.

We cannot survive if we follow the false political prophets who "con" us with the lure of something for nothing.

We cannot survive if America's yardstick turns to what's in it for me instead of "My country 'tis of thee."

Martha, the last of the carrier pigeons lived in a cage for 29 years.

Will we live in a cage of softness and selfishness and moral decay for 29 years before somebody puts up a sign in front of us "Species Americans—Extinct." We would have nobody but ourselves to blame.

From President Johnson: Visit and a Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, our President visited New England on Monday, landing in Providence and then traveling to all the New England States. I was privileged to be with him in Hartford, where the turnout of Americans anxious to pay their respect was beyond belief.

His schedule was crowded, but President Johnson displayed his customary warm, friendly desire to talk with the people, to be among them, to report to them and to pledge his continued service. The crowd responded enthusiastically, so much so that many a citizen of Hartford who has known other visits found it hard to comprehend.

I was particularly pleased that President Johnson had an opportunity and took the time, while he was in downtown Hartford, to see and visit the brilliant accomplishment of urban renewal represented by Constitution Plaza. This is a remarkable combination of private and public investment carried out under the authority of the urban renewal act in downtown Hartford as positive proof that where the people have vision, the future is within their grasp.

He met, there, during his visit, some of the leading businessmen and industrialists of our city and our State, and he talked with them. His remarks were down to earth and yet they moved many of his listeners to hearty agreement and inspiration. They drew an editorial from the Hartford Courant, the oldest newspaper in the United States, celebrating its 200th birthday this month, which I offer for the RECORD:

FROM PRESIDENT JOHNSON: VISIT AND A TRIBUTE

Citizens of Hartford gave President Johnson something to remember them by when he came here yesterday. They turned out for the Nation's Chief Executive in a tumultous throng larger than any within recent memory. Not only were there some 80,000 persons packed into the area in front of the Hartford Times where the President spoke, but his calvacade had to plow its way through throngs that time and again brought his car to a stop, as he made his way to rostrum site. No one could recall anything like it, and those who have been following the President elsewhere as he campaigns about the country were astonished by what they saw here.

Obviously it was a converging with political dimensions. After all, the President came to Hartford as a political candidate, and myriad of his fans swelled the great throng. And too, the President in return did make remarks pitching it for his Democratic Party. But the part that the citizens of this community should remember in especial—quite apart from political considerations—was his glowing tribute to the American system of free enterprise. Here the President's words touch everyone, and should be graven on everyone's memory. For they sum up a national achievement and a national philosophy.

Speaking particularly to businessmen who met him at Constitution Plaza, President Johnson contrasted the philosophies of democracy and communism. We have been capped capitalists, he said. Then he defined: A captalist is a man who through prudence accumulates a sum of money and then invests it in America. He expects a reasonable return, but his enterprise and industry and faith build the prosperity of the Nation at the same time. In return, he does not fear he will be arrested in the middle of the night. Free enterprise, the President reminded us all, has been the heart and the measure of American achievement. "We can outwork, outproduce, and outfight any nation in the world," the President assured his hearers, because of this mighty tradition.

Nor was this all just general praise for the American way. President Johnson applied it here in a way that should make this particular community particularly proud. He especially asked to meet business leaders here, he said, because the people of this area have always led in vision, prudence and progress, and he came to take counsel with them. "Your eyes have been in the stars and your feet on the ground," he told this community, "and you have made outstanding contributions to American history and living."

In a political year, the President's words had more than a political implication. If the people of Hartford gave the President something to remember in their thronging presence, he gave them in return something to mull over long after he had gone. It was this, that democracy, founded on free enterprise, is unconquerable—and that we here may take pride in contributing to it so well and so long.

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—The Uncoordinated Effort, IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I referred earlier to the fourth dimension of foreign policy: the ideological and psychological.

This dimension embraces a wide range of programs and activities which are intended to communicate information and ideas to foreign audiences, to influence them, or to move them to a particular course of action.

Included in this category are radio and television broadcasting, distribution of publications, community relations projects, educational and cultural exchanges, strategic psychological operations, and a host of other programs.

As shown in the inventory published by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements ("The U.S. Ideological Effort: Government Agencies and Programs," Foreign Affairs Committee Print, 1964), operations of this type are currently conducted by more than 20 departments and agencies of the U.S. Government. Their cost runs into hundreds of millions of dollars annually. They constitute the third and increasingly important dimension of U.S. foreign policy.

How do these programs operate? How are they coordinated with each other? How is the experience and information derived through these programs channeled and brought to bear on the formulation of foreign policy decisions? How are foreign policy decisions transmitted to the operational heads of these programs and implemented?

In a series of executive hearings held in January and February 1964, the subcommittee addressed these and many other questions to the representatives of the four governmental agencies principally involved in foreign policy decisions: the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, and the Department of Defense.

The testimony of these witnesses, after the required security deletions, was pub-

lished under the title, "Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—Hearings Before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, Parts VI Through VIII." In addition, this three-volume set contains an appraisal of "The Cold War Since 1960," prepared by the Department of State, as well as several research studies of the U.S. Information Agency.

On the basis of information received in the course of the two sets of hearings conducted by the subcommittee—March-September 1963 and January-February 1964—the subcommittee issued report No. 2 entitled "Ideological Operations and Foreign Policy," House Report No. 1352, 88th Congress, 2d session, 1964. The subcommittee's findings, outlined in that report, may be summarized as follows:

First. The basic goals of U.S. foreign policy have been expressed clearly and have remained fairly constant. They are designed to advance our national interests and security by encouraging a peaceful world community of free and independent countries whose governments are responsive to the just aspirations of their people, and by combating Communist designs for world domination.

Second. The concurrent revolutions of the 20th century—in science, warfare, communications, education, and other aspects of life—have in turn revolutionized the practice of diplomacy. Foreign policy operations have acquired a new dimension: the ideological or psychological. This revolution has been recognized only recently by the United States—much later, in fact, than by many other countries.

Third. In the pursuit of its basic objectives in the world, the United States, unlike the Soviet Union, has assigned relatively low priority to the ideological and psychological area of foreign policy operations. The attention and the resources devoted to these operations do not begin to approach those expended on foreign military and economic activities.

Fourth. There exists in the executive branch a broad range of nonmilitary and noneconomic programs which are directed at foreign audiences and can provide support for U.S. foreign policy. These, however, are yet to be orchestrated into an effective instrument of our foreign policy. The concept of an "ideological offensive"—of coordinating these programs and their application—thus far has been only partially implemented by the executive branch.

Fifth. A number of U.S. Government programs which operate in the third dimension of foreign policy suffer from fuzziness of concept. Their purposes and the roles which they are supposed to play in the execution of U.S. foreign policy have not been clearly defined.

Sixth. The coordination of programs operating in a particular field—for instance, information, research, exchanges of persons—is less than fully effective. While considerable progress has been made in recent years to improve coordination, there is evidence that greater effort will be required to complete the job and to eliminate duplication and underutilization of resources.

Seventh. The implementation of the country team concept has improved the oversea coordination of U.S. programs. Careful selection and adequate training of personnel placed in charge of U.S. country teams is indispensable to the success of U.S. operations abroad.

Eighth. Perhaps the weakest aspect of the U.S. ideological effort in support of foreign policy is the apparent lack of a clearly defined, operational authority. Such direction is necessary, in our opinion, to coordinate programs operating on this plane and thereby maximize the effectiveness of our effort.

Ninth. The fragmentation of congressional supervision over programs comprising the third dimension of U.S. foreign policy presents another problem. At least six major committees and an even larger number of subcommittees exercise jurisdiction over programs in this area of foreign policy operations. From the standpoint of legislative authorizations and appropriations, programs are judged, supported, or criticized, as the case may be, on an individual basis rather than in the context of the total effort in support of U.S. foreign policy.

Tenth. Too little effort has been expended in exploring the contribution of private American citizens and organizations abroad to the advancement of U.S. foreign policy objectives. These private operations have a tremendous potential.

At the conclusion of its report, the subcommittee made the following recommendations:

First. The need for organizing U.S. Government operations on the ideological and psychological plane and blending them into an effective effort in support of U.S. foreign policy, particularly with respect to the cold war challenge on this plane, should be acknowledged at the highest level in our Government.

Second. Operational authority for the management of ideological and psychological activities in support of U.S. foreign policy should be unified and placed at an appropriately high level in the executive branch.

Third. A systematic evaluation of all Government programs with a potential for influencing the attitudes of foreign audiences should be undertaken with a view to eliminating duplication, abandoning programs which are no longer related to the requirements of our foreign policy, and providing those which are, with a clearly defined mission.

Fourth. The coordination of programs operating in each of the several fields—exchanges of persons, information, strategic psychological operations, and others—should be greatly improved. The implementation of recommendation No. 2 appears indispensable to the attainment of this objective. In addition, responsibility for coordination at lower levels should be clearly defined and adequate authority provided to make possible effective discharge of such responsibility. The cumbersome structure of interdepartmental coordinating committees should be streamlined by reducing the number of such committees to the minimum required for effective operation.

Fifth. To the extent possible, educational and informational activities should be brought into a single agency or department—as suggested by the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information. Existing division of operations and responsibility between the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and, to some extent, the Agency for International Development, is illogical and not conducive to efficiency and economy.

Sixth. Government officials and personnel responsible for the conduct of ideological and psychological operations should be trained in the requirements and techniques of ideological warfare. It is not practical to try to bring all of these activities into a single Government department or agency. It is both feasible and necessary, however, to provide appropriate training to the personnel of Government departments involved in this type of foreign operations.

