

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18783

Act of 1962 permitted the President to centralize the authority for aid but little else. I supported the President in speeding surplus foods to the Hong Kong authorities and the Nationalist Government on Formosa to feed the Chinese refugees. The Senate adopted my amendment to a war claims bill to allow claims for loss at the hands of the Nazis by those who later became U.S. citizens.

AGRICULTURE

I voted against both farm bills which passed the Senate: the omnibus bill which was defeated in the House of Representatives and another bill relating to wheat and feed grains. I see real disadvantage to New York farmers in programs of strict production control and supply management, particularly respecting feed grains so important to dairy, poultry, and livestock farmers. Food prices to the housewife are not lowered under these programs. I remain convinced that until Congress adopts a policy based on the realities of the U.S. economy in 1962, our agricultural productivity will continue to be a drain on the taxpayer.

The severe drought which hit New York dairy and livestock farmers brought immediate favorable action by the New York congressional delegation in obtaining emergency authorization for farmers to use retired land.

The much publicized Jesse Stalker case relating to producer-handlers, and the Supreme Court decision affecting milk marketing orders, have created an uncertain situation with respect to orderly milk marketing procedures in the New York milkshed, and I am prepared to respond to the need for legislation, if necessary, to assure dairy farmers an adequate return.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

I favor a pay raise this year for postal employees, as well as all other Federal employees who face the same cost-of-living squeeze—even if it is necessary to raise postal rates to help provide for such increases. Congress must maintain wage scales comparable with private industry.

An increase in postal rates appears to be fiscally necessary to cut down on operating deficits, but such increase must take full account of the public interest in the informational and educational contents of second-class mail, and the commercial functions of third-class mail advertising.

VETERANS

I have supported bills increasing the compensation for disabled veterans, and giving peacetime veterans the same hospital and medical care for service-connected disabilities as war service veterans get. Also, I voted for the bill re-opening for 1 year national service life insurance to applications from Korean war and other veterans; this passed the Senate but was limited in the House to those with service-connected disability only. I continued to support the resolution to establish a standing Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

TRANSPORTATION

The financial problems of our railroads and the rising costs of freight and pas-

senger operations continue to demand solution. The Senate considered the mass transit bill, which I cosponsored, to provide Federal financial assistance for the planning and development of comprehensive mass transportation systems in urban areas.

Hearings are now being held by the Interstate Commerce Commission on the proposed merger of the New York Central and Pennsylvania railroads and the Civil Aeronautics Board will hold hearings on the proposed American and Eastern Airlines merger. Mergers of common carriers into more efficient operating units appear to be necessary but they must protect the public interest in reasonable rates and service and the workers' interest in continuing security of employment, including, if necessary, retraining, severance pay, early retirement or other means, with the Federal Government helping as may be desirable. The railroads need modernization but the cost should not come out of the workers.

HOUSING

Long concerned with difficulties faced by tenants of both commercial and residential property which is demolished to make way for Federally-assisted projects, I sponsored legislation to extend relocation assistance, already made a part of the urban renewal program and expanded with my help, to those displaced by Federal highways. Also, I introduced additional legislation to help small businesses to relocate because of Federal housing and urban renewal.

I cosponsored the bill to create a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs to coordinate the many Federal housing and other programs related to urban areas. The creation of this new Department was defeated for this session.

NEW YORK STATE

The analysis of defense procurement activities which my office has prepared and released every 3 months since 1959 indicates a continuing decline in contract awards given to businesses in New York State. Our share of the national total dropped from 15.3 percent during the Korean war to 12 percent during fiscal 1961, and a further decline lowered the share to 10 percent during the first 9 months of fiscal 1962.

To increase the number of contracts subject to competitive bidding and improve the preferential set aside system for labor surplus areas is the aim of the armed services competitive procurement bill which I introduced with the cosponsorship of the New York State congressional delegation.

I am particularly gratified that my efforts in this session helped to secure the \$17 million appropriation to build a U.S. Pavilion at the 1964-65 New York World's Fair.

POLITICAL ADVANTAGE THROUGH MANIPULATION OF NEWS ABOUT THE PEOPLE'S AFFAIRS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the Boston Herald of September 18, 1962, has an editorial of basic fairness. It calls for an end to the undigni-

fied practice of giving this or that Member of Congress political advantage through the manipulation of news about the people's affairs.

I am proud that under the Eisenhower Republican administration there was no such practice. I never received notices except those on the basis of simultaneous notification to all members of the Maine congressional delegation. That is the way it should be.

The editorial very accurately states my position and contention when it says—

What she asks, and what ought to suit everyone, is not favoritism but impartial treatment.

I recommend this editorial as good reading for the Portland Press Herald, the Portland Evening Express, and the Portland Sunday Telegram—and for the White House Special Assistant on Congressional Relations, Mr. Lawrence F. O'Brien.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be placed in the RECORD.

