

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17687

reational activities, and in the cooperative work relationships that are necessary to keep the institution going.

One might say about this new project that it is difficult to single out one or two components of the whole that are more responsible than others for its success in helping narcotics addicts regain a sure footing. It is rather the particular combination of the various elements that seems to have produced this unique institution which has come to be described as "the most significant attempt to help addicts off drugs that has ever been made."

The Synanon program was originated by Charles E. Dederich, a former business executive and past alcoholic, and contains some of the functions of Alcoholics Anonymous. He is aided by professional people who give of their time and energy in helping the addicts on their long road back. One such individual who should receive credit is Dr. Lewis Yablonsky who brought this institution to my attention and to the attention of the subcommittee.

Some of the participants in the Synanon program, both male and female, have been drug addicts for as long as 20 years or more. These are hardened addicts who now for the first time in their lives have abstained from using heroin and other drugs for 1 or 2 or even 3 years. Most of their former lives have been spent in prisons and mental hospitals without a cure and without hope for a cure.

I heard the testimony of seven of these brave young people who appeared before the committee and told tales of human degradation that would shock the average citizen beyond belief. I think I should name these seven people, not as "horrible examples" to to exploit their difficulties but to praise them for having the courage to bare their stories and their struggles so that other suffering humans might draw inspiration from their experiences. They have no objections to repeating their personal histories in public; in fact, part of their treatment is to be able to "talk out" their difficulties, and in so doing gain insight and understanding of their own problems. I feel that by giving them recognition for their achievements they will be further encouraged to remain free of the drug habit. I will name them, their crimes, and their present adjustment just as they submitted this information—for the record—at our recent hearings:

Jack Hurst, age 31, from California. Addicted to heroin 9 years. Off drugs at Synanon: 3½ years. Maintained approximately \$25 a day habit through burglary, shoplifting, bad checks, and selling narcotics. Was in custody in the Los Angeles County Jail and Army hospital. At Synanon, he is a member of the Synanon board of directors.

Carmen Armstrong, age 29, from New York City. Addicted to heroin 10 years. Off drugs at Synanon: 1 year, 5 months. Maintained approximately \$25 a day habit through prostitution and shoplifting. Was in custody at Lexington Federal Hospital and Bellevue Hospital in

New York City four times. At Synanon she is one of the administrators at Synanon nursery facility.

Herman Gayer, age 37, from California. Addicted to heroin for 14 years. Off drugs at Synanon: 3 years and 1 month. Maintained \$25- to \$50-a-day habit through armed robbery, burglary, selling narcotics, and procurement—prostitution. Was in custody in the Los Angeles County jail three times and in San Quentin Prison for 36 months. At Synanon he is a "third stager," which means he works out in the community as a salesman. He is a member of the Terminal Island Prison project and returns to Synanon frequently to counsel newer members.

Jeanne Camano, age 29, from California. Addicted to heroin for 3 years. Off drugs at Synanon: 3 years. Maintained approximately \$25-a-day habit through prostitution, theft, and selling narcotics. Was in custody at Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Hospital and San Francisco General Hospital. At Synanon she is the coordinator in charge of office files and has worked in the community for 1 year.

Ronald Pacific, age 22. Addicted to marihuana 2 years and heroin 4 years, total of 6 years' addiction. Off drugs at Synanon: 7 months. Maintained approximately a \$20-a-day habit through burglary and robbery. At Synanon he is in charge of maintenance and the Synanon motor pool.

Betty Coleman, age 39, from California. Addicted for 9 years. Off drugs at Synanon: 3 years. Maintained approximately \$25 a day habit through prostitution, selling narcotics, and work. Was in custody at the County Jail, Camarillo State Hospital, and Lexington Federal Hospital. At Synanon she is a member of the board of directors and head of the finance department, chief girls' counselor, and supervisor of Women's Terminal Island Prison project.

Frank Lago, age 31, from New York City. Addicted for 12 years. Off drugs at Synanon: 2 years and 6 months. Maintained approximately \$25 a day habit through robbery, selling narcotics, and procurement—prostitution. Was in custody at Danbury Federal Prison, Lexington Federal Hospital three times, Bellevue Psychiatric Ward two times, and Rikers Island, N.Y., Prison two times. At Synanon he is a coordinator and plans to attend city college art class under the California vocational rehabilitation program.

There we have it. Just seven young people who have a total time of 63 years as addicts and who have spent years in jails, penitentiaries, and hospitals; who have committed an unbelievable range of crimes from burglary, shoplifting, and forgery, to robbery, armed robbery, selling narcotics, and prostitution.

They were considered hopeless cases a few years ago. Today they can look forward to a life free from the ravages of drug addiction.

The program has survived now for several years in spite of mistrust and attacks by the public, by some professionals, and also by the State on several oc-

casions. The participants have organized into a foundation finally recognized and incorporated as a nonprofit corporation and have maintained their existence through public support, through donations of food, furniture, and other equipment by business concerns in the community and through the faith in the program of the members and the directors, most of whom were confirmed drug addicts a few years ago.

Today they are productive members of their small community. They all have worked hard to turn the old armory building into a home and they have maintained themselves by organizing the collection of food and clothing in the larger community. Every day they send a truck into the city to pick up unsold bread from bakeries and other food items that can no longer be sold by the stores and restaurants for one reason or another. Together they have built an institution as peculiar, but as courageous, as the individual men and women who live there. Because of this unique method of self-maintenance, Synanon can be operated at a cost of some \$60 per patient a month. This is a fraction of what it costs to maintain patients at one of the Federal hospitals for drug addicts, and the more than 200 addicts helped at Synanon, that is individuals who have not relapsed to drug use to date, compare favorably with the 40 patients that, by the hospital's own admission, were helped in the Riverside Hospital in New York City after an expenditure of \$4 million.

I want to emphasize that the people at Synanon as many other addicts at one time used \$25 to \$50 worth of narcotics per day. They often had to steal \$100 worth of goods daily to support the habit, and their crimes, together with the court processes against them and their upkeep in public institutions, cost the community virtually millions of dollars.

Increasingly today the Synanon project is being studied by criminologists and sociologists, and it is my hope that it will spread and expand with chapters being organized in all parts of the country with high addiction rates. It is also my hope that Federal agencies, such as the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and the National Institute of Mental Health, will consider the program as a source of study and as a source of investment of some of the funds available for testing new ways of fighting crime and delinquency.

I have recommended that the director of Synanon, Mr. Dederich, apply for funds to the National Institute of Mental Health, so that he can expand his program and introduce it in correctional and other institutions throughout the country. I propose also that social scientists and heads of treatment institutions for addicts request funds to experiment with the Synanon idea. It is my belief that we have found something new and workable in this project and we must develop it to the fullest extent.

Mr. President, there is indeed a miracle on the beach at Santa Monica, a man-made miracle that I feel can benefit thousands of drug addicts.

1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 6

In bringing this project to the attention of my colleagues here on the floor of the Senate, I want to pay tribute to the founding members of this new institution and to give its present and future participants some of the encouragement and recognition which they have often lacked in the past.

SECRETARY FREEMAN'S PLEDGE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I was very much surprised to read in the newspapers today of the pledge of the Secretary of Agriculture at the United Nations yesterday, whereby we take the first step in relinquishing our control over the distribution of our surplus food and agricultural commodities.

In his speech yesterday delivered before the United Nations he said:

The United States herewith pledges \$40 million in commodities and an additional \$10 million in cash and ocean transportation services on U.S. vessels. This is the American contribution to the total \$100 million for all countries taking part in this experimental program.

The U.S. contribution of commodities and transportation services will be made through the Public Law 480 program, while the cash contribution will come from the U.S. foreign assistance program. In view of our internal procedures for annual appropriations, we are planning that the cash contribution be provided from the appropriations of 3 years separately, beginning with the one now before the U.S. Congress.

I am perfectly aware of the broad authority contained in Public Law 480. I am also aware of the fact that last year at the FAO Conference in Rome Mr. McGovern, then Director of the food-for-peace program, and others indicated that the United States would participate in such a program through the United Nations. But, I feel quite certain that the Department of Agriculture and Secretary Freeman have stepped far beyond the intent of Congress with regard to this program.

The administration presented to Congress this year a very comprehensive farm program containing over 100 pages—and divided into 7 major titles. Title II of S. 2786, and the companion bill in the House—H.R. 10010—dealt with the Agricultural Trade Development Act.