Seventh. The input of the ideological and psychological dimension of foreign policy—particularly in the field of basic research in behavioral sciences—should be increased.

Eighth. Cooperation with private enterprise should be strengthened. Prompt attention should be given to ways and means of achieving that goal.

After issuing report No. 2, the subcommittee turned its attention to programs conducted abroad by private American organizations. That subject will be discussed in the next part of my report.

Westchester County Leads Country in Crime Prevention and Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, in our great country, our affluent Nation, possessed of the most advanced technology, of unexcelled cultural advantages available to all, and of a social consciousness which reaches to every corner of our villages and cities, mass crime still exists. The challenge to combat the problems of mass crime makes the jobs of our law enforcement officials momentous as the network which surrounds certain public offenses meshes into a sophisticated traffic which transgresses city, county, and State lines and ignores the strata of education, environment, parental interest, wealth, and civic pride.

So it is with traffic in narcotics, one of the grossest violations of human law.

The most heinous villain is the narcotics baron who operates through national syndicates, who hides behind the local pusher, and who preys upon the innocent, the unsuspecting. He is our society's most evasive criminal.

The county of Westchester, N.Y., has conducted the most intense and successful campaigns in the Nation against narcotics traffic. A concerted effort to combat the problem as it exists within a small segment of the county has uncov-

ered and led to the conviction of leaders in interstate and international traffic in narcotics. This campaign has been undertaken by the county sheriff's office under the direction of Sheriff John E. Hoy who has effectively utilized the combined forces of the Federal, State, county, and city government officials in law enforcement and narcotics prevention.

Sheriff Hoy's contribution to the suppression of the narcotics traffic was saluted by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics in the following words of George Gaffney, Deputy Commissioner:

In reviewing our cooperative effort over the years, I feel I must take this opportunity to extend my most sincere thanks to you for the tremendous contribution you have made in suppressing international and interstate traffic in narcotics. I can say, without any risk of contradiction, that your efforts in this field cannot be surpassed by any municipal official in this country. I shall continue to point to your department as a splendid example of enlightened narcotics enforcement and prevention.

I join with the people of Westchester in expressing my pride and confidence in this campaign. In the public interest, I have asked Sheriff Hoy to outline the enforcement and preventative steps taken by his office.

His report follows:

REPORT OF THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE, WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N.Y., JOHN E. HOY, SHERIFF

Herein is outlined the steps taken by the sheriff's office, under my direction, to combat the narcotic drugs use in Westchester County.

In the year of 1960 as a result of an investigation conducted by the combined forces of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, the sheriff, the district attorney, and local police departments, four persons were arrested, pleaded guilty, and were sentenced to prison to serve terms up to 15 years.

This investigation disclosed the fact that these 4 individuals had influenced 135 persons between the ages of 14 to 19 to use narcotics, such as heroin, marihuana and hashish. This incredible condition called for drastic action on the part of law enforcement and after due consideration it was decided to acquaint the fathers and mothers with the acts of their young people. This was done in each and every case and a follow up has shown the authorities that of the 135 persons who were involved, only 5 returned to the use and sale of drugs and have since been sentenced to State institutions.

Westchester County authorities together with the Federal Bureau of Narcotics inaugurated an intensive campaign to ascertain whether or not narcotics were available in any quantity in Westchester County. Investigations disclosed the information that some questionable people resided within our county whose mode of existence was dubious in character. Their daily acts were observed and it was determined that they were engaged in the narcotics traffic on the wholesale level. Day and night observations of these individuals were conducted by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and members of my staff.

One day they came into Westchester County driving a bakery truck which was discovered to be equipped with a false bottom containing $5½ million worth of pure heroin. The seizure of this heroin, along with the arrest of the individuals transporting it led to the further arrest and conviction of more than 20 others, including Joseph Valachi who had testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations during the hearings on organized crime and illicit traffic and narcotics.

Alarmed at the discovery that such a condition could exist in Westchester County immediate steps were taken to acquaint the youths of the county to the dangers of narcotics and its use. A program was set up by the sheriff to make personal appearances in the high schools of Westchester County. To date 28,226 members of the student body of our high schools have been addressed and warned of the dangers of narcotics use. It is the plan of my office to address every high school in the county on this subject. In addition lectures on the subject of narcotics have been given before groups in synagogues, churches, parent-teachers associations, women's clubs, fraternal organizations, veterans agencies, colleges, and Westchester County medical societies.

In addition to the steps taken as outlined above Mr. George Belk, supervisor, New York office, Federal Bureau of Narcotics, was contacted for the purpose of setting up a school of instruction for the law enforcement officers of Westchester County pertaining to the narcotics problem.

One hundred and forty-nine police officers attended a 2-day session on this subject at the Westchester County Community College. Commissioner Henry L. Giordano, Federal Bureau of Narcotics, Washington, D.C., sent to Westchester County and this school his top experts to instruct our men in all phases of investigatory techniques pertaining to apprehending narcotic traffickers. Deputy Commissioner George H. Gaffney, Federal Bureau of Narcotics, appeared personally before this group.

In addition to the program supervised by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, we have been able to secure the facilities of Iona College for police training purposes where 431 new police officers have been trained and have received instructions on narcotics and narcotics investigations.

Manhattan College and its metropolitan law enforcement conference has set up seminars for the discussion of the narcotics problem at the request of the writer. At these seminars there has been an attendance of approximately 400 persons affiliated in the field of law enforcement, a predominant number coming from Westchester County. We have been addressed and instructed by the top men in the field of narcotics, including the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, the New York City Police Department, and representatives from the New York State Bureau of Narcotics.

We have also been fortunate in having a seminar on narcotics of 2-day duration held in Westchester County under the supervision of the former deputy chief inspector, Edward Carey, of the Bureau of Narcotics of the New York City Police Department, together with his associates. The problems of observation, recognition, techniques, and methods of operations of the pusher of narcotics has been gained through the experience of the men of the Narcotics Bureau and the New York City Police Department.

At present the representatives of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and New York State Police and the District Attorney's Office and local police departments of Westchester County and the sheriff's office are combining their efforts to cope with any narcotics situation that exists within Westchester County.

County Executive Edwin G. Michaelian of Westchester County has appointed a committee known as the County Executives Advisory Committee on Narcotics. The membership of this committee is comprised of doctors, psychologists, psychiatrists, the district attorney, probation officers, the sheriff, a police chief, educators, hospital directors, and judges.

This committee has had before it many experts in the field of narcotics addiction and they collectively are attempting to delve into the causes. The committee meets regularly and discusses the problems with which the various agencies are confronted and gathers pertinent information about eventualities which will be evaluated and acted upon.

Ohio Partners of the Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 28, 1964, in Cleveland, Ohio, a group of Ohio business, civic and education leaders formed an organization to work as a partnership between the citizens of Ohio and the State of Parana, Brazil. The project is known as Ohio Partners of the Alliance and will conduct various programs on a reciprocal basis with the Brazilian State.

This is part of a growing program between the American States and Latin American nations and is sanctioned by member countries of the Alliance for Progress.

"Projects are expected to be worked out on the basis of reports of visitation teams from each State," said Dr. Paul Noble, dean of Business Administration of Ohio University and head of the partnership's executive committee.

The following civic leaders of Cleveland have joined this splendid movement and serve on its executive committee:

Dr. Vernon R. Alden, president of Ohio University; Clifford M. Andrews, vice president of foreign operations of the Ferro Corporation, Cleveland; Frank P. Celeste, president of the World Investment Guaranty Corp., Cleveland; Dr. John E. Corbally, Jr., vice president of Ohio State University; Raymond Dix, publisher of the Daily Record, Wooster; Lynn Brua, 2734 Southington Road, Shaker Heights; Herbert E. Evans, president of the Peoples Broadcasting Co., Columbus; Harry M. Griffith, export manager, Reliance Electric & Engineering Co., Cleveland; William Guthrie, president, Buckeye Federal Savings & Loan Association, Columbus; Joseph W. Vander Laan, executive director of the Cleveland World Trade Association; Severino P. Severino, vice president, Beiswenger, Hoch Arnold & Associates, Cleveland; C. H. Smith, Jr., president, Steel Improvements & Forge Co., Cleveland; Dr. R. L. Moloney, chairman of the department of Spanish and Portuguese, Miami University, Oxford; Don Newkirk, executive director of the Ohio Hospital Association, Columbus; John Crout, retired vice president of Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, and Dr. Otis Maxfield, senior minister, First Community Church, Columbus.

At the first meeting of the Ohio Partners of the Alliance the following address was made by the Ambassador of Brazil Juracy Magalhães, at the Hotel Sheraton-Cleveland on Monday, September 28, 1964:

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR JURACY MAGALHÃES, OF BRAZIL, AT THE MEETING FOR ORGANIZATION OF THE OHIO-PARANA PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE PROGRAM, CLEVELAND, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 28, 1964

I should like to begin by telling you that to meet people and to make friends has al-

ways been one of the real pleasures in my life; and that in this new phase of my activities, since I accepted the honor and the responsibilities of representing my country in the United States, I have always welcomed, as one of the most interesting experiences, every opportunity to contact people in all the different areas of the American society. These contacts are particularly pleasant to me, because on the one hand they confirm the admiration I have always felt for the singular qualities of the American people, and on the other hand they reaffirm the close ties of friendship and understanding that have always existed between our two countries.