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

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, of Maine, is mad as a hornet at the White House, and we don't blame her.

A year ago she complained to Presidential aid Lawrence O'Brien that the White House had given Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, early notification of the news that a million dollar contract for a medical facility at Maine's Dow Air Force Base had been awarded.

O'Brien, she says, promised to investigate this inequity as between Maine Senators (not to say as between a male Senator and a female Senator). But nothing happened.

Indeed, she says, "Not only does it appear that * * * no investigation has been made during the interval of a year—but the handling of the recent disclosure of the construction award of a nuclear submarine to the Kittery Naval Shipyard constitutes a repetition of political favoritism on a matter of national defense in the notification given to Senator MUSKIE on the submarine award far in advance of the release time."

We don't envy Mr. O'Brien his placatory tasks. But we do hope he doesn't go so far as to offer to give Mrs. SMITH a few defense contract "exclusives" of her own. What she asks, and what ought to suit everyone, is not favoritism but impartial treatment.

It's time for an end to the undignified practice of giving this or that Member of Congress political advantage through the manipulation of news about the people's affairs.

WITI-TV HITS HARD FOR MORE ADEQUATE TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Milwaukee television station WITI continues an excellent editorial policy that constitutes an impressive contribution to our great metropolis in Wisconsin.

One of its recent editorials deals perceptively with a matter under consideration by the Senate and the House of Representatives—namely, the serious problem of getting more teachers and better teachers. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

18784

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 19

NOT JUST MORE TEACHERS BUT BETTER QUALIFIED TEACHERS

Not only more teachers but better qualified teachers should be the goal in modern education.

A modern school system faces many challenges. Probably the greatest is to meet the demands of our more complex and more competitive world. It means we need not only more teachers but better qualified teachers. Yet, in Milwaukee we do little to encourage our educators to add to their own training.

The average teacher here has spent 4 years in college to get a bachelor's degree that will qualify him for a job in the public schools. His starting salary is \$4,900 a year, almost \$2,000 less than the average income in Milwaukee in 1961.

We say we'd like this teacher to continue his education, work toward a master's degree, keep up with all the new knowledge available, and pass that knowledge on to our children.

But what incentive do we offer him? This starting salary of \$4,900 won't inspire him. Under the present setup the teacher gets \$100 a year more for obtaining his master's degree.

Here's what that master's degree costs him: Approximately 1,280 hours in class, many more hours of study outside of class, the time and money it costs him to get to and from class, ever-increasing tuition fees, and the possible loss of income he could be getting through evening or summer employment.

For all this effort, time, and expense we add \$100 a year to his paycheck. This is how we are trying to compete not only with industry and other States but with other cities here in our own State.

Now the teachers are asking for a better break, for more incentive. They are asking for a \$300 pay boost for obtaining a master's degree. The plan would cost \$480,000 next year; it would be money well spent. We will encourage more people to the teaching profession, and we will encourage them to become better qualified instructors. Channel 6 believes we need this incentive in our modern school system.

EUROPEAN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, NO ALIBI FOR U.S. RED INK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion about the more rapid growth rate of the economy of the European countries. Attention has been called to the fact that some European economies have been growing recently more rapidly than has ours. Some have argued with force that this growth is forced by government deficit financing.

A recent analysis published in the New Republic was reported on by Sylvia Porter in an article published last night in the Washington Star. Her article casts some badly needed light on the reasons why European deficit spending might contribute to national growth, while red ink in our country would not.

Mrs. Porter writes:

In Europe, governments own, by and large, transportation, communications, power and many basic industries such as coal, gas, petroleum, iron and steel. When European government budgets go into the red, a fundamental cause is that they are investing in these enterprises—which are productive, make jobs, spur growth.

In the United States, the situation is drastically different, for "Much that would

be government enterprise in Europe is privately owned."

The Federal budget of the United States is quite different. Our Federal deficits do not mean that we are investing more extensively in productive enterprises.

On the contrary, Federal spending is not likely to be productive in the same way that is private investments in the productive development and growth of plant and equipment.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Sylvia Porter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HOW DEFICITS HELP EUROPE TO GROW

(By Sylvia Porter)

"You should read an article which has just appeared in the New Republic on this question of the American economy's inadequate growth in recent years in comparison with the strong growth rates of European economies and what should be done about it," said William McChesney Martin, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, "for the article says things people here should understand."

The face of a man I have known since he was the boy-wonder president of the New York Stock Exchange broke into a broad smile. "Of course, the reason I'm asking you to do this is that I agree with the points the article makes."

So naturally, as soon as I left the Federal Reserve Board's headquarters in Washington, I picked up the magazine (Aug. 27 issue) and studied the article "Deficits and Economic Growth" by Matthew J. Kust, identified as a "Washington lawyer specializing in international tax and financial matters." It is not easy reading, but here in simple language are the major points Mr. Kust makes.