Title II of the administration bill provided, among other things, a major amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. It proposed to add a new title—title V—and provided for sections 501, 502, 503, and 505. Had the Congress approved title V, then the Secretary of Agriculture would have had sufficient authority to have entered into agreements with the United Nations and make commitments for the United States to participate.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that both the Senate Committee on Agriculture and the House Committee deleted this new title and this new authority.

The agricultural legislation is now under consideration by the conferees of the House and Senate. It puzzles me

that the Secretary of Agriculture would commit the United States, in light of the clear rejection of this proposal by both Agriculture Committees.

I think this is the first step in relinquishing U.S. control of the distribution of our agricultural commodities. In my estimation, this is the first step toward giving the Communists under the domination of the Soviet Union an equal share as to the operation of our so-called food-for-peace program.

I raise the question again—If the Secretary had this authority under Public Law 480, then why did he ask the Congress to give it to him in 1962? And, since both Houses have rejected the new title V of Public Law 480, then why did a Cabinet officer make such a far-reaching commitment only yesterday, while the agricultural legislation is still under active consideration by both Houses of Congress?

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, one of the areas of tremendous growth within the structure of our Republic is Federal employment.

President Kennedy, in the course of his campaign, stated:

I abhor the waste and incompetence of large-scale Federal bureaucracies in this administration, as well as in others. (Liberal party acceptance speech, New York City, Sept. 14, 1960.)

And later, in his statement to Cabinet officers and agency heads, he declared:

I am also especially desirous that the number of Government employees be limited to the minimum consistent with getting the job done. There is no question that employment can be held substantially below the levels which would be possible under the funds authorized by the Congress if strong efforts are made to achieve increases in productivity and efficiency, to use better techniques of management and production, and to staff each activity with only the minimum number of employees needed to carry out our objectives. (Office of the White House, press secretary, Oct. 26, 1961.)

The facts, nevertheless, show that instead of reducing the Government payroll the Kennedy administration, in addition to replacing the 452,553 who left the Government service in calendar 1961, also hired 75,854 additional employees in calendar 1961 for a total of 528,407 in 1 year alone.

There is an additional factor which has gone largely unnoticed in both the press and public comment. When you add the 67,804 new employees for the first 6 months of 1962, plus the 217,531 replacements for the first 6 months of 1962, you find the administration has hired an 18-month total of 813,742 Federal employees since taking office.

If therefore, the Kennedy administration is sincerely interested in positive steps to reduce unneeded, unnecessary and nonessential expenditures, the solution should be obvious not only to the President but to the country as well.

Were the President to declare a moratorium on all but absolutely essential positions, the current nonmilitary attrition rate of 20.93 percent would re-

duce Federal payrolls by half-a-million employees per year. I do not advocate mass firing of Government employees, merely not filling the vacancies when they leave the Government service.

This means that current Federal civilian payroll costs, including foreign nationals, of \$14.5 billion could be reduced by a potential \$2.9 billion per year, a substantial saving in this day of staggering Government debt and dwindling gold reserves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter received by the Republican policy committee from the Civil Service Commission, documenting the employment reductions that could be realized by a moratorium on nonessential hiring.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., August 27, 1962.

Mr. DAVID S. TEEPLE,
Secretary and Staff Director, Republican
Policy Committee, U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEEPLE: In reply to your letter of August 17, 1962, the annual separation rate for the U.S. Government during the fiscal year 1962 in the United States was 20.93 percent. This includes all types of separations from Federal agencies. If we eliminate transfers between agencies, terminations of temporary or excepted appointments and leave without pay, the rate would be 11.74 percent.

Rates for the component types of separations are:

Quits	8.24
Transfers	1.53
Discharge	.58
Reduction-in-force	.66
Termination	6.09
Displacement	.02
Extended leave without pay	1.57
Death, retirement, disability, etc.	2.1

Sincerely yours,
NICHOLAS J. OGANOVIC,
Deputy Executive Director.

SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS TAX RETIREMENT ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for H.R. 10.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

PROPOSAL FOR U.S. NAVAL-AERIAL BLOCKADE OF CUBA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, David Lawrence, in his column entitled "Cuba and the Monroe Doctrine," published in the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, September 4, 1962, suggests that a world war might be prevented by a naval-aerial blockade of Cuba. He apparently speaks of an unlimited blockade. His arguments are cogent though I myself would not

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17669

more than a war materiel blockade at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article by Mr. Lawrence, together with an interesting eyewitness report concerning Russians in Cuba, which was published in the Washington Daily News of September 5, 1962.

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

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 4, 1962]

CUBA AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE—U.S. NAVAL-AERIAL BLOCKADE TO FORCE EXPULSION OF SOVIET MILITARY URGED

(By David Lawrence)

The Soviets have political control of Cuba and now have openly acknowledged that they are supplying Castro with military aid. This action flagrantly violates and denounces the Monroe Doctrine. President Kennedy, however, said, in effect, 6 days ago that he will not "invade" Cuba at this or any other time. Does this mean that the Soviet government can consider it has obtained a free hand to take over any Central American or South American country and can assume there will be no opposition by the military forces of the United States?

This is the dilemma in which the Washington Government finds itself today as news dispatches from Moscow tell of the issuance of a formal communique in which the Soviets inform the world they have agreed to comply with the request of the Cuban Government to supply it with "help by delivering armaments and sending technical specialists for training Cuban servicemen."

The Soviet government contends that "all Cuba's true friends have every right to respond to this legitimate request" and that the Cuban Government has "every justification for taking necessary measures to insure its security and safeguard its sovereignty and independence."

So the Soviet formula for conquest is at last made clear. The Communists infiltrate a country, get possession of the government there, and cause it to file with Moscow a request for military aid. This is supposed to be the legal justification for sending armament and military personnel to "train" the local troops. It so happens that the Monroe Doctrine, since the 1820's, has warned the world that no European country would be permitted to get a military foothold anywhere in this hemisphere.

President Kennedy may not realize it, but what he said at his news conference last Wednesday could be responsible for his present embarrassment. Had he not responded at the time to an impromptu question and had he consulted with the Secretary of State before issuing any statement, it is doubtful whether Mr. Kennedy would have given the reply he did on the spur of the moment. A correspondent had asked the President to comment on the suggestion of Senator CAFFERTY, of Indiana, that Cuba be invaded by the United States. Here is the verbatim reply as taken from the tape recording:

"The President: I am not for invading Cuba at this time. No, I don't—the words do not have some secondary meaning. I think it would be a mistake to invade Cuba."

"Question: Mr. President, the Soviets, as you well know—"

"The President:—Because I think it would lead to—that it should be very—an action like that, which could be very casually suggested, could lead to very serious consequences for many people."

Just previously in the same news conference, the President, in discussing possible action in Cuba, had referred to American "obligations all around the world, including West Berlin and other areas, which are very sensitive," and had added:

"Therefore, I think that in considering what appropriate action we should take, we have to consider the totality of our obligations, and also the responsibilities which we bear in so many different parts of the world."

This comment could mean that the President is fearful that, if he takes action in Cuba, it might lead to greater pressures in West Berlin—a reaction which the Soviets doubtless are trying to foster. The Soviets, on the other hand, may be waiting to see whether the United States is hesitant to use military force even as close as 90 miles away from its shores. They could misconstrue the President's reluctance as implying that the United States might not even fight to protect West Berlin or any part of Europe when a showdown came.

The situation strangely parallels the 1930's which Winston Churchill describes in his book "The Gathering Storm," published in 1948. He speaks of the "milestones to disaster" in the 1930's and of the series of acquiescences in Hitler's aggressions in the Rhineland, in Austria, and in Czechoslovakia, until finally the climax came in Poland. Mr. Churchill writes:

"Here is a catalog of surrenders, at first when all was easy and later when things were harder, to the evergrowing German power. * * *

"Still, if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival.

"There may even be a worse case: You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves."

What could Mr. Kennedy really do now? He could order a complete naval and aerial blockade of Cuba and demand that all Russian advisers brought in by the Cuban Government to train military forces in that country be expelled at once. He could proclaim that no further shipments of any kind, either by air or by sea, military or nonmilitary, will be permitted to enter Cuba from any country until the Cuban Government restores to American citizens the properties taken from them in the last few years.

To apply this policy could lead to some fighting. But whatever sacrifices are made would achieve the patriotic purpose of preventing any misunderstanding as to the resoluteness of the West in and around Berlin. It could prevent a world war.