It was, therefore, with great pleasure that I accepted President Alden's invitation to come here and to speak to you tonight. And my pleasure was even greater because I knew this would be an opportunity for me to make new American friends and I knew I would find them joined together by the sincere wish of serving the noblest of the causes and working for the final achievement of the common ideals of all the peoples of this hemisphere. For what was to bring us here was the same motivation which inspired the launching and will guide the final implementation of the great crusade of the Alliance for Progress. To achieve prosperity with social justice is not only a common purpose in the Americas: it is a fundamental responsibility of all of us, of the old generation which right now bears the duties of the leadership and of the younger generations preparing themselves for their hour to come.

For that achievement, desirable as it is indeed, is still far ahead; it is a formidable task, a tremendous work which is not of one man, nor of one nation or even of one generation. It is a task for a whole continent, for a community of nations and for the generations yet to come as well as for ours. However, difficult and distant as it may be, such an achievement is not impossible, provided the peoples of the Americas remain united and faithful to their common destiny. I would say, moreover, that we have already identified and recognized the one indispensable condition for the fulfillment of that aim: cooperation. Full, sincere, permanent cooperation between all the countries of this hemisphere is the sole inescapable condition to be fulfilled. And since we have already understood such an important truth, our first task, right now, is to keep faith to that recognition, to fight everything and everyone who could imperil our union and jeopardize our understanding.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to emphasize once again the importance of Latin America from the viewpoint of the foreign policy of the United States. Illustrious Americans, President Johnson himself, Secretary of State Rusk, Assistant Secretary Thomas Mann and so many other statesmen and distinguished citizens—have already done it repeatedly and clearly. As to the importance of Brazil, within the context of Latin American affairs, to the highest interests of the United States and the free world, it suffices to keep in mind that the Brazilian revolution of last April, which restored the national dignity in my country and freed it from the threat of Communist subversion, was justly considered by the most qualified observers of American political thought to have been one of the decisive victories of democracy in our times. The revolution's reinstatement of the foreign policy of Brazil on its traditional path of friendship and mutual understanding with the United States was explained very clearly by President Castelo Branco in his address on July 31 last to the graduating class of the Rio Branco Foreign Service Institute: "The Brazilian foreign policy is based upon the fundamental option which consists in a political and cultural adherence to the Western democratc system." Such a policy on the part of the Brazilian Government opens the broadest possible outlook for fruitful cooperation between our two countries in the field of economic development and social progress. I feel sure that we will respond to the challenge of the responsibilities that rest on our shoulders in measure as we, together and united, explore all new roads to this necessary and fundamental cooperation in behalf of our most enduring common interests. And in so doing we shall be but rendering testimony to the exceptional political foresight of one of the Founding Fathers of the American Nation, Thomas Jefferson. As far back as 1787, Jefferson made this affirmation: "As a North American I firmly believe that my country not only wants but also needs an independent, strong, and friendly Brazil to carry out in the southern portion of the hemisphere the mission that is ours in the northern part. Our two nations, united by a sincere friendship, would not only maintain peace throughout the Western Hemisphere, but would form with the other countries of America a bloc capable of resisting any aggression."

My friends, the least I could say about the partners of the Alliance program, so fittingly launched under the auspices of the Alliance for Progress, is that I see it as a venture entirely in line with the true American tradition of doing things directly, of achieving goals with full and open participation by the people. The mere idea of its launching is one more proof that the Alliance is a living force, not only in the documents that approved it and that regulate its implementation, but also, and principally, in the hearts of the peoples of the Americas.

I feel that special praise is due to the spirit in which the program was conceived and is being carried out: as an instrument to help the Latin American peoples to help themselves, exempt from any sense of charitable assistance or from one of "adoption" such as has already frustrated so many good intentions of collaborating on this terrain. Indeed, each new tool placed in the hands of a Brazilian agricultural worker, through a contribution from the American people, represents one more link to strengthen the ties of understanding and amity between our two peoples; for I do not know of any language that favors comprehension among men better than the joining of efforts for the sharing of a common ideal. And each new school that is built in Brazil with the help of young Americans will be one more home sheltering the same substantiated hopes for a future of prosperity and justice.

In considering a relationship between Ohio and Paraná, the two States which are now planning a partnership of work and progress, one might be led initially to accentuate their dissimilarities: Ohio situated in a north-central temperate area, Paraná at the edge of a southern tropical belt; Paraná open to the sea, Ohio inland, facing the Great Lakes; Ohio garnering the fruits of a fully developed economy, Paraná attempting the first steps toward its economic development; Ohio with a highly concentrated urban population, Paraná with 60 percent of its population located in rural areas. But, with some measure of historical perspective and projection toward the future, it would not be difficult to emphasize similarities: Paraná's economy today, as was Ohio's in the past, is strongly based on agriculture, in consequence of the singular fertility of its lands; and its economic destiny will be, as Ohio's has become, that of maintaining and encouraging a high agricultural productivity simultaneously with the development, expansion and diversification of its industrial plant. Paraná also is a significant example of the harmonious work of a migratory flow of varied nationalities, brought together by the same desire for progress in a land that is young and rich in possibilities. Paraná is today, as Ohio was in the times of Moses Cleaveland, a challenge to the enterprising spirit of its people, and the record of its progress in the last decades shows how this challenge is being met.

Before I conclude, I should like to convey to you a brief idea of what the State of Paraná is, in terms of the Brazilian reality today. The State has an area of 82,740 square miles; it is bordered on the northeast by the State of Mato Grosso, on the south by the State of Santa Catarina, on the north by the State of São Paulo, on the Southwest by Argentina, on the west by Paraguay, and on the east it faces the Atlantic Ocean. It is the second youngest member of the Brazilian Federation, having been raised to the category of Province of the Empire in 1853, when it was separated from the then Province of São Paulo. The evolution of its economy presents one of the most significant examples of the progress being made by some regions in Brazil. After going through a number of well-defined cycles in an extractive economy—mining, lumber and firewood, mate tea, etc.—Párana finally took its place as one of the great agricultural States of Brazil. Throughout this transformation, the breeding of cattle on the broad plateaus westward of the Serra do Mar mountain range continued to be one of the main sources of wealth for the region. But it certainly was since the decade of the thirties, with the migration of coffee from the south of São Paulo to the north of Párana, that the State began the swift ascending trend which now projects it as one of the live forces in the national economy. The richly fertile lands in the north and northwest were thus opened to cultivation in a pioneering march that displaced the economic frontiers of Brazil. Where 30 years ago there was nothing but forest and desert, the labor of a community formed by a true melting pot of the most varied national origins has created a series of urban centers, some with 200,000 and 300,000 inhabitants. The city of Maringá, for instance, ranking second in importance in the region, had a tax yield of over $3 million only 17 years after its founding. The wealth created by coffee encouraged new activities in industry and agriculture, opening perspectives for the economy of the State such as no one could have foreseen only a short time ago. At this point, I would ask your permission to quote a passage of the speech delivered by Ambassador Lincoln Gordon in Curitiba, the capital of Paraná, when the State Assembly of Paraná granted the title of "Honorary Citizen of Paraná," post mortem, to President John F. Kennedy: "President Kennedy would have felt himself at home in this State. Paraná, as well as his home State of Massachusetts, is in the process of creating a new civilization, through the amalgamation of people of many different national origins and cultural traditions. The people of Paraná look ahead with confidence and strength while maintaining their precious cultural heritage in the fields of music and fine arts and attaching the greatest importance to education in all its stages. At the same time, this fast growing State displays an impressive push toward progress, not only through the development of its natural resources but also by the broadening of opportunities to every one of its inhabitants. Indeed, one finds here the spirit of the New Frontier, the expression created by President Kennedy to symbolize his views on political leadership within his own country and on the world scene."

Coffee supplies today over 40 percent of the revenue of the State. It is therefore and will continue to be for some time the main source of wealth of the region, Paraná being today the principal coffee-producing State in Brazil. Production grew from one million bags in 1940 to 18 million in 1960, which represents the total Brazilian quota under the International Coffee Agreement and about a third of total world production.

The participation of the State in the overall national revenue, which amounted to 4.8 percent in 1950, had risen to 7.5 percent by 1962. The rate of population growth is one of the highest in the country: from 120,000 in 1940 to 5,600,000 in 1964. The immigration flow explains, to a large extent, this increase which also benefits the economy of the State through the experience and technical know-how brought into the area by this adoptive citizenry coming from the most varied origins.

This population explosion expresses, moreover, the diversity and magnitude of the problems confronting the administration of the State. There is such a swift process of creation of wealth and multiplication of claims upon the public interest, that the Government has to make a tremendous effort to avoid being overtaken and surpassed by this rhythm. It is indeed a living crisis of growth. There is much to be done in all sectors, despite all that has been and is being done, and despite the resources available locally.

The economic outlook of the State, as I have mentioned, is one of maintaining the agricultural basis of the economy and trying to increase productivity steadily, while making use, on the other hand, of the exceptional conditions for a planned and growing process of industrialization. Paraná is today, without doubt, one of the Brazilian States best provided with the infrastructure required for a great manufacturing center: its territory is crossed by one of the main branches of the railway network of the country, as well as by a good highway system; it is located near the great consuming centers; it has a hydroelectric potential sufficing to attend to the present and future necessities of the entire southern region of Brazil. Besides all this, the State capital, Curitiba, a modern city with half a million inhabitants, is one of the outstanding educational centers of the country, possessing the oldest Federal university in Brazil.