1. It has become fashionable this year to suggest we examine what Europe has been doing that we have not been doing to spur economic growth—and an argument gaining adherents is that Europe "owes its greater economic growth to a bolder use of government deficit finance." But before we accept this, we should inquire whether government budget deficits have the same economic impact in the United States as in Europe.

2. We have kept pace with European countries in running deficits during the last decade. Our Federal, State and local governments had deficits in 8 of the last 12 years; Britain in 9 of the last 11; France in each of the last 10 years, and Germany in 4 out of the last 6 years.

MIXED ECONOMY

3. Why, then, have government deficits resulted "in such an inadequate rate of growth in the United States while yielding such high rates in France and Germany?" The answer is that "Europeans have accepted, which we have not, the principle of the mixed economy wherein the government conducts many industrial undertakings that are privately owned in the United States." In Europe, governments own, by and large, transportation, communications, power, and many basic industries such as coal, gas, petroleum, iron and steel. When European government budgets go into the red, a fundamental cause is that they are investing in these enterprises—which are productive, make jobs, spur growth.

4. In the United States, the situation is drastically different, for "Much that would be government enterprise in Europe is privately owned." When our Federal budget goes into the red, little of the extra spending

is for productive enterprise. Mr. Kust explains: "It would be quite different if, let us say, the Government owned the railways and floated a multibillion dollar bond issue for rehabilitation and modernization."

TAXES CURB INVESTING

5. Tax policies also are a key factor. We tax corporations far more heavily than other countries do. "Since corporations undertake most of the private productive investment in industrialized countries, heavy taxation of their earnings dissuades growth." The same goes for our personal tax structure, which cuts down on the savings that are essential to greater investment in productive facilities. We invest much less of our total production in new machinery and equipment than European countries do, and the outcome is that the United States "has an old and obsolete industrial plant."

Mr. Kust's conclusion is that "it is this quite striking difference in the economic impact" of our various government policies "which may provide the answer to the great difference in growth rates." He clearly believes the fundamental need is to overhaul our fiscal policies with the primary aim of stimulating investment rather than consumption.

Whether or not you agree, this is a thoughtful contribution to the debate on what we should do to get back on the road to strong growth. And most significant is that Mr. Martin sympathizes with this view, for, as head of the powerful central bank of the United States, he is among the most informed and influential men of the free world.

**Cuba
U.S. ALLIES STILL POURING MACHINERY AND INDUSTRIAL RAW MATERIALS INTO CUBA**

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the House of Representatives is about to consider the foreign-aid appropriation bill, and the Senate will do so shortly. I am very much disturbed about the fact that countries which receive substantial amounts of assistance from the United States are continuing to trade extensively with Cuba.

Yesterday's New York Times reported that—

Cuba has been getting machinery and industrial raw materials from Canada, diesel motors and chemicals from West Germany, and machinery and chemicals from Britain. The Netherlands and France also have exported goods to Cuba.

The article states that these countries continue to make such shipments in very large quantities.

I think the Senate should give serious consideration to this matter when it considers the foreign-aid bill, in the next few days.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the article published in the New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES FAILS TO CURB ALLIES OVER CUBA

Nevertheless, Cuba has been getting machinery and industrial raw materials from Canada, diesel motors and chemicals from West Germany, and machinery and chemicals from Britain. The Netherlands and France also have exported goods to Cuba.

According to figures available here, North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries sold

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18785

Cuba about \$138 million worth of goods in 1959 and purchased goods amounting to \$79 million. In 1961, NATO exports dropped to \$86 million and imports from Cuba to \$32 million.

In addition, Japan conducted a \$16-million annual trade with Cuba, exchanging light machinery for sugar. Chile was the only country in Latin America reported to have an appreciable trade with Cuba, bartering various foodstuffs for sugar.

TWO ALLIES INCREASE TRADE

Two allied countries increased their trade with Cuba during the 2-year period, 1959-61, contrary to the general trend. Canada was the biggest Allied trader with Cuba in 1961, exporting \$31,800,000 worth of goods, slightly more than double her 1959 exports. The Netherlands increased her trade total with Cuba from \$8,275,000 to \$10,920,000.

The United States, which ended all imports from Cuba and limited sales to food and medical supplies, is now sending less than \$50,000 worth of such supplies to Cuba each month.

SPACE INDUSTRY SURE TO EXCEED AUTO INDUSTRY IN SIZE; REQUIRES FAR GREATER ECONOMY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the very important developments in the United States and, in fact, in the world has been the magnificent progress made by the space industry. All of us are anxious to have our country able to meet and to surpass such developments by the Soviet Union. We are being challenged in this area more than in any other, except perhaps the military area.