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 5, 1962]

EYEWITNESS REPORT OF RUSSIANS IN CUBA

(By Andrew Fyall, London Daily Express)

(NOTE.—A British newsman who has come out of Cuba tells of the breadth of the Russian aid that is helping build a Communist-style stronghold 90 miles off the coast of the United States.)

MIAMI, September 5.—I have just returned to Florida after a week in Fidel Castro's fortress island, where censorship and suppression are a part of life.

My dispatches from Havana last week were all conveniently "lost" by the Cubans.

Now I can reveal what I saw in the island.

In the fields around Havana I saw row after row of canvas tents—the home of the Soviet "technicians," all brawny young men tanned

by the hot tropical sun, superbly fit and constantly in training.

They glared at me suspiciously over a barbed wire fence as I drove past their camp near El Cano, 12 miles from Havana.

A radio mast was plainly visible from the roadway.

SCORES OF TRUCKS

Several hundreds of yards away, in a thicket of palm trees, scores of Russian military vehicles and trucks were lined up.

But the only guns and uniforms in sight were worn by Cubans.

At the gate of the camp, which could have housed up to 3,000 men, Cuban soldiers carrying Czech submachineguns mounted guard.

A few miles away anti-aircraft guns were being hauled into position in a field adjoining a Cuban Army camp. All along the road from El Cano to Havana troops were on the move.

In Havana, the busiest place is the waterfront.

Every day sees the arrival of a new ship, usually Russian, but often a British vessel on charter to the Russians.

A few bring food urgently needed in Cuba. But most bring Russians in baggy ill-fitting suits and army trucks which are quickly whisked off to secret destinations.

Some ships are unloaded at night and no one knows what comes off them.

I asked several prominent Cubans the reason for this military buildup in a country where eggs are rationed to five a month and butter is almost a luxury.

AT WAR WITH UNITED STATES

Their replies were summed up in the words of a young army officer who said: "We are not just preparing for an invasion.

"We already consider we are at war with the United States. Our people don't mind some hardships while we are building up our defense strength."

He claimed he was speaking for 90 percent of Cuba's people, but in the absence of free elections his words are clearly questionable.

From all parts of the world dedicated Communists, like physics teacher, Trevor Marshall from Birmingham, England, have flocked to Cuba.

Marshall, who admitted he is a Communist, has joined with Russians and Czechs in helping to mould a new destiny for Cuba.

Like most instructors he is a privileged person. With his wife and two children he occupies two rooms in the Havana Libre (once the Havana Hilton), his bill heavily subsidized by the government.

Cuba's few tourists—a handful of Canadians and British citizens from neighboring islands—are turned away by a gun-carrying reception clerk.

TOURIST ON THEIR OWN

The "technicos" and instructors are all-important. The tourists have to look after themselves as best they can.

There is suspicion and distrust throughout the island. I was well aware that my every move was watched.

And when I left, a young army intelligence officer at the airport insisted that I should remove my shoes and socks so that he could look between my toes for hidden valuables or hidden plans.

He peered at my feet, stuck his hands inside my socks, withdrew them empty and said: "All right, sir. Now you can leave Cuba."

RELIGION IN SCHOOLS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, today's Wall Street Journal contains an article entitled "Jefferson's Thoughts on Religion in Schools," written by the distin-

17670

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 6

guisted columnist John Chamberlain, in which Mr. Chamberlain discusses a recent book entitled "Jefferson on Religion in Public Education," written by Robert M. Healey, a member of the faculty at the University of Dubuque Theological Seminary.

Because of the current controversy over the recent Supreme Court so-called prayer decision, I believe the article by Mr. Chamberlain and also the book by Professor Healey merit the attention of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Chamberlain's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JEFFERSON'S THOUGHTS ON RELIGION IN SCHOOLS

When the Founding Fathers put into the first amendment to the Constitution the clause reading that "Congress shall pass no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," did they mean to banish prayer from the public schools?

The answer, as Robert M. Healey makes plain in his "Jefferson on Religion in Public Education," is that they weren't that definite. Since Thomas Jefferson was the moving spirit behind the adoption of the Bill of Rights, which included the first amendment, surely he must have had something important to say on the scope of the religious clause to which the founders would have given assent.

Jefferson's oft-quoted phrase about "building a wall of separation between Church and State" has been taken by a majority of the present Supreme Court justices to mean that he was a strict, a very strict, constructionist in the matter of the first amendment. By strict constructionism public school prayer would be out. But Professor Healey, who teaches at the University of Dubuque Theological Seminary, has diligently searched through all of Jefferson's writings on the subject of religion and education and found title to justify the Supreme Court's most recent stand.

Like others of the American Revolutionary generation, Jefferson wished to have no part of a State church. On the other hand, Jefferson was a religious man. He believed that the order, or the design, of the universe proved the existence of God, and he never tired of referring to God as the "Giver of Life," the "Author of Morality," the "Author of Nature," the "benevolent Governor of the World," and the "Creator, Preserver, and Supreme Ruler of the universe."

CHILDREN AS MORAL BEINGS

As a theorist of education, Jefferson conceived it to be the duty of the public schools to train children as moral beings, endowed as such by the Creator. Though Jefferson considered it entirely possible for atheists to have a good moral sense, he himself felt that "primitive Christianity," as exemplified by the life of Jesus, had much to say on the subject of morality. And he was not for excluding this from the schools.

The proof? Professor Healey finds it in a number of places in Jefferson's proposals for building a tax-supported system of primary, secondary, and university education for his own State of Virginia. For example, at one point, Jefferson hoped to bring the College of William and Mary under State control. In outlining a curriculum for the college he advocated that two professorships of divinity be abolished. But he urged that the college maintain "a perpetual mission among the Indian tribes" which, among other things, would "instruct them in the principles of Christianity."

Again, in a proposed curriculum for the University of Virginia which was drawn substantially as Jefferson had written it, provision was made for the "professor of ethics" to present "the proofs of the being of a God, the Creator, Preserver, and Supreme Ruler of the Universe, the Author of all the relations of morality, and of the laws and obligations these infer."

Thus it can be seen that Jefferson did not interpret the first amendment to mean the exclusion of references to God or Christianity in State-supported schools. What Jefferson, along with his friend and colleague James Madison was worried about was sectarian domination of public education.

In a letter to Thomas Leiper, written toward the end of his second Presidential term, Jefferson said: "The moral branch of religion which is the same in all religions * * * instructs us how to live well and worthily in society."

A BENEVOLENT DEISM

Jefferson, in short, was a man of his times, which were favorable to the feeling that the squabbling of the sects might give way to a benevolent deism in religion in which the things that were common to all faiths would be stressed and doctrinal differences would be forgotten. Quite unconsciously, so Professor Healey says, Jefferson wanted to put the force—and the money—of the State behind the fostering of his own "general religion" of "peace, reason and morality." Inasmuch as this type of religion called for no organized church, Jefferson did not think of its presence in the schools as having anything to do with "an establishment of religion."

Since Jefferson's day the benevolent hopes of the deists have been rudely shattered. But this still does not mean that the Founding Fathers were averse to opening the school day with a very general prayer, or that they were against mentioning the fact in school that morality can have a religious base. On Professor Healey's showing, the author of the Bill of Rights and his friends were merely against making the priests of any single sect into officers or favored beneficiaries of the State.

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN.

A WAR MATERIEL BLOCKADE OF CUBA?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, over 2 years ago, reports were widely circulated that secret shipments were being received at Havana from Soviet vessels, and that some of the crates being unloaded were large enough to hold aircraft assemblies or missile parts. At that time, the Secretary of State, Mr. Christian Herter, was attending a meeting of the Organization of American States. I called upon him to urge that, in concert with the Organization of American States, a blockade be imposed upon Cuba with respect to war materiel. I suggest that all other items—food, clothing, medical supplies, industrial equipment, and the like—be exempt from the blockade. It was to be a blockade, with no war materiel into Cuba and no war materiel out of Cuba. Unfortunately, my plea was apparently ignored. In any event, I have received no information to indicate that the idea was ever even proposed—formally or informally—at the meeting.