Such is the Brazilian State, enlivened by a unique rhythm of progress, and whose friendly and hospitable people hope to receive the valuable cooperation of the people of Ohio. For myself, I feel sure that the program will be crowned with great success and that it will help to insure a new and promising stage of friendship and cooperation between Americans and Brazilians. And right now, in a sincere desire to help in any way at my command, I want to assure you that the Brazilian Embassy will place its services at the entire disposal of the organizers of the partnership program. The Brazilian diplomatic service will be honoring its finest traditions by participating in this initiative.

Thank you.

Religious Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 2, 1964, I placed in the Appendix an article by Franklin H. Littell entitled "Toward Religious Liberty."

In his article Mr. Littell made some remarks about Protestants and Other Americans United for separation of church and state and at the request of their general counsel, Mr. Franklin C. Salisbury, and in the interests of fairness, I call the attention of our colleagues to the reply prepared by the POAU:

PROTESTANTS AND OTHER AMERICANS UNITED FOR SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE,
Washington, D.C., September 18, 1964.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MULTER: We read with interest the article, "Toward Religious Liberty," by Franklin H. Littell, which you had inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 2, 1964. You state that it should be read by everyone who concerns himself with the problems posed by church-state relations. We commend your interest in the problems of church-state relations.

May we request that since our organization was criticized, by name, in the article which you sponsored that, perhaps, you would permit us to prepare an answer to be inserted in the Appendix to reach a similar readership.

The author, Mr. Littell, has stated that:

"Organizations such as Protestants and Other Americans United (POAU) build up their staffs and budgets by appealing to Protestant anxiety at the rise and increasing acceptance of the Catholic community, and flood our churches with the most vicious and scurrilous attacks on American catholicism, its leadership, and on such Protestants or Jews as seek solutions to specific issues by reasoned discussion rather than blind prejudice."

This, of course, is untrue. His observation is on the same level of accuracy as his previous statement:

"Although the public schools have been largely a Protestant institution, with a prevailingly Protestant liturgy for generations, and although for many decades in various States Protestant boards received tax moneys in contract to perform a public purpose, the petitions of the Catholics for scholarships, or other tax assistance for their schools is condemned as un-American, 'contrary to the principle of separation of church and state,' and so on ad nauseam."

The members of organizations such as POAU are equally offended by Protestants who seek tax money for Protestant parochial schools. It was, in fact, the Roman Catholics who succeeded in establishing the principle of separation of church and state in the public schools by the elimination of the then prevailingly Protestant "liturgy" which, at an early date, characterized the public school system. Organizations like POAU seek to assure both Protestants and Catholics alike that tax money will not be used to support any schools, no matter what the faith, which teach sectarian religion. POAU teaches that sectarian church-related schools must be supported by the members of the church to which they belong.

If Mr. Littell knows of any "Protestant boards" which presently receive tax money to teach sectarian religion, let him reveal their whereabouts and POAU will publicize the violation of separation of church with equal vehemence.

It is odd that a man who accepts the seeking of "solutions to specific issues by reasoned discussion rather than blind prejudice" stoops to an appeal to unenlightened prejudice in his attack on our organization. Contrary to the misrepresentations set forth in the article, POAU rather carries out in practice the principle which Mr. Littell so ably sets forth in a later paragraph in his article:

"We must remember religious liberty, like our other liberties, will not long endure if citizens neglect the disciplined initiative which brought it into existence in the first place."

It is this disciplined initiative which organizations like POAU promote and to which its members are dedicated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN C. SALISBURY,
General Counsel.

Congressman Minshall Report of the 2d Session of 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 88th Congress is nearing adjournment after more than 9 months in session.

The House of Representatives passed nearly 400 public bills out of the more than 3,000 introduced. It also approved more than 100 Senate bills. Of this number more than 300 will have been signed into law by the President by the time Congress adjourns.

During my 10 years in Congress I have answered literally thousands of rollcalls and my attendance record on votes has been better than 91 percent. However, bare statistics do not accurately represent the long hours spent by each of us in committee work alone. It is in committee that the major portion of actual legislating is done. There the bills are painstakingly studied, analyzed, discussed, often amended. Those measures favorably reported by a committee are again studied and debated when they reach the floor of the House, but the spadework is accomplished in committee.

My own Appropriations Committee assignments include a massive amount of detail and work. As a member of two of the most important subcommittees in the entire Congress—the Department of Defense appropriations and foreign operations appropriations—I spend many long hours in locked-door sessions with our Nation's highest civilian and military officials. I have access to top-secret information pertaining to our defense posture and planning. These two subcommittees have a great sense of responsibility in taking initial action on budget requests submitted by the executive branch. My Defense Subcommittee scrutinizes military expenditures, which account for more than one-half of the entire Federal outlay. My Foreign Operations Subcommittee makes the dollar appropriation on economic and military assistance to foreign nations.

I have an intense interest in both of my committee assignments, and I feel that in fulfilling them is one of my important services as a Representative in Congress.

Although there are occasional sharp differences of opinion among members of the subcommittees, I can report to you that every member works diligently in what he believes to be the best interests of his country.

My report on the second session of the 88th Congress follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Unanimous support was given by the whole House for the Defense Appropriation, $46.7 billion for fiscal year 1965, a figure the Senate basically agreed to. It represented a reduction of nearly half a billion from the previous fiscal year, and

a reduction of $718 million less than Pentagon requests. In addition to this amount, nearly $1.57 billion was appropriated for military construction.

Chief dispute in the House over the Defense measure centered around the Pentagon's too-heavy reliance upon cost-effectiveness studies, failure to develop major new weapons, and political censorship of testimony given before my Defense Subcommittee.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

A spirited attempt to cut the foreign aid bill by $247.8 million was waged by the chairman of my Foreign Operations Subcommittee, allied with most of the minority members of the group. This economy move was defeated on the floor of the House by a mere 10 votes in a 198 to 208 rollcall. The House approved a total of $3.7 billion for the entire aid program. The Senate authorized nearly the same amount and their appropriation bill awaits final action as this is written. A rider attached to the Senate foreign aid authorization delayed action somewhat on reapportionment of State legislatures, as ordered by the Supreme Court.

International Development Agency: Public and congressional reaction to the seemingly endless flow of American dollars overseas was reflected by the House when it rejected funds for IDA late in February, later reconsidered and passed the necessary legislation by a narrow margin in May.

Laos Commission: House floor debate was heated over authorization of payment of the U.S. contribution of $683,000 for 1964 to the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos. Dispute was over the Commission failure to prevent funneling of Communist troops and supplies through Laos to Vietnam. Payment was approved in a 268 to 89 rollcall vote.

Vietnam resolution: Following the Bay of Tonkin clash in early August, the Congress approved a resolution in support of the President's action in the crisis and reaffirming the United States' determination to assist any member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization which asks for aid in defense of its freedom.

United National Charter: As the Soviet Union remained intransigent in its refusal to pay certain of its financial obligations to the U.N., the House unanimously approved a resolution expressing its sense that the President should direct our permanent delegate to the U.N. to continue efforts toward securing payment of assessments, and that if such arrears are not paid that article 19 of the U.N. Charter should be invoked penalizing nonpayment by revoking the right to vote in the Assembly.

The Panama Canal may soon reach the point where it will not be able to meet the demand of increased size and number of vessels. Congress authorized a study to determine a site for construction of a new and larger sea-level canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

DEBTS AND TAXES

For the sixth time since January 1961, the House voted to increase the national debt ceiling, this time from a "temporary" $315 billion ceiling to a "temporary" $324 billion limitation. On an average, there has been an increase of about $8 billion a year each year since 1961.

An omnibus tax bill, provided for $11.5 billion reduction in rates, lowering individual and corporate taxes, but repealing the 4 percent dividend credit, and tightening allowable deductions for certain State and local taxes, casualty losses, sick pay, and certain oil and gas income. Too low withholding on payrolls may leave many unhappy taxpayers with money due Internal Revenue next April.

An attempt to repeal wartime-imposed excise taxes on jewelry, fur, luggage, handbags, and toilet preparations was defeated by a scant 22 votes in the House, and continued for another year.

Social security benefits were increased by 5 percent across-the-board by the House, with limited benefits extended to some 600,000 formerly ineligible persons. Self-employed physicians were added to compulsory coverage, firemen were included on a voluntary basis. Increased payroll tax rates for employers and employees will be 3.8 percent each starting January 1, 1965, spiraling upward to 4.8 percent each by 1971. Increased self-employed tax rate will be 5.7 percent as of January 1, 1965, reaching 7.2 percent in 1971. House and Senate conferees are presently meeting to resolve differences. The controversial "medicare" amendment is likely to be shelved until next Congress.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Mass Transportation Act: The $375 million mass transportation act was given congressional approval for the purpose of making Federal grants and loans to States and communities to acquire, construct and improve land, rolling stock and terminal facilities for mass transportation systems owned or leased by a public transportation authority. Of the $375 million authorized, $75 million is to be appropriated in 1965, the balance in fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

Federal pay raise: Proposed increases in the salaries of Members of Congress caused many of us who have always supported pay raises for Federal employees to vote against this bill as a protest against raising our own salaries at a time of heavy national deficit spending. The $10,000 increase for Members was defeated in early 1964, but a majority of the House voted for the bill the second time it was considered, when it limited the congressional raise to $7,500. Although I strongly felt that the average 4.3 percent raise for Federal workers and 5.6 percent raise for postal employees carried in the bill was justified, I voted against the congressional pay raise, feeling that any increase would be inappropriate for Congress at this time. Another military pay raise totaling $207.5 million monthly was voted into effect during this past year.

Civil Rights Act: As enacted into law, voting rights are afforded stronger protection; public school desegregation will be accelerated, discrimination will be eliminated from all programs receiving Federal assistance. Most controversy and debate centered around the public accommodations provision, which outlaws discrimination in hotels, motels, restaurants, lunch counters, movie houses, theaters, and stadiums, or by any establishment which offers its services to patrons of the covered establishment, such as a barbershop located in a hotel; and the Equal Employment Commission, whose task will be to prevent discrimination in hiring, promoting, firing, apprenticing, or job assignment.

National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, composed of 14 members, was authorized to report legislative recommendations to Congress by January 1, 1966.

Wilderness bill: After many years' delay in Congress, the wilderness bill finally received congressional approval. The legislation places 9.1 million acres of Federal land already classified as "wilderness," "wild," or "canoe" land, under a permanent protective wilderness system. The Secretary of Agriculture is assigned to review 5.4 million acres of primitive national forest areas and the Secretary of the Interior some 22.1 million roadless park areas and 24.4 million wildlife refuges and game ranges and to recommend their inclusion or exclusion from the wilderness system. Congress would be required to act before such recommendations would become effective.

Economic Opportunity Act: Better known as the antipoverty bill this new law revives a number of work programs from the 1930's and launches several new ones. The 3-year program, authorizing specific appropriations of just under $1 billion, provides for 10 separate programs under the supervision of the Director of the new Office of Economic Opportunity. The act provides for a Job Corps training youth in conservation camps and in urban and rural residential training centers, a work-training program for youth on the community level, community action programs involving Federal aid and direction to civic groups and other private organizations, a Domestic Peace Corps to be known as VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—and a number of programs for rural areas.

Appalachia bill: The Senate passed a bill to provide public works and economic development programs, as well as the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of this whole region. The House bill awaits floor action in the near future.

Fish and wildlife protection from the use of insecticides and pesticides was furthered in legislation passed by Congress as the result of Rachel Carson's bestseller, "Silent Spring."

National Defense Education Act: The 1958 measure is to be extended for another 3 years and college student loan funds increased from $135 million to $195 million for fiscal 1969. The bill also includes the 50-percent loan forgiveness to student teachers in private institutions as well as public ones. The House will take action on the conference report prepared by conferees from both Houses late this week.

Housing and health: The Housing Act authorizes $1.2 billion for urban renewal, 37,500 low-cost public housing units,

loans to elderly citizens and farmers, and some relaxation of FHA conditions and requirements for home mortgages.

The Hill-Burton Act for construction and modernization of hospitals was extended for 5 years and authorized $1.3 billion on a 50-50 State-Federal matching basis.

Other bills authorized a total of nearly $360 million to provide aid to education of nurses and other professional personnel in the health field.

Highways: $1.1 billion annually for 1966 and 1967 was earmarked for the Federal contribution to our national road system. It should be of interest to know that in the past 2 years 33 Federal-aid highway projects were authorized for Cuyahoga County, having an estimated total cost of $95 million. This covers improvements to a combined length of 17.9 miles and the construction of 31 bridges in the greater Cleveland area.

Veterans: Several bills were passed in both sessions to liberalize the veterans' pension laws. Of most interest this session is the House passed bill to increase non-service-connected pension for veterans and their widows, and to revise upward limits of permissible income without loss of pension. This measure is on the Senate Calendar awaiting action.

PUBLIC WORKS

Over $3.5 million will go into survey work, construction, and operation and maintenance of Cleveland harbor and river facilities in 1965.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will spend $709,000 on the Lake Erie portion of a comprehensive study of the Great Lakes to find a solution to the problem of pollution of lake waters.

It is an honor to represent the nearly half a million residents of the 23d district, one of the most highly informed and articulate congressional districts in the entire Nation. I take particular pride in the fact that these citizens have awarded me their confidence and support during the decade I have served them in the U.S. House of Representatives.

My Cleveland and Washington offices are always ready to provide counsel or assistance for constitutents who are involved in the increasingly complex problems of Federal Government.

Forest Service Should Not Open Green River Watershed to Public Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the city of Tacoma, Wash., receives about 95 percent of its water supply from the Green River. Certain area bordering the river is known as the Green River watershed. This area has for years been closed to public recreational use for the reason that the city did not want its water supply polluted. It wished to protect the health of the citizens of Tacoma who used the water. The Federal Government has cooperated but now is considering the opening of the watershed to public use.

The opening of this watershed to public travel and recreation could most seriously affect the quality of the water in Green River. Waterborne diseases such as typhoid fever, amoebic dysentery, and infectious hepatitis can be easily contracted from polluted waters. The probability of contracting these diseases increases with the increased use of watershed by human beings.

The Green River watershed is not needed for recreational use. In Washington State only 1 percent of the total land area is devoted to municipal watersheds. Thirty-two percent is listed as "public outdoor recreation areas" by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. It can readily be seen, therefore, that the Green River watershed itself would add very little area to that already devoted to public use.

There has been an interesting development in connection with the proposal to open the watershed to public use. The proposal received its impetus from some residents of Seattle and from a couple of public officials representing the Seattle area. Just recently the Seattle City Council asked the Federal Government to exempt its own watersheds from public use. A timely editorial appearing in the Tacoma News Tribune points out that cities other than Tacoma are interested in keeping their water as pure as possible for the sake of the health of their citizens. I insert the editorial herewith and shall send a copy of it and of this statement to the U.S. Forest Service.

The editorial follows:

[From the Tacoma (Wash.) News-Tribune, Sept. 26, 1964]

SEATTLE JOINS THE FIGHT

Seattle, facing the same encroachment on its sources of water supply as Tacoma, has fired off a resolution to appropriate Federal agencies. The resolution, adopted by the city council, asked the Federal Government to exempt from public recreation use any Federal land in Seattle's Cedar River and Tolt watersheds.

The Seattle Times properly classed the action as a fight to maintain the purity of Seattle water.

"The sportsmen who want access to the watersheds," said the Times editorially, "say the public would be protected through pollution-control regulations. But we do not believe either the State or Federal Government would be justified in taking chances with the purity of domestic water supplies.

"Seattle and neighboring cities always have been proud of their water, which is the purest in the United States. This is one of the few areas in the Nation where the bottled water business does not flourish."

If anyone disagrees with this, and with similar comments earlier in the News-Tribune, let him ask the city of Bellingham. There, where the watershed was opened to recreation, the water was polluted to the extent that Bellingham now must put in a $3½ million filter plant to bring water back to the standard required by State and Federal health departments. Bellingham has found that it cannot service ships entering the port with water below the standard for interstate use. Tacoma and Seattle don't want it to happen here. And Bellingham, although already burned, is a strong supporter for Tacoma's case and Seattle's.

Hypocrisy Clouds Nuclear Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the principle issues of the 1964 campaign involves the question: "Should our NATO commanders have flexibility with regard to the use of tactical nuclear weapons under certain emergency conditions?"

Senator GOLDWATER very early in his campaign said "Yes," they should. The opposition immediately retaliated with cries that he was "reckless" and "trigger happy" and that by taking such an "uninhibited" stand he would almost certainly plunge us into a nuclear holocaust.

As it turns out, NATO commanders have had such authority under Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson himself, although he has been most reluctant to admit it.

Under the circumstances it was most refreshing to read Marguerite Higgins' clear and concise analysis of the issue as it appeared in the September 28 edition of the Yonkers Herald Statesman, to which I hereby respectfully invite your attention. I might add that while I agree with her treatise of the nuclear weapons issue, I do not necessarily concur with what she terms "GOLDWATER'S failings."

The article follows:

HYPOCRISY CLOUDS NUCLEAR ISSUE

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—The trigger-happy nuclear issue has been overwhelmingly good for vote seekers in the Democratic Party. But is it good for America?

Ever since the United States exploded its first atomic weapon and got a nuclear head-start, the aim of Communist propaganda has been to brainwash the American public into such a state of terror that its Government would never dare use its most formidable weapon.

This would suit the Communist military purposes just fine. It would checkmate the one area in which America has superiority and leave any contest to be fought out in a way that would assure Communist victory because the Communists have the edge in manpower and conventional weapons.

And the one sure way to invite a war is to make the Communists think that we would never use nuclear weapons even in self-defense. Why should Moscow resist the temptation of sure victory?

OFFICIALS UNEASY

It is against this background that many thoughtful Americans—including some of our top defense officials who are muzzled by policy—are profoundly uneasy over those Democratic Party television commercials showing a little girl picking daisies and then vanishing in an atomic cloudburst.

The target of the commercial is, of course, BARRY GOLDWATER. But whatever GOLDWATER'S failings, and they are many in the way of imprecision and lack of clarity, it is a disservice to the truth, a disservice to the United States of America, a disservice to an honorable and decent American, and a disservice to the 30 percent of America that believes in him, to say that the GOP nominee wants war.

It is "tommyrot"—to use General Eisenhower's phrase—to suggest, for example, that GOLDWATER is trigger happy because he feels that American troops stationed near Hamburg, Germany, ought to have the right instantly to defend themselves without taking the time to telephone Johnson—with their atomic bazookas such as the Davy Crockett (range 2 miles; explosive load 40 ton) if the Russians staged a surprise attack in that area.