Since that time, there have been several developments. The meeting of the O.A.S. at Punta del Este, Uruguay, last January, revealed a deplorable lack of

unity over the threat of world communism—a situation which might well have precluded Mr. Herter from making an effort to pursue my suggestion a year and one-half earlier. The Alliance for Progress has been launched, without any apparent effort to premise it on unified action on the Communist takeover of Cuba. President Kennedy has intimated that we would go it alone, if necessary, should the other members of the O.A.S. persist in their apathy and should the situation in Cuba become sufficiently serious with respect to our security. A Soviet-initiated crisis over Berlin has arisen, and, despite the wishful thinking of some writers, has not cooled off, but has continued to smoulder dangerously. Some 50,000 tons of war materiel have poured into Cuba from Communist-bloc nations, putting the international Communist conspiracy in firmer control than ever. And now we learn that since June some 61 vessels have unloaded more war materiel and some 5,000 Soviet technicians, including 3,500 Soviet bloc military men, into Cuba. The President has recognized the situation, by warning Cuba against aggressive action in this hemisphere, while at the same time saying that this Soviet assistance was not of an offensive character. Perhaps it was intended that the American people be reassured that there is nothing to worry about over the Cuban situation; but if this was the intention, one wonders why it was necessary for a warning to be issued to Cuba. Also, one wonders why no warning was issued to the other nations involved in this penetration by the International Communist conspiracy of the Western Hemisphere.

The situation is further complicated by the Berlin situation, for we all know that the Communist-inspired crises around the world are a part of an integrated plan of aggression against the free world.

The President has been silent over the question of whether the Monroe Doctrine has been violated; if it has been, what is to be done; and where the line is to be drawn if, in his opinion, there has as yet been no violation. Inasmuch as the line between offensive and defensive war materiel can be very fine—especially if so-called defensive weapons are to be transshipped to feed the fires of revolution, infiltration, or guerrilla warfare in Western Hemisphere countries, and inasmuch as it is officially recognized by our Government that the Soviet bloc nations are part of the international Communist conspiracy to aggressively overthrow the free world nations, it would appear that merely to split hairs over the question of the "offensive" or "defensive" character of the war materiel involved is of little practical use.

The question which thus arises is whether a blockade of war materiel should be invoked.

The answer should not be the easy-way-out statement that such a blockade would be an act of war. Nor is it any response at all to say, as the President did, that it would be a mistake to invade Cuba at this time. It is partially responsive to suggest that such action

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17671

might lead to reprisals by the Soviet elsewhere—in Berlin, for example. But such a suggestion implies such a weakness of the administration over Berlin as would cause the Soviets to think that these so-called reprisals would be tolerated. Furthermore, our position in West Berlin bears no resemblance whatsoever, from the standpoint of agreements and rights arising from conquest, to the Soviet position in Cuba.

I think it is time, Mr. President, to point out that a war materiel blockade of Cuba, now in control of the international Communist conspiracy, is not an act of war. Once this myth is cast aside, the situation can be viewed in a more realistic light.

The imposition of a limited blockade of war materiel under the circumstances existing in Cuba raises the question of the extent to which such a blockade would be permissible under the Charter of the United Nations. Article 2, paragraph 3, of the charter provides that—

All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

Paragraph 4 of the same article provides that—

All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Offhand, it might be argued that a so-called Pacific blockade is a threat of force or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of the state blockaded. However, inasmuch as Cuba is clearly under the control of the international Communist conspiracy, the answer could be given that its political independence no longer exists.

Article 51 of the U.N. Charter provides as follows:

Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

It has been argued that it is an extreme view to assert that "resort to force by a member is unlawful, regardless of any wrongs or dangers which provoked it, and that if no collective United Nations relief is available, the member may still have to submit indefinitely without redress to the continuance of these wrongs and dangers," Stone, "Aggression and World Order 95, 1958." The question, then, is whether a blockade limited to war materiel—which is a use of force under paragraph 4 of article 2—is a measure of self-defense under article 51. It has been argued that "to exclude action taken against an imminent danger but before an armed attack occurs bears no relation to the realities of a situation which may arise prior to an actual attack and call for self-defense immediately if it is to be of any avail at all. No state can be expected to await an initial attack which, in the present state of armaments, may well destroy

the state's capacity for further resistance and so jeopardize its very existence," Bowett, "Self-Defense in International Law 191-92, 1958."

Here is where the fine line must be drawn between what is "imminent" and "not imminent," and between what are "defensive" and "offensive" weapons. I suggest that the installation of ground-to-air missiles, the provisioning of MIG fighters, and tons and tons of small arms and ammunition cannot be justified as necessary to the "defense" of Cuba. Moreover, as long as the governing authorities of Cuba represent the international Communist conspiracy, the aggressive character of that Government is clear; and the "imminence" of the threat of attack by such an aggressive Government, especially as a mere agent for the power of Moscow, is as "imminent" as the power of Moscow decides to make it.

Another point should be made with respect to the excessive amount of war materiel being shipped into Cuba. If it is not to be used against the United States—although only Soviet Russia will make that determination—then it exists as a ready source of supply for purposes of revolution, infiltration, or guerrilla activities in other nations in the Western Hemisphere. This poses a threat of armed attack which would be clearly in violation of the Monroe Doctrine. In 1947, the United States took the view that furnishing of war materiel by Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia to guerrilla forces in Greece fighting against the Greek Government constituted an "armed attack" by those states on Greece—see Kelsen, "The Law of the United Nations 798, 1951." I suggest that a threat to do so falls within the concept of "armed attack" as enunciated by Bowett, previously referred to.

Another point that is to be made is with respect to the provision in paragraph 4 of article 2 against the use of force against "the territorial integrity or political independence" of any State. I have already pointed out that Cuba, being under the control of the international Communist conspiracy, no longer has "political independence." The international Communist conspiracy has already violated paragraph 4 of article 2, insofar as it has, through the use of force, taken over control of the territory of Cuba. Accordingly, the Soviets, representing the headquarters of the international Communist conspiracy, are in no position to complain against a war materiel blockade which would be calculated to prevent them from continuing the violation of the territorial integrity of Cuba.

One final argument should be made. Professor Stone suggests that there may be cases in which the failure of the collective-measures procedures of the Charter to successfully meet infringements of the rights of States may give rise to a right to use self-help outside article 51, to protect those rights. This would seem to be particularly applicable to cases involving a violation of the Monroe Doctrine, and more particularly to a violation by the international Communist conspiracy. Goodrich and Hambro also support Professor Stone's position, as follows:

The provisions of article 51 do not necessarily exclude the right of self-defense in situations not covered by this article. If the right of self-defense is inherent as has been claimed in the past, then each Member retains the right subject only to such limitations as are contained in the Charter.

Goodrich and Hambro, "Charter of the United Nations 301, 1949." The authors caution, however, that abuses could arise from unilateral action pursued under this doctrine.

From what I have said, Mr. President, I trust it is clear that a war materiel blockade is not "an act of war" either under the U.N. Charter or under the inherent right of self-defense. I emphasize that this is particularly true when we are dealing with a country that is without political independence and has become but a mere subdivision of the international Communist conspiracy.

It is time to recognize the international Communist conspiracy for what it is—an aggressive, ruthless, godless, monolithic force bent on destroying the free world, with the United States as its No. 1 target.

It is time to realize that firmness, backed by the necessary power, is the only effective way to stop this aggressive force.

And it is time to make clear that whether our rights in Berlin or our rights under the Monroe Doctrine are transgressed, all necessary action to put a stop forthwith to such transgressions will be employed.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS TAX RETIREMENT ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, H.R. 10 relates to the retirement needs of self-employed individuals. It would enable self-employed individuals to establish qualified retirement plans for their own benefit and for the benefit of their employees if there are any. Under existing law, since 1942, self-employed individuals have been denied the benefits of qualified retirement plans because technically they are not employees, although corporate owner-managers are permitted to participate in retirement plans created by their corporation. Enactment of this bill will eliminate this discrimination against more than 7 million self-employed individuals which has continued for 20 years.

Legislation to correct this discrimination has been proposed in various forms

since 1947. It has been the subject of many hearings and considerable deliberation by the tax committees of Congress over the last 10 years. Specifically, the Ways and Means Committee held public hearings on the subject in 1952, 1953, 1955 and again in 1958. In 1959, panel discussions were held by the Ways and Means Committee. The Committee on Finance held public hearings on this subject in 1959, 1960, and in 1961.

In various forms, H.R. 10 has been ordered reported by the Ways and Means Committee in four separate Congresses, has passed the House three times, and has been favorably reported by the Committee on Finance on two occasions. This brief legislative history is indicative not only of the considerable attention Congress has given the problem through the years but also of the tremendous work that has gone into writing this particular legislation.

The bill now before the Senate is the culmination of many years of work by the tax committees of the Congress. It represents an acknowledged improvement over prior versions of the legislation.

Before proceeding with a description of the bill, I would like to make clear at this point that the committee's bill would not affect, in any manner, corporate pension plans now in existence, nor would it impose any restrictions on contributions which may be made by corporations on behalf of their owner-managers or their employees. This bill is restricted in its application to self-employed individuals. While there may be abuses in the corporate pension area which should be studied, it was the judgment of your committee that the correction of those abuses should be considered on their own merit and not as part of this legislation which relates solely to self-employed individuals.

H.R. 10 treats self-employed individuals as employees for retirement plan purposes. By treating them as employees, H.R. 10 permits them to be covered under a qualified employees' pension, profit-sharing or bond purchase plan. However, to prevent these plans from becoming tax avoidance devices for the self-employed, limitations are placed upon amounts which they may contribute for their own benefit; penalties are provided where they make withdrawals before retirement on permanent disability; and payout of their benefits under the plan must commence by age 70½, thereby preventing lifetime accumulations which might escape income tax altogether.

In addition, coverage of employees of self-employed individuals is required and contributions for them must be nondiscriminatory and fully vested, thereby providing pension programs for people in retirement. A program would be provided not only for the self-employed, but also for the employees of the self-employed, which I think number a little over 18 million people.

The House bill treated self-employed individuals under different rules depending upon whether they had three or

fewer employees or more than three employees. It required a self-employed individual with more than three employees to cover each of them with more than 3 years' service, under this plan. If he had three or fewer employees, the self-employed individual was not required to include them in the retirement program. The committee has simplified the House bill and also has made it more equitable by requiring all self-employed persons who desire retirement plan coverage for themselves to cover all their employees under their retirement plan regardless of the number of employees they might have. This is a distinct improvement over the House bill.

The committee's bill also requires that each employee of the self-employed be granted nonforfeitable rights to contributors. The House bill would have required vesting only where there were more than three employees of the self-employed. The Committee on Finance felt it was unfair to deny employees a vested right to contributions made for them when their employer will always have a vested right to contributions he makes on his own behalf. Here again, we have improved upon the House bill.

Under the House bill, contributions for self-employed individuals were based upon their self-employment earnings. However, this made it possible for them to receive retirement benefits based upon investment income rather than earnings from personal services. The committee felt this was unwise and we provided instead that contributions for self-employed be based upon their earned income which the bill defines generally to mean compensation for personal services; however, special rules apply where net income of the self-employed individual is from a trade or business in which both capital and personal services are material income-producing factors. This change not only places contributions for self-employed persons on a more proper basis but also serves to reduce substantially the revenue loss under the bill.

The committee bill allows self-employed persons to contribute to a qualified retirement plan, on their own behalf, 10 percent of their earned income, up to \$2,500. However, the amount which may be deducted on a tax return is limited still further. Although the first \$1,000 contributed may be deducted in full, only one-half of contributions between \$1,000 and \$2,500 may be deducted. Under this rule, a self-employed individual who makes the maximum allowable contribution of \$2,500 may actually deduct on his tax return only \$1,750. Moreover, the committee bill definitely limits to \$2,500 a year the amount contributed for any self-employed individual regardless of the number of businesses or employees he may have. The House bill, by contrast, provided a basic limitation on contributions for self-employed persons of 10 percent of self-employment earnings or \$2,500, whichever was lesser, but this basic limitation could have been exceeded by self-employed persons with more than three employees where con-

siderable amounts were actually contributed for employees. In such a case there was no dollar limit on deductible contributions.

In other words, the House bill had no limitation in some respects, so long as the retirement program which was set up for employees was as generous and as beneficial to the employees as it was to the self-employed. In the Senate committee bill we have added limitations so that under no conditions can a self-employed deduct from his income tax return more than \$1,750, irrespective of what he might be doing for his employees. We further have required that he not be permitted to set up a retirement program for himself unless he also sets up a retirement program for his employees.

The Committee on Finance felt that this provision gave self-employed persons who had diverse business interests and large numbers of employees unwarranted advantages over other self-employed persons. For this reason, and to further protect the revenues, the committee bill has cut back substantially on the tax deduction privileges of the House bill.

Under the House bill, retirement plans covering self-employed individuals with three or more employees could be coordinated with social security under special rules which permitted the self-employed individual to take into account only social security taxes actually paid by him on behalf of his employees and self-employment tax paid for himself. Self-employed individuals with three or fewer employees would have been permitted to coordinate their plan for employees under the more beneficial rules of existing law. The committee bill adopts the more rigid coordination rule of the House bill, but applies it to all plans covering self-employed individuals without regard to the number of employees. This not only simplifies the bill, but makes it certain that no self-employed person can establish a plan under which his employees ostensibly are covered, but where no contribution would be made for them because their retirement benefits would be provided through social security.

The bill as approved by the Finance Committee requires self-employed individuals to consent to be covered under qualified employees' retirement plans. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. This consent requirement improves upon the House bill in two important respects: First, it allows existing plans covering employees of the self-employed to continue to function under the present law unless the self-employed person chooses to participate under the plan. If he does consent to coverage, the plan would have to be modified to incorporate the new requirements of this bill. Second, without the consent provision, a self-employed person who is a minority partner in one partnership and a controlling partner in another would have to establish a plan for employees of his controlled partnership if the other partnership, in which he is a minority partner, established a

In Buenos Aires, he parlayed the interests of two groups of Americans into his first promotional success. One group was trying to sell skywriting equipment, but had neither plane nor pilot. The other group was looking for someone with enough cash for advertising to take on the franchise to sell Eversharp pencils.

Cournand had no cash, but he had access to an airplane and was a pilot. He demonstrated the skywriting, and by spewing Eversharp across the sky got the pencil franchise. "In a year, I was a millionaire in francs—that was \$80,000—and I returned home to show my family I was a success," he says. He was 25 years old and in another year was broke; officially, he lost the money in an unsuccessful venture to sell shoes to the Russians, but a between-us-boys twinkle says he enjoyed spending every centime of it.

MIGRATION DEAL

He wanted to get to the United States. "France is too small for me. You cannot be a young general in France." He talked the editor of a French trade magazine into paying his traveling and living expenses to Canada to write a series of articles on industry in the Dominion and in the United States. When he got to New York, he resigned his job and leased Grand Central Palace for a French trade fair. Then he went to the Franco-American Board of Trade and got its backing for the project.

He explains: "I had decided I wanted to be the representative in this country for some French business, and I thought the way to find out what kind of business was to hold a fair and see which booth most people were interested in. Then I would ask that manufacturer to let me represent him." The scheme worked, but not quite that way. He told it unknowingly to the head of Caron perfumes, who was so delighted with Cournand's enterprise that he signed him up on the spot.

THE SCENT

Cournand had to stray from the scent on occasion since, but only reluctantly and by force of circumstances. In 1927 he married the daughter of the founder of a large architectural bronze business, and at her father's insistence joined the company. "In the bronze business I was very unhappy," he recalls. After his wife died, he left General Bronze and took on the U.S. sales agency for Celestine Vichy Water. In 1940, he got the Lanvin franchise, but before he could exploit it the war cut off supplies.

By this time he was an American citizen and went to Washington to sign up with the Army Air Corps. "My old friend Hap Arnold (Gen. H. H. Arnold, head of the Air Force) told me 'Edouard, you and I are too old to fly in this war. You go back to New York and figure out something to make for us.'"

What he figured out was the one-piece plastic canopy for planes. He uses the experience to illustrate why he succeeded in the perfume business: "Everyone else builds from what exists, I look at what should be the base and I build from what should be there. I knew from aviation two things. One was the dogfight. By the end of the war it was a two-second affair. So I said in this war it was going to be a split second affair and everyone had to have visibility. Two, if you are going to make a glass dome and there's an engineering change it takes weeks because you need a steel mold. I had to find a material strong enough that could be shaped easier. When I offered it to Du Pont they said I was crazy."

MASS MARKETING

When he got back to the perfume business, nobody had ever successfully mass-merchandised imported perfume. Coty had tried it before the war, and ran into difficulties that would have swamped a company of lesser size and fewer products. Lan-

vin even now has only perfumes, toilet waters, bath oils, dusting and talcum powders in seven fragrances—with Arpege and My Sin perfumes and toilet waters accounting for 90 percent of sales—and in 1947 the product line was even narrower. (This summer, though, Lanvin added a suntan cream and has plans for a full line of men's toiletries.)

"Everything in this business," says a man who has made it his life, "tells us a company can't be mass and exclusive at the same time." The giants of the business—Coty, Avon, Revlon—are mass merchandisers of all forms of cosmetics and toiletries. Until Cournand, the other strictly fragrance houses limited distribution to uppercrust outlets. Says Leon Schulman, Lanvin administrative vice president and treasurer: "The industry had tried to cultivate the American abroad, not here. It was snob appeal."