HEARING DESERVED

There are some Americans, no doubt, who believe that even the firing of a 40-ton nuclear weapon which has only sufficient explosive power to take out a bridge, ought not to be permitted without a specific checkback with the President of the United States even if, as is almost certain, the delay means the sacrifice through obliteration of the forward troops ordered to stand there and take it without defending themselves in the interval.

It is an argument that deserves a hearing on its merit. But so do the counterarguments deserve a hearing. There is the fact, for instance, that under such conditions the morale of frontline troops is likely to become nonexistent.

And in any case there is much evidence that this issue of emergency delegation of powers has been massively infused with hypocrisy.

Two weeks ago this reporter wrote that according to European NATO sources, there was a gentleman's agreement between Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, NATO commander, and the White House in which in certain specific emergencies, military units equipped with atomic weapons could fire back if fired upon by these weapons.

REPORT AMPLIFIED

Since that time this report has been amplified in two national magazines.

Additionally, in recent days several American sources at the Pentagon have flatly told this reporter that in the Eisenhower and Kennedy years and in at least part of the Johnson administration, the right to fire back with nuclear weapons in specific attack situations has been delegated.

If this is true, and there has been no contradiction as of this writing, the Democrats have been calling GOLDWATER trigger happy for advocating something that has been operational procedure under two Democratic Presidents as well as under a Republican President well known for his cautious ways.

The hypocrisy is not only downright breathtaking but obscures the sensible debate that would be good for America. The central issue is: How best to prevent nuclear war?

WILL IT HELP OR HURT?

If American public opinion is horrified by nuclear mushroom into ruling out the use of nuclear weapons under any condition, will this help or hurt the cause of peace?

If the Russians know NATO frontline troops cannot retaliate instantly to a local nuclear attack, will this help or hinder the cause of stability on the East-West frontline of middle Europe? These are the questions that count.

After 5 Years in South America—Story of Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following article by David B. Richardson which appears in the September 21 issue of the U.S. News & World Report on the accomplishments of the Alliance for Progress in Latin America. This is a thought-provoking piece, and I commend it to my colleagues:

A North American returning home after 5 years in South America brings with him the impression of a whole continent struggling to shake off its backwardness and catch up with the rest of the Western World.

One's second impression is that the likely outcome of that struggle is far from clear.

Chile, in the opening days of September, joined a growing list of South American countries moving to make a sharp break with the past. It did so by electing as President, by a landslide, Eduardo Frei, a Christian Democrat who is pledged to sweeping reform and modernization.

South America has come a long way in 5 years. You see signs of progress in many places—ultramodern office buildings, new factories, broad highways streaming with traffic, store windows loaded with consumer goods. The changes are profound as well as numerous.

Yet South America's drive to modernize, backed by more than $2.5 billion in U.S. aid since 1959 and with the promise of more to come under the Alliance for Progress, has not rescued the continent from the nagging fear that its internal strains will someday erupt into widespread violence and chaos.

South America, for all its recent gains, still suffers from poverty, illiteracy, and disease. It is faced with a staggering increase in population. It grapples with huge economic problems, with widespread social injustice.

In 5 years, Cuba's Fidel Castro, the Communists, and other extremists have failed in several attempts to take over countries of South America. The latest came in Chile's presidential vote, with a pro-Castro candidate who had nearly won power before suffering a smashing defeat. Yet the danger of tyranny remains, and will remain so long as the big problems of this region are unresolved.

How far has South America come as an emerging continent? Can it surmount its troubles and make the grade as a prospering and stable part of the world in years to come?

South America is so big, so complex, so variegated in its peoples and geography that no simple answer would be completely true. It is made up of 10 different countries and 3 colonies, each with its own history, resources, and racial mix, and each at its own particular stage of development.

All told, the 10 countries contain a total of 150 million people and cover an area nearly twice as large as the United States. To travel from the capital cities into the countryside is, in some cases, to go from the 20th century back to the 16th century, or even further into the past.

This much, however, seems clear after 5 years of traveling the length and breadth of South America:

NOW: A MIDDLE CLASS

Large numbers of South Americans are better fed, better clothed than ever before. You see more and more members of an emerging middle class. These changes stem partly from U.S. aid, partly from a rise in industrialization, but also partly from new self-help efforts on the part of South Americans themselves.

Five years ago, the rural areas were the most backward and neglected parts of most countries in South America. Now, farm-to-market roads, irrigation projects, and schools are starting to reach out into many long-dormant backlands. Under this impetus, food production is climbing in several countries.

Five years ago everybody talked about the acute housing shortage in South America, but nobody seemed to be doing anything about it. Now you find low-cost housing projects shooting up in many places. In Chile, a leader in housing, hundreds of modest new homes now stand row on row in many districts where slums festered in the past.

The changes also include growing numbers of all-weather roads, health center and hospitals, water systems, powerplants. No more than a fraction of South America's rural communities have gotten such improvements so far. But there are stirrings of hope. In a Bolivian village, an illiterate farmer tells you: "My sons now have a school to go to and can earn money." Down the road, village volunteers are building a community health clinic in hopes of getting a nurse. A truck has begun making a regular run through the area to collect llama wool, the country's latest boom export.

At the same time, dramatic changes are occurring in the cities. In some places, old Spanish colonial towns are emerging as modern metropolises. South America's new boomtowns bear such names as Cali, Colombia; Valencia, Venezuela; and Santa Cruz, Bolivia. Each is teeming with new enterprise, new opportunity, plenty of money.

These stirrings in the cities are having an impact on the lives of hundreds of thousands of ordinary people. Take, for example, the cholos (Indians) of Peru. Not many years ago, all the cholos were illiterates, eking out a primitive existence high in the Andes. Then many began streaming down into Lima and other cities in search of a better life. At first they had to live in slums and do menial labor. But today you see cholos in business offices, behind store counters, and in Government jobs. They now make up 70 percent of the population of Lima alone, and wield important political and buying power.

South America's middle class still is not large by U.S. or European standards, except in Argentina and a few big cities elsewhere. But it is growing fast. Wage earners and small businessmen throng the shops to buy appliances, clothes, furniture, books. Many of them are also moving upward from the bicycle or motorbike to a small automobile—often buying on credit terms of as high as 2 to 4 percent a month.

THE NEWLY RICH

Further up the economic ladder, a new moneyed class is taking its place alongside the old families who ruled in the past. There are sharp differences between the two groups. The old-family wealthy have traditionally limited their business interests to landownership, banking and law. The new breed is much more free-wheeling, will go into anything where there's the prospect of a good return. It is much less inclined to ship money abroad as a hedge against inflation or politics; it takes chances.

With their derring-do as entrepreneurs, the "new" South American businessmen are forcing many changes in business practice on the continent. They are applying the lessons of modern U.S. and European management experience, learned in some cases in seminars financed by U.S. aid. You see the results in better advertising, the expansion of installment buying, the introduction of employee incentives in some of the larger firms.

In the process of catching up with the modern business world mistakes are made. Bad financing has left many a half-finished building as a rusting skeleton. Inventory control sometimes is so loose that the radio set in the window turns out to be the only one of its kind in a large appliance store—and that set is broken. Business failures are high.

Even so, it was Brazilian businessmen whose city-to-city shuttle planes, between São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, served as a forerunner of today's New York-to-Washington air shuttle. And in the field of modern architecture and construction, South Amer-

icans are credited with several advances now adopted elsewhere.

PRICE RECOVERIES

Foreign trade is one of the brightest spots in the new South American picture. A long decline in the world prices of the main commodities that South Americans export—coffee, cotton, cocoa, wool, cooper, tin—has at last been reversed. Many economists blame the prolonged trade slump, dating back to the mid-1950's, for many of the economic and political crises of recent years.

Now export earnings are climbing again almost across the commodity board. Suddenly, there's more foreign exchange with which to buy capital goods and other needs of development.

On top of this, more money is flowing into South America from other sources. The Alliance for Progress is pouring in U.S. aid at the rate of $800 million a year. At the same time, European and Japanese investors are showing a greater interest in the region by setting up new plants in several places.

More important still, U.S. private investors, who hold the bulk of the foreign investment, are beginning to put in money again, although more warily than formerly. Many investors have been running scared ever since local governments, just a few years ago, began clamping down with a series of expropriations and restrictive moves on remittance of profits.

In 1963, however, new U.S. investments in South America were up $85 million over 1962. And this year investment analysts are predicting that U.S. private companies will increase their holdings there by at least as much—quite possibly more.

This doesn't mean things have suddenly started coming up roses for all United States and other foreign investors. In Argentina, the Government of President Arturo Illia has yet to arrange a settlement for last year's annulment of oil-drilling contracts with United States and British companies, which had invested upward of $150 million since 1958. Individual companies still face difficulties in Chile, Peru, Bolivia, and Brazil.

But there are more hopeful signs, too. Just recently the Brazilian Government agreed to the terms of a proposed sale of the holdings in Brazil of the American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., for $135 million. A previous government had blocked the sale—or rate increases that would have enabled the U.S. firm to expand its facilities and still make a fair profit.

Talk to the managers of major U.S.-owned business firms in South America and you find them, as a group, cautiously optimistic. Their feeling is that the risks in most places are balanced by the rapidly expanding market, the competitive advantage of being on the spot and a substantial rate of return for most products.

"Sure, it's a gamble to be doing business here," says one drug company's chief executive in South America. "But what growth situation isn't? And actually, the risks are less than some reports would indicate. Since the Cuban takeovers there have only been two to three expropriations in this region I know about, and these have all been negotiated to bring fair settlements."