Cournand hired 7 salesmen, giving each a territory so that every city in the country with a population of 50,000 or more was covered. Eventually they signed up 7,500 retailers (drugstores, department stores, and specialty shops), Lanvin backed them with heavy advertising (Now \$2.5 million a year), and none of the 7 salesmen was making less than \$30,000 a year and 1 was drawing down \$90,000.

FRANCHISE PLAN

The business grew faster than Cournand thought his seven men could handle, so in the midfifties he offered them a chance to buy franchises; each would own a piece of the business and set up his own distribution. He's grieved that none took him up on the offer because he had to expand his field force until now he has 43 sales representatives.

Last year, when Lanvin went public, Cournand used another device to make partners of the people who sell his perfume. A special offer of 145,000 shares was made to "associates," including retailers and their employees, and about 3,500 bought Lanvin stock. Since no other fragrance house has stock on the market, an industry figure comments wryly: "You know whose fragrance those people are going to push."

INHERITANCE

In a complicated recapitalization that preceded the public issue, Cournand gave up control of Lanvin Parfums, Inc., to Lanvin Parfums S.A., the French company that originated the business. In good French tradition, Cournand wants the business to pass to Bernard Lanvin, son of the principal owner of Lanvin-Parfums S.A., and to whom Cournand has taught the business as though he were his own son. Cournand and his first wife had a daughter (now a noted ballerina in France), but he and his second wife are childless.

Anyway, at 65, Cournand wants to slow down. He sleeps at his New York apartment only Monday and Tuesday nights, and Wednesday evening drives to the estate, on a promontory jutting into Long Island Sound near Huntington. He pampers his gardens—especially strong on tulips and roses—and entertains friends engaged in almost every endeavor except selling perfume.

FRONT MAN

He is the front man and creative thinker at Lanvin; his puckishness takes wild turns with "Hortense," a dummy dressed as a French maid, which is posed in the window of Lanvin's Fifth Avenue salon in any number of situations. His attractive blond wife is executive vice president of the company and in effect the general manager. "I can analyze and see trends," he says, "but I hate patchwork, I hate detail. But my wife, she is well organized and will take care of detail like nobody."

The purpose of Cournand's thinking, the people he associates with, the salon on

Fifth Avenue—even the antics of Hortense—are all to create a certain atmosphere for Lanvin fragrances. They should be not quite aloof, but desirable; they should be reached for, but by no means unreachable, for they are in 7,500 stores across the country. "I tell my wife," says Lanvin Executive Schulman, "sometimes I feel I'm pushing dope. Once a woman starts, you can't get her off it."

Textile Imports Threaten Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Clover, S.C., Herald of August 30, 1962:

TEXTILE IMPORTS THREATEN JOBS

(By Rose White)

We've been told that there are only two things certain in this life: Death and taxes. Well, there could be another certainty. Unless something is done to curb the foreign imports which are flooding this country, thousands of men and women are going to be without jobs.

This concern over the failure of the United States to do something about this situation is not new. In February of 1961, I received a reply to a plea to do something about the situation from Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON. He said: "During the past several years I have contacted the President and the Secretary of Commerce time and time again urging that relief be brought about by administrative action. The only answer I received was that the dangers facing American industries were brought about by competition and bad management. Whether the new administration will take a new viewpoint is difficult to say."

In August 1962 there can be little doubt as to where the "new" administration stands.

Officials of the textile industries were told that the Geneva Agreement would hold imports of 1962 to the same level as those of 1961. Now indications show that imports will be 30 percent above 1961.

The "new" administration's views are made crystal clear in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. It is based on the idea that it is proper for the President by trade agreements to grant eliminations or reductions of duties which will necessarily injure American industry, agriculture, and workers and give the President unprecedented power to eliminate some duties completely. The State Department has put constant pressure on the President's office to favor foreign economies at the expense of the "home" economy.

You are no doubt aware of the situation of the Sullivan-Southern Zipper Tape Plant here in York. Mr. J. K. (Jack) Benfield has been to Washington on many occasions in behalf of his company versus foreign imports. Cheap Japanese zipper tapes here in the United States has closed factories in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and New England.

Sullivan-Southern is not the only industry which is watching with increased concern. Mr. Charles Cannon, chairman of the board of Cannon Mills recently stated that the passage of this new trade bill in its present form would "destroy the jobs of many thousands of workers * * * particularly in the textile and garment industries." Mr. Roger Milliken, president of Deering-Milli-

ken Mills, joins Mr. Cannon in his appraisal of this most serious situation.

These industrial leaders have gotten together with Senators STROM THURMOND and PRESCOTT BUSH and six other bipartisan Senators and have come up with a vital revision to the Trade Expansion Act. This revision is called the "Bush amendments."

The Bush amendments would:

1. Require true reciprocity in concessions by foreign nations with provision for elimination of reductions in duties if foreign nations violate the agreement and impose restrictions against U.S. exports.
 2. Require other nations to apply the most-forward-nation policy as the United States does; that is, to grant to other nations the same access to their markets which the United States affords to Asiatic and other free-world nations on reductions of duties made to the Common Market.
 3. Restore the authority of Congress weakened by the proposed bill, to put into effect Tariff Commission recommendations when such recommendations are ignored or overruled by the President.
 4. Strengthen the U.S. bargaining position and export situation by requiring European Common Market countries to receive our exports on terms as fair as we accord their exports.
 5. Prevent complete elimination of duties when Tariff Commission finds such reductions would injure domestic producers and workers.
 6. Restore and strengthen the present peril point and escape clause procedures.
 7. Remove the option to the President to put workers on the dole and give "adjustment assistance" to domestic industries injured by imports in place of enforcing the escape clause and restoring the duties.
 8. Provide a solution to the problem of domestic textile industries resulting from the glutting of U.S. markets by Asiatic and other producers by securing for them access to European markets which is now denied and which may continue to be denied under the provision of H.R. 11970.
- A number of people, realizing that our industries are in jeopardy, have wired Senators STROM THURMOND and HARRY BYRD (chairman of Senate Finance Committee which completed hearings on the trade bill last week) to offer full support of the Bush amendments.

The time to act is not after the plants are forced to close but before. Mr. Ralph Hoke, superintendent of Cannon Mills and Mr. Benfield report that their respective plants are running well at the present. The vital question is: "What of tomorrow?"

A Hillbilly in the Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following news article which appeared in the West Virginia Hillbilly under date of September 1:

A HILLBILLY IN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS—IF YOU WERE A HABITUE OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, YOU WOULD RUN INTO NATHAN GOFF CARDER, A HILLBILLY AMONG THE BOOKS, BUT SINCE YOU AREN'T, YOU'LL HAVE TO BE SATISFIED READING HIS WRITINGS IN THIS PAPER

(By James L. Creasy)

The mighty Ohio today rolls on past steel furnaces, manufacturing cities, and seething

populations, but to one man, at least, it is still the fabulous river of the past. It is the river traveled by George Washington, Daniel Boone, and George Rogers Clark—the beautiful river of Indian and French voyagers.

Known in Washington as Nathan and in West Virginia as Goff, the subject of this sketch, Nathan Goff Carder, uses his full name only when writing articles or stories for publication. Born and reared on the banks of the Ohio in Jackson County, Goff Carder is a graduate of Marietta College, Ohio State University, and did graduate work in Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland. His varied experiences range from that of coal miner to university professor. He is at present employed in the U.S. Office of Education. His hobbies are writing and public speaking.

Living within sight of the Library of Congress, Mr. Carder is a familiar figure around that institution. Here he spends much leisure time pursuing his favorite subject—history. Though of a rather studious and retiring nature, he is a member of several organizations, including the American Legion, Alma Shrine Temple, Toastmasters International, the West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia.

The old maxim about taking a boy out of the country is certainly true of this West Virginian removed from the Ohio Valley. To Goff Carder, the Ohio is not only the river of his childhood, but through his travels and studies has become the river of the ages, the river that flows through the most beautiful country and has the handsomest jade-green water, the river with the richest bottoms, the greatest floods, and rocky hills indented by numerous tumbling streams along the rugged border of West Virginia. And to Goff it is a river of great historical significance. He knows the lore of the valley—of the renegade, Simon Girty; the surveyor, Crawford; and the great Shawnee Chief, Kiashtuta, who spent an entire day with Washington where Ravenswood now stands. He is familiar with Christopher Gist's Journal of 1765, the Adventures of La Salle, and other early French explorers.

Mr. Carder's main interest, of course, is in the 19th century and the early steamboat days, the days when river traffic flourished after Nicholas Roosevelt took the first steamer to New Orleans back in 1811. This age, when the river was the main artery of commerce, he considers the natural beauty of its shore lines and bottom lands.

Goff Carder's nostalgia for this mighty river in America's industrial heartland is equal to that of Mark Twain's for the Mississippi. The river was his boyhood, both at work and at play. He earned his first dollar at the age of 7 helping operate a hand ferry, and his only recreation was that afforded by the river. Before the locks and dams were built, many log rafts, shanty boats, dish boats, and even "picture-gallery" boats floated down the open stream through the summer months. People along river towns thrilled to the sound of the steam calliope as a showboat rounded the bend, bringing fun, entertainment, and drama from the city. As a boy, Goff sat on such famous boats as the *Cotton Blossom*, the *Majestic*, *Bryant's*, and *French's New Sensation*. He witnessed, at an early age, the old favorites—"East Lynn," "Ten Nights in a Barroom," and "Uncle Tom's Cabin."

Mr. Carder is truly a West Virginian with roots deep in our Mountain State. His ancestors crossed the Alleghenies to settle along the Ohio in 1804, and one of them built and operated a floating grist mill at the foot of Buffington Island, the kind of "novelty" mill which became so famous and necessary in the days of Indian warfare.

Long before West Virginia had county schoolhouses, Goff Carder walked daily to high school at Ravenswood, some 5 miles from his home. While a student he became

interested in literature and had his first story published in the Ravenswood News. A poor boy with sterling character, Goff left the valley to work his way through college and then to teach in the city. Throughout the years he has continued writing periodically and has had many articles published under various pen names. He has quite a collection of sketches and stories of local color. With an unusual scholastic background and a prodigious memory, he is particularly fitted for the writing profession. But Goff has always considered writing just a means of relaxation, or hobby. His theory is that everyone should have a hobby, something to continue in the halcyon years when professional days are over. After retirement he plans to return, like the sock-eyed salmon, to his native hills, live there with his family, and write a history of Jackson County.

Cuba Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, all Americans look with grave apprehension on the events taking place in Cuba. The beaches of Florida are only a short 90 miles from the Communist enclave.

Today I have called for a restatement of the Monroe Doctrine to firm up our policy toward Castro and the Russian intervention in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere. An editorial in the Palm Beach Post, September 4, asks the question, "Are we too firmly committed to the doctrine of 'too little and too late'?" This newspaper has been alert to the problem of Castro from the beginning, and has close ties to the Cuban colony in Florida. I ask that this editorial, "Cuba Doctrine" be printed at this point in the Record.

The editorial follows:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Sept. 4, 1962]

CUBA DOCTRINE

President Kennedy is not in favor of "invading Cuba at this time."

However, he does support the Monroe Doctrine, under which the U.S. declares it will regard as "an unfriendly act" any interference with American Republics by a European nation.

President Kennedy has no information that Soviet "troops" have moved into Cuba recently, or that the country has received Soviet anti-aircraft missiles.

The President made those statements at his news conference last Wednesday. They are interesting, but not too enlightening.

Each statement opens a new question of vital importance:

1. Does the President favor invading Cuba at some future time?
2. If he supports the Monroe Doctrine, at what point will he move to implement it?
3. When is a technician not a technician? Or, more specifically, what differentiates military technicians from "troops"?

It would appear that we are fighting a battle of semantics. The President intimates the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba would be regarded as an unfriendly act, inimical to the peace and security of the United States.

So long as such troops appear on the roster as "technicians," however, no unfriendly

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6657

act has been committed and the Monroe Doctrine is a mere scrap of paper.

Many reliable sources have confirmed that military "technicians" have been arriving in Cuba from Communist bloc countries in large numbers. In one case the "technicians" were even reported wearing Soviet fatigue uniforms.

It can be assumed they are not in Cuba to cut cane. The evidence, in fact, points to a sharply increased militaristic attitude by the Castro regime in recent weeks.

Starting with a series of provocative charges against U.S. violation of Cuban air space and espionage from ships, the Cuban Reds last Thursday fired on an unarmed U.S. Navy plane in international waters.

Probably the best evaluation of this incident came from Senator HOMER CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, "Russia is feeling us out," he said. "The only thing we can do is to retaliate if there are any more incidents."

Such retaliation already has been ordered by President Kennedy. But here again we are following a policy of reaction against the Communist policy of action.

Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., Democrat, of North Carolina, declared: "I think we should have ordered a naval blockade and stopped the Russian ships before they got to Cuba. But it is too late for that now."

Certainly it's too late to stop the ones already there, but it's not too late to stop additional ones from arriving.

If the Monroe Doctrine still is a living policy, why should not our Government notify Russia that no further occupation of Cuba—by "technicians" or troops—will be tolerated; and back up the notification with a naval blockade?

Or are we too firmly committed to the doctrine of "too little and too late"?

Telstar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am happy to enclose an editorial by David Lawrence, noted patriot and columnist in America, from the New York Herald Tribune of August 22, 1962, and the Washington Star of August 29, 1962. These editorials point out the happy resolution by which private enterprise was given the responsibility to develop a communications system through Telstar and other satellites in outer space. I salute Mr. Lawrence for his timely and decisive treatment of the subject, and agree with him as a citizen and in my official capacity and thank him for his comment.

When the question of nationalization, for that is what it was, and private enterprise was presented before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the U.S. House of Representatives, I hastened to side with private ownership. I knew private ownership would be more efficient, speedier, would render revenues and taxes, and had the most use. I am happy that private enterprise won the victory because private enterprise is the basis for a strong and free America, past, present, and future.

I include the fine articles referred to: [From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Aug. 29, 1962]

VICTORY FOR PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM—PRIVATE ENTERPRISE TELSTAR OPERATION CALLED STRONG ANSWER TO REDS

(By David Lawrence)

People's capitalism has just won a significant victory in the United States. It is a triumph that negates the very basis of Soviet communism.

For the Congress of the United States, by an overwhelming vote and with the support of the President, has just given a private corporation the opportunity to develop a communications business through Telstar and other satellites in outer space.

Had the vote in Congress gone the other way, the Communists would have gloated. For, in the Soviet Union, everything is owned by the government. The Soviets are taught that only the Government can really perform economic tasks and that a system of private profit is wrong.

In the United States, by the latest vote in Congress on the bill that provides regulation for the whole Telstar operation as far as communications are concerned, private enterprise is selected because it is experienced, more efficient and better trained through its talented personnel to do an effective job.

Some of the champions of Government ownership in their recent speeches in both Houses of Congress declared that, since the project was so big and since it might involve relations with other governments in the making of communications agreements, the task should be wholly in the hands of the American Government. The argument was made also that, since the Government had spent a good deal of money in developing the vehicle used to launch the Telstar satellite, the "people" should own the whole communications project.

But there are many things in America for which the Government has at one time or another spent large sums, and yet this has not led to Government ownership. Also, the Government once owned most of the land in the West, but it virtually gave away homesteads to attract settlers. Likewise, during wartime, enormous plants were built that became obsolete for military purposes. Aluminum plants and synthetic-rubber plants which cost many millions were sold for relatively low prices to private companies, some of which thereby got their chance to become big and successful competitors of existing companies in the same line of business.

The new measure, which has gone through both Houses and shortly will be signed by a sympathetic President, gives the public an opportunity to invest in the new corporation. Only half the stock is to be held by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.—otherwise known as the Bell System—and by other communications companies. The other half of the stock is to be sold to private investors at \$100 a share.

The communications companies will elect a third of the board of directors, and the private investors will pick a third. The remaining third will be designated by the Federal Government—a very helpful method of keeping the Government posted on matters that come under the heading of Government regulation, such as the fixing of rates to the public. Monopoly is regulated in America where it touches the matter of rates to be paid by the public. Private companies are allowed what is designated as a "fair return" on invested capital, but the public interest is safeguarded against inordinate profitmaking.

The communications companies, such as A.T. & T., the Radio Corp. of America, and the Western Union Co.—all of which are privately owned—have managed under this plan to make America's communications facilities

the very best in the world. While the Bell System is the largest of the telephone systems, there are 3,040 independent telephone companies in various parts of the United States owning 15 percent of all telephones.