Even so, most of the new U.S. investment here is in manufacturing, not in the more politically risky field of electric power and mining. Most South American governments, far from shunning the investment of a foreign manufacturer, will sweeten the deal by providing a protective tariff if a new product is made locally.

Just recently, one of the most singular developments in South America has been the sudden appearance of political stability. Not for months has a major flareup occurred in any country of this long-turbulent region.

Brazil, the giant of the continent, has enjoyed a prolonged period of peace and quiet following the revolution that ousted a radical leftist regime last April. Things are much more stable in Venezuela, too, since the victory over pro-Castro terrorists who last December tried to topple the constitutional government at the polls.

In Argentina, Peru and Ecuador, a more peaceful period has been evident lately. Colombia, meanwhile, finally has come up with the military means to start routing the bandit gangs that have long subjected its countryside to terror and violence.

British Guiana remains uneasy, with British troops on guard after sporadic violence, but this remote colony seems an exception in a suddenly calmer continent. Even Bolivia, long regarded as the tinderbox of the Andes, appears to be much stabler than it was just a few months ago.

NO CUBA HERE

How long all this tranquility can last is anybody's guess. But that there is a prolonged spell of peace and quiet is significant. To a North American leaving South America after 5 years, it is a reminder of the impressive fact that in all this time the entire region has managed to escape the tragedy that overtook Cuba.

There are sharp memories of that first year or so in South America after Castro grabbed power in Havana in early 1959. Then, the continent was in almost constant turmoil. There were predictions on many sides that sooner or later—more likely sooner than later—one country after another in South America would go the way of Cuba. Walls everywhere bore the words: "Cuba, si; Yankees, no."

Yet, 5 years later, the countries of South America remain free. They remain so in spite of everything Castro and the Communists have thrown at them—propaganda, trained guerrillas, smuggled arms and money, elaborate plots, popular front movements, neutralist pitches. True, there are frequent complaints about various government officials in South America. These are accused of being corrupt highhanded, undemocratic—but none in power now is a Soviet puppet running a police state, or the engineer of his country's ruin.

Indeed, as Castro looks worse and worse, some of South America's government leaders are looking better and better. Take President Fernando Belaúnde Terry, of Peru. In his first year in office, Belaúnde has tranquilized a country that seemed on the verge of bloody revolution. He has done so, among other ways, with a self-help scheme that is encouraging more and more villagers to meet their own community needs with government tools and technical advice.

In neighboring Bolivia, President Victor Paz Estenssoro, a former Marxist, has abandoned leftist policies that were stagnating his country. Now he listens to U.S. experts on how to promote broad growth. The result, a progress calling for more accent on agriculture, transportation, and small industry, is paying off, with substantial help from U.S. aid money, in a 6.5-percent annual growth rate.

In Venezuela, new President Raúel Leoni has done so well in his first 6 months in office that he is being talked of as a leader who may even outdo his vigorous predecessor, Rómulo-Betancourt. Leoni is pushing a 4-year plan of public works and private investment that already is exceeding some of its production targets. Industry alone is expanding at a rate of more than 14 percent a year.

It is military men in two other countries, Brazil and Ecuador, who are pushing programs of development. In so doing, the ruling officers are confounding those who have insisted that only a democratically elected government can produce needed changes.

Already, a military junta in Ecuador has whipped through a tax reform, an administrative reform, and a self-help credit plan for rural development. In Brazil, Marshal Humberto Castello Branco, as President of a revolutionary government, is conducting a major overhaul of his country's inflation-ridden economy and is pushing several social measures.

By no means all of the countries in South America enjoy good government. But to one degree or another, you sense in many of them a growing confidence among top government officials that their country can achieve, in a peaceful way, a social and economic revolution outstripping Red Cuba's tortuous system.

Yet there remains another and darker side to the South American picture. A North American is likely to come away with the depressing thought that South America, in trying to solve its urgent problems, almost is in the position of a man running on a treadmill.

South America's population, according to a recent survey, is rising at an average rate of 2.9 percent a year—much faster than that of any other major area in the world. In India and Red China, the rate is 2 percent.

STAGGERING PROBLEMS

This human explosion, a product of modern medicine in reducing the death rate, compounds the already staggering problems of bringing economic and social progress to the continent. At the South American rate, the 150 million population will double within the next 25 years. Almost half of the continent's population is under 15 years of age, putting a severe burden of dependency on the other half.

What's needed is more jobs and better pay. But industry in this region is not growing nearly fast enough to absorb today's children into tomorrow's labor market. And trying to substantially increase income per capita—one of the main goals of the Alliance for Progress—turns out to be a Herculean feat.

South America's real per capita income rose barely 1 percent in each of the last 2 years—well below the Alliance for Progress goal of 2.5 percent. Last year, in fact, the population growth actually outstripped economic growth in three countries—Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. These three nations account for about two-thirds of the continent's population.

When the Alliance for Progress passed its third year of operation this August, U.S. aid officials were able to reel off a long list of projects completed or underway—new homes, schools, roads, irrigation networks, health centers, water systems, hydroelectric plants. By itself it made impressive reading. But when you set it against South America's needs, the result is chilling.

Take housing: In 3 years, some 180,000 new homes have been built in South America. Yet there are still vast shantytowns around most of the principal cities. Experts say the continent must have, to get ahead of this problem, some 900,000 new housing units a year.

Or take education: Since 1961, about 19,500 new classrooms have gone up. But almost everywhere you travel, you see children without schools. As of now, 10 million children have neither classrooms nor teachers.

Food production, for all its gains in some countries in recent years, is a depressing picture over all. Population has grown so fast that per capita food output in 1962–63 was 7 percent lower than before World War II. Only the pumping in of U.S. surplus foods under the food-for-peace program has prevented growing hunger.

And so it goes, with one problem after another in South America. Progress is being made, but simply not enough to win the race against population growth—and the threat of chaos and violence. Behind the bright facade of surface prosperity, millions of peo-

ple still live in misery and squalor. Opportunity to imrove remains limited.

What's the answer? Is it a question of more U.S. aid, or what? Basically, most development experts agree, the key to whether South America will ever become a thriving part of the world lies with the South Americans themselves. U.S. aid and private foreign investments are vital elements in development, these experts say, but could never begin to take over the major burden.

"What we need down here," says a Chilean economist who has lived years abroad, "is another revolution in every country, a revolution in our way of thinking."

As some observers see it, too many South Americans display only three loyalties—to themselves, their families, and their God. As for their community, their country, the company they work for, these may scarcely enter in. Yet a spirit of teamwork and mutual cooperation is paramount to the real success of any development program.

Many of South America's wealthy keep on shuttling their money into Swiss banks for safekeeping, rather than investing it for productive purposes at home. An estimated $8 billion in such flight capital now reposes abroad.

Others in South America simply wink at corruption in government. They may speak out in favor of democracy with considerable heat, but they lack the sense of responsibility to make it work.

A North American traveling in South America gets used to the sight of cars zipping through unpoliced red lights and people smoking in "no smoking" coaches on trains. For there's an unspoken rule that many go by: The law is to be respected but not obeyed. Tax evasion reaches flagrant proportions in most countries, with loss of revenue of 50 percent or more.

It is habits of mind such as these that hamstring many carefully laid development programs, lead to misunderstanding and ill feelings between South and North Americans, and could ultimately open the way to extremism—if not the Castro brand, then some other.

In an important sense, the revolution in thinking that alone can bring about a breakthrough is already underway in some places and at some levels in South America.

Consciously or otherwise, this revolution is being fought by the cholos striving to improve their lot by their own efforts, by the new businessmen out to apply the latest management methods, and by a new breed of enlightened political leaders who appear to be coming to the fore in several South American countries.

There is a long way to go in South America. But the continent is moving, and there is reason for hope in the fact that, as of now, it is moving away from Castro and extremism, along the path of freedom and progress.

Explanation of Voting Positions of Representative James G. Fulton, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 22, 1964, and on Wednesday, September 23, 1964, I was in my Pittsburgh congressional office making myself available for consultations and conferences with my constituents. This saves trips to Washington, D.C., for my local people, and I am glad to cooperate by making these appointments in Pittsburgh. As the present session of Congress has extended much longer than expected, it is necessary for me to meet these commitments previously made.

On rollcall No. 260, Tuesday, September 22, 1964, on the final passage of H.R. 12633, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 262, September 23, 1964, on the final passage of the National Ice Age Scientific Reserve, I would have voted "nay."

Ship of Good Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, some people may have the mistaken idea that the doctors who sign aboard the S.S. *Hope* enjoy some sort of vacation from arduous medical practices back home. A recent article in the New York Herald Tribune refutes any such misconception.

Dr. Alex Sahagian-Edwards, an internal medicine specialist in New York City's Ayerst Laboratories, soon learned that duty on the floating medical center is all work.

In his account in the Tribune, Dr. Sahagian-Edwards describes how he quickly replaced his camera with a stethoscope—and never picked up his camera again.

Dr. Sahagian-Edwards, in his vivid story, describes the torment of many of the world's people and the devotion of the small group of doctors, nurses, and medical assistants who each year leave their successful practices or jobs to help cure the world's sick and instruct their less knowledgeable counterparts in the latest discoveries in medicine.

Following is the article by Dr. Sahagian-Edwards:

SHIP OF GOOD HEALTH

(By Alex Sahagian-Edwards)

(NOTE.—In Indonesia, South Vietnam, Peru, and Ecuador, disease is the human condition: it batters, blinds and buries thousands there every year. For 3 successive years, the steamer *Hope* has sailed to those countries, carrying a task force of doctors, nurses, and medical technicians to fight disease and medical ignorance. Each time Dr. Alex Sahagian-Edwards has gone with them to work as an internist. This is his report on the Ecuadorian expedition.)

GUAYAQUIL, ECUADOR.—I'm exhausted. I've just spent 3 hours at the clinic of the Luis Vernaza Hospital, and I might as well have held the clinic in the street. The place looks like the Bastille, and the examination rooms are like accommodations for solitary confinement. There is one table and one sink in each cubicle. There is no place for the patients to undress, so we examine them with their clothes on. If you can picture trying to hear a lady's heart and lungs by dropping the stethoscope down the front of her dress (for heart) or the back of her dress (for lungs), then you can appreciate the informality of the situation. However, the diseases we see are so far advanced—so clinically identifiable—that physical examination only keeps up appearances.

Such an experience exposes the desperate need of Ecuador and many other nations for medical facilities and knowledge. And outside the hospital in the barrios, the situation seems overwhelming.

A barrio by our definition is a slum, but these in Ecuador make the Algerian casbahs look like the Copacabana. I went clad in a sport shirt with a camera slung over my shoulder like something off a Grace Line cruise, not intending to play doctor. At the *Hope* dispensary, however, the nurse immediately handed me a stethoscope and an interpreter and, presto-chango—instant pediatrician. I had to examine patients from 6 months to 11 years old, after a lifetime of thumping only adult torsos. The canny nurse explained that pediatrics, after all, was internal medicine for little people.

I had my problems with these small patients. A lady carrying a red-headed child walked in accompanied by two black-haired children. I immediately explained that we were obviously observing a classical case of kwashiorkor, a protein deficiency disease common in advanced malnutrition, whose principal sign is a reddening of the patient's hair.

DYE, NOT DISEASE

"How long has this child's hair been that color?" I asked in my most academic tone.

"Ever since I dyed it," the woman said.

The older children had put chewing gum in the child's hair and peroxide had been used to remove it. The red-head wasn't even the patient.

Instead of being asked to leave the premises, I went on to see at least 15 more patients. We saw cases of tapeworm, kidney disease, tapeworm, rheumatic fever, tapeworm, juvenile diabetes, and tapeworm. The incidence of parasites, such as tapeworm, down here is staggering.

After the clinic I walked around the barrio and it became clear why 80 percent of the children had worms. The area is a swampland, regularly flooded with the tide of the Guayas River. Pools of green slime surround the houses on stilts, and children (mostly naked) run around barefoot, picking up hookworm. There is no plumbing in these houses. The only available water is a rusty pump stationed every three or four blocks. Why a massive epidemic doesn't wipe out the entire population is a phenomenon only an epidemiologist can explain.

On board the *Hope*, I am working directly with two Ecuadorian doctors who have come from opposite ends of the country to live and work on board. One is from Lojas, in the extreme south, near the Peruvian border, and the other from Esmeraldas in the extreme north, near the Colombian border. These men are observing how we practice internal medicine in the hospitals in the United States. And for every *Hope* specialist there is an Ecuadorian counterpart—urologists, gynecologists, neurologists, surgeons, etc.

We have four wards open, plus an intensive care unit for postoperative patients and acute emergencies. In the 7 months the *Hope* has been here, the doctors have set up a teaching program for nurses and medical students in Guayaquil, an immunization program in the slums which has protected about 130,000 children against tetanus, whooping cough, and polio for the first time in the country's history.

The *Hope* people have a nutrition program for poverty-stricken Indians, which has so captured the imagination of the Ecuadorians and everyone else in Guayaquil, that the

wives of the foreign consuls have volunteered their services, along with the upper-middle-class Ecuadorian housewives, who ordinarily shun any direct contact with the poor natives of their country.

The program is the brain child of Dr. Dinah Kohner, a pediatrician of the *Hope* staff. Nine American college students recently gave up their summer vacations to join her.

The program is brilliant, simple and effective. For centuries the Indians have been starving their newborn because they cannot conceive of feeding them anything but breast milk. If a mother cannot breast feed, then the child inevitably dies. However, after 9 months when a new baby comes (as it evitably does), the older infant gets sugar water or anything else that is around. One woman fed her 10-month-old toothpaste.

Dr. Kohner now teaches mothers the simple art of straining food. Whatever the adults eat, the baby eats strained. Along with this basic tenet she is also teaching "sophisticated" facts, such as that beans contain protein, potatoes and corn are starch, and oranges and limes contain vitamin C.

A couple of weeks ago I flew up to the Hope project in Cuenca, a small town in the Andes Mountains. The population is mostly Indian and on Sunday morning (a market day) a few thousand more Indians from remote areas descend into the village.

TOP MEDICAL SCHOOL

In the midst of a primitive atmosphere, there is a medical school which turns out only 25 students a year, but oddly enough it has been our experience that Cuenca-trained physicians are some of the best in Ecuador. Cuenca has about 24 doctors, 21 of whom are on the medical school faculty, and 1 hospital, St. Vincent de Paul, adjacent to the medical school. The Sisters of Charity, who wear the large white caps, keep the place immaculate and efficient.

Most of the doctors have spent some time in the United States and are very conversant with our current medical literature.

For these reasons, Project Hope is going to set up a permanent program there. Three of our nurses on board have already volunteered to return there after this tour. An American orthopedic surgeon, Dr. James Madison, of Miami, will spend the next 14 months organizing a modern medical training center. Medical students from Quito journey to Cuenca to consult with American specialists already working there. Nurse teams from *Hope* have already visited Cuence to work with the nuns.

I never cease to marvel at the ingenuity, courage, and dedication of the *Hope* nurses. Nothing daunts them. Some have been assigned to duties which would give any man pause. I have seen our American nurses go alone into the barrios to teach native women how to bathe infants. On several occasions, nurses have run the dispensaries there without the help of a doctor. The sign of their success is the ever-increasing number of patients who show up each morning when word of mouth has spread through the barrio.

SLAVERY—A MOUTH LESS

Two of my patients want to come home with me. One is a little boy of 11 with a rare blood disorder, and the other, a little girl with chronic kidney disease. I'm tempted to bring them back, but I don't know if I could get them past immigration. This is not entirely in jest, because the other day I met an American State Department officer who is down here consulting on crime and legal matters. He tells me that kidnaping is not a criminal offense, and that every day children disappear with very few complaints from parents. They are apparently snatched and used as household servants (which adds a new dimension to slavery). Many families, mostly Indian, are glad of the opportunity to feed one mouth less.

The last rotation of doctors on the *Hope* ship started July 1. At this point we are sending teams of doctors and nurses to all parts of Ecuador, such as Esmeraldas and Lojas. Activities on board ship are somewhat reduced, but teaching continues. The other day 54 Eucadorian laboratory technicians had a 2-hour session on common laboratory procedures. And just to keep things interesting, one of the workers on the dock fell off a freighter and was rushed to the *Hope* with a comminuted fracture of the femur and possible brain concussion. We are a regular floating Bellevue.

The gringos have never been very popular in Guayaquil. However, I am told by disinterested observers that there has been a visible change in the attitude toward Americans. Wearing a Hope pin in this town is a guarantee of courtesy, gratitude, and effection wherever you go. And why not? To date more than 1,200 Ecuadorian patients have been admitted and treated abroad the *Hope* and thousands more in the various clinics. If we could do this all over the world, Americans would be greeted everywhere.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board of independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abele, Homer E., *Ohio*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*—4000 Mass. Ave.
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla*—4614 Reno Rd.
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Anderson, John B., *Ill.*
Andrews, George W., *Ala*—3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.*—4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.*—The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N.J.*—113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baker, Irene B. (Mrs.), *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N.Y.*—3001 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Battin, James F., *Mont.*—217 Slade Run Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Becker, Frank J., *N.Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Beermann, Ralph F., *Nebr.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.*—1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.*—118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.*—307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*—2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C.*—Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn.*
Bromwell, James E., *Iowa*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*—Alban Towers
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif.*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C.*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Bruce, Donald C., *Ind.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N.Y.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burkhalter, Everett G., *Calif.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.*—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.*—1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N.J.*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y.*—The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.*—220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif.*
Clawson, Del, *Calif.*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.*—1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*—5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C.*—2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Corman, James C., *Calif.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.*—6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.*—4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.*—4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, John W., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N.Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dole, Robert, *Kans.*—6815 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y.*—1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg.*—914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Edwards, Don, *Calif.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.*—5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill.*
Finnegan, Edward R., *Ill.*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.*—Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.*—The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I.*—1235 New House Office Building
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich.*—514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Foreman, Ed, *Tex.*
Forrester, E. L. (Tic), *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C.*—The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn.*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*—3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn.*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla.*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y.*
Gill, Thomas P., *Hawaii*
Glenn, Milton W., *N.J.*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex.*—200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y.*—3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa.*
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.*—4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla.*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.*—4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y.*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif.*
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Harding, Ralph R., *Idaho*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.*—1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, William Henry *Wyo.*
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich.*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.*—1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N.Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.*—26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Henderson, David N., *N.C.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich.*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.*—2120 16th St.
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J.*
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.*—1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*—5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y.*—The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N.Y.*
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.*—4807 Newport
King, Carleton J., *N.Y.*
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C.*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa.*
Kyl, John, *Iowa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif.*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C.*
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah*—800 4th St. SW.