The Bell System, moreover, like the others in the communications business, is not owned by a single interest. It has more than 2.2 million stockholders, and more than 850,000 of these are employees of the company.

In the last 20 years, the Bell System has earned for the Government of the United States in taxes a total of \$9.5 billion and for State and local governments a total of \$7.3 billion. This is the highest record of tax money contributed by any corporation in the world.

In other countries, where government ownership prevails, the service to the public is, by comparison, very poor. A private company has the incentive of profitmaking to spur it on to efficiency. Government-operated projects are devoid of such motive, and this is often revealed as a serious weakness.

The new Telstar project may or may not yield profits to the investors. There is no certainty that communication to other points on earth through outer space will be as economical as by cables under the seas or by radio through the atmosphere. But that is why the name "risk capital" has arisen. Investors do take risks, but they may be rewarded with good profits if the enterprises are successful.

Efficiency of service and good dividends usually have been a characteristic of private enterprise, and today there are many millions of citizens who have put their savings into enterprises of all kinds. This is "people's capitalism," and, despite the tirades by Nikita Khrushchev and other Communists who inveigh constantly against "capitalistic" countries, the system has proved successful in bringing the maximum good to the maximum number of people.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 22, 1962]

TODAY IN NATIONAL AFFAIRS—PUBLIC OWNERSHIP POLICY OF LIBERALS SEEN GROWING

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Shall the Government own everything, regulate everything—including prices and wages—and control the whole national economy? For many decades the answer to such a question would have been an emphatic negative, but today the Democratic Party has a substantial number of Members in Congress who openly favor Government ownership as a public policy.

The recent filibuster on the bill covering ownership of the space-satellite communications system—known as Telstar—revealed several Democratic Senators of the so-called liberal group as favoring Government ownership, despite the opposition of the administration.

Also, some Democratic members of the Senate Antitrust Committee now are demanding that the steel companies disclose data on their internal operations, which means that all competitors would see this information. Apparently the drive is on to increase Government control over the making of prices. This is a short step away from wage setting.

Proposed mergers, moreover, of railroads and consolidations of airlines are before governmental bodies today for approval or disapproval. The prospect is that many workers will lose their jobs because of such mergers, though the companies predict that the gain in efficiency will result in improved service and eventually in more jobs.

LABOR RESPONSIBILITY

The labor union leaders would be the last to admit it, but they must assume some responsibility for the plight of those transportation companies which are not able to

A6658

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 6

get high enough rates to absorb increased wage costs and to meet the expense of "featherbedding"—payment for work not being done. This constitutes a form of subsidy devised by labor unions to benefit their own members.

Companies nowadays have to decide whether to seek an alternative or to try to get along with fewer employees and be content with a smaller volume of specialized products sold at a relatively high price to those who must have such goods no matter what the cost. The alternative policy is usually to endeavor to get a larger sales volume at lower prices. This is theoretically a sound approach, but it depends on the use of automatic equipment and on the development of greater efficiency. This is something to which labor union policy customarily refuses to give cooperation.

Also, to build and modernize plants requires more capital. Investors do not like to lend or invest money in enterprises that are in trouble. So it's a vicious circle. Unless there are satisfactory earnings, the funds cannot be obtained to build better plants to promote greater efficiency and to increase earnings. Yet unless labor costs and work rolls can be held in line, employers will soon find their earnings steadily diminished.

Economic principles, therefore, are coming into conflict more and more today with the pressures of groups which uncompromisingly demand the maximum and do not think of the future of the whole economic system.

Then there is the factor of Government competition with industry, as manifested by the Government invasion of the power industry through the construction of dams and the subsidizing of publicly owned power plants, instead of leasing these facilities to private companies that could competitively bid on them.

WHAT IS THE REASON?

The whole system of free enterprise is one of risk capital and hazards, but it nevertheless has managed to build America into the most powerful economic factor in the world today.

What is the reason for the emergence of a new faction in Congress which boldly champions Government ownership? Do the people really understand the fundamental issues? Experience in other lands has shown that when initiative is stifled, competition—with its emphasis on skills and inventive genius—is abandoned and there develops a lazy reliance on the Government to do everything. The result is inefficiency and poor service rendered to the people.

Thus, for example, not a single private telephone or telegraph system exists in the larger countries of the world except the United States. They are all Government owned. America has not only the largest system of private communication anywhere but one that far excels any governmental system in service and convenience. To this fact any one with experience here and abroad can testify.

Yet in Congress a fatal blow is being aimed at the whole doctrine of "people's capitalism," which describes the system prevalent in America today—where the people still have a right to own private companies and share in their earnings, even as the population as a whole shares in the benefits that science and research bring.

The United States now is going through a critical period in its economic history. Will Government ownership come to America, as it has in Communist Russia and in other countries? Or will America retain its system of people's capitalism? This is the issue that seems certain to come before the American people in the national elections in the next few years.

Social Security: A Proposal for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, ever since it has been my privilege to serve in the Congress, representing the 12th Congressional District of Michigan, I have been greatly concerned about improving our Federal social security system. My aim has always been to improve and strengthen it, to make the system more meaningful for the 17 million beneficiaries now on the rolls and the untold millions of people who will henceforth become eligible for retirement, disability, and survivor benefits. Now and then improvements have been made in this law but I have repeatedly maintained that the law is still not adequate to meet the pressing needs of the retired, the disabled, the widows, and the orphans. I have proposed several helpful changes in the system, some of which were accepted and are now incorporated into the social security system. However, some very important proposals are still awaiting action by the Congress. I trust that action can be taken before the Congress adjourns.

Our elder citizens are faced with difficult problems with respect to health, finances, housing, and employment. They have the usual diseases associated with age, diseases which are long in duration and frequently require expensive medical care in hospitals and nursing homes. By and large, they do not have the income to pay for such care. The census data for the year 1960 show that 53 percent of persons aged 65 and over had less than \$1,000 annual cash income. Another 24 percent had an annual cash income ranging between \$1,000 and \$2,000, so that 77 percent of our aged population had less than \$2,000 annual income.

Early this year, approximately 17 million individuals were receiving benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program. The amount of benefits paid to these beneficiaries in 1961 amounted to \$12.7 billion. Expenditures under this program will continue to grow because of the growth in the labor force, the higher benefit rates to which people come on the benefit rolls, and because of the disability benefit provision under the 1956 amendments. Furthermore, the proportion of older people in our population is increasing and when the insurance program has been in operation for a longer period of time, more individuals will reach retirement age each year and will qualify for these benefits.

There are many retired people today in every State of this Union whose social security pensions are so small they must seek assistance from various welfare and charitable organizations to maintain the

barest type of existence. No sound reason has been advanced for permitting this lamentable situation to continue any longer.

There are those who argue that we cannot afford to increase social security pensions and liberalize other benefits because of the great cost. But I feel certain most working men and women throughout the country would be willing to absorb a part of this cost if they were assured they would receive a pension at the time of retirement which would enable them to live decently and comfortably without other assistance.

We have been very generous in our aid to foreign countries to enable them to improve their economies and provide better living conditions for their people. We can ill afford to neglect those at home to whom we owe our first and primary duty.

Basically our social security system is one of the soundest in the world. It is consistent with our free enterprise system where the worker, the employer, and the Government all join together in contributing to a plan which will assure a high standard of living for those who are no longer able to pursue gainful employment. Congress has made many improvements in this basic law since it was first adopted some 27 years ago. But the program cannot stand still. It must be geared to changes in our economic growth and progress in order to meet constantly changing conditions and particularly to keep pace with increased costs of living.

It is all very well to discuss the matter and present theories for a solution—but this is a slow and tedious process. The time has come when we must do something practical about the problem.

Our social security system is based on the sound principle that workers and their employers should contribute a share of earnings each year during their working life toward a source of income when they can no longer work. It recognizes that, for most American families the paycheck represents a place to live, adequate food and clothing, and necessary medical care. When that paycheck stops—because of death, retirement, or disability—the social security benefit indeed becomes the difference between a life of dignity and self-respect and one of humiliating destitution.

Because I am concerned with maintaining a sound and fair social security system, I introduced H.R. 11390, providing principally for hospital, nursing home, and surgical services to all those eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, facilitating retirement at an earlier age, and increasing benefits. This bill is similar to the one I introduced in the two previous Congresses. My bill has seven principal points which I now wish to explain.

First, Add a new program which will provide for the cost of hospitalization, surgery, and nursing home care for the retired worker, his wife or widow when they have reached retirement age, or at any age for a worker retired on disability, providing his gross income did