Nevertheless, I believe we must recognize the enormous size which the space industry will achieve in the next few years.

An article published yesterday in the Washington Post states that the space industry is expected to exceed the automobile industry in size.

Mr. President, with no profit incentive or discipline and with no budget discipline—because in the House committee hearings it was revealed that the Bureau of the Budget leaves virtually untouched the budget of the Space Agency. With the terrific public relations buildup for developments in space, with television, radio, and the newspapers enthusiastically urging us to make more and more investments in space, there is danger that there will be great extravagance in this area.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Post, entitled "Space Industry Seen Topping Auto in Size," as well as an editorial from Fortune magazine entitled "Defense in Space," be printed in the Record at this point.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 18, 1962]
SPACE INDUSTRY SEEN TOPPING AUTO IN SIZE

St. Louis, Mo., September 17.—An aerospace executive said today the astronautics industry within 10 years may exceed in size the combined automotive industries of the world.

The prospect was raised by M. G. O'Neill, president of the General Tire & Rubber Co.

in a talk prepared for a national convention of tire dealers.

He likened the impact of the space age to that of America's discovery nearly 500 years ago.

O'Neill said the country's steadily growing aerospace endeavor already numbers 5,000 companies or research organizations, and has led to over 3,000 space-oriented products.

He estimated that the approximate cost of landing a man on the moon by 1970 would be \$30 billion, and said some estimates for the Government's total space projects run to \$150 billion.

Calling space exploration a necessity for national survival, O'Neill enumerated useful byproducts of the space effort in the fields of medicine, communications, weather, and marine navigation.

[From Fortune magazine]

DEFENSE IN SPACE

It is high time that we forsake some of the more exotic scientific idealism in the space program, in recognition of a real and somber threat. NASA's programs should be trimmed at the fringes, and its lines of control strengthened. The Nation's defense requirements should be thoroughly, openly, and honestly integrated with the fabulously expensive development of moon-shot technology. Congress should see to it that these unified objectives are ensured by unified direction—not just coordination—of all space activities by the national aeronautics and space council. As Secretary of the Air Force Eugene Zuckert wrote recently: "We must be able to enforce our stand on the peaceful uses of space."

ISRAEL FOREIGN AID PROGRAM MODEL OF EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in connection with the foreign aid bill which is about to come before the Senate, all Senators are aware of the many examples of waste, and some examples of graft and extravagance, in our foreign aid program. The little State of Israel, which is deficient in resources, limited in capital, diminutive in population as compared with ours, and urgently in need of capital investment on its own account, has been carrying on an inspiring foreign aid program from which we can learn real lessons.

A recent editorial in the Milwaukee Journal stated in part:

In Kenya, Israel has helped organize two cooperative stores. In Nepal it is helping to set up a bus transport system. It has just added Jamaica to the list of countries given free scholarships for technical students in Israel.

Africans from Dahomey, Niger, and Togo are studying radio techniques in Israel and more are coming soon from the Ivory Coast. Israel technicians have the contract to build large bathhouses in Ethiopia.

Israel's foreign aid program is such a model of efficiency and effectiveness, so honest and economic in its operation, that I think it serves as a real example for us and the rest of the free world. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be printed at this point in the Record.

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

ISRAEL HELPS OTHERS

Israel is one of the smaller nations but one of the most enterprising. Surrounded by Arab enemies, it has been making friends constantly by its program of international cooperation.

In Kenya, Israel has helped organize two cooperative stores. In Nepal it is helping to set up a bus transport system. It has just added Jamaica to the list of countries given free scholarships for technical students in Israel.

Africans from Dahomey, Niger and Togo are studying radio techniques in Israel and more are coming soon from the Ivory Coast. Israel technicians have the contract to build large bathhouses in Ethiopia. Two Israel doctors are at work in eye clinics in Liberia, which were set up by Israel experts. A number of students from French speaking African nations have completed police training in Israel.

Recipient of much foreign help itself, this small country is busy helping others.

PROXMIRE RESOLUTION TO END SCHOOL DROPOUTS BEFORE 17 WILL REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently I submitted a resolution calling on State school officials to give consideration to raising the school dropout age to 17, which in some areas is now 14, 15, or 16. I submitted the resolution for many reasons. The principal reason is that unemployment is so highly concentrated among our young people.

Sylvia Porter, in a very fine article, commented on this question and stated:

This summer, while the general unemployment rate has ranged under 6 percent, the rate among the unskilled has been 11 percent. Among the 900,000 who were graduated from high school in June 1961 and didn't go on to college, the unemployment rate last October was 18 percent. Among the 350,000 youngsters of 16 to 24 who quit elementary or high school between January and mid-October 1961, the unemployment rate in the fall was 27 percent.

Even when he gets a job, a dropout is likely to get an undesirable one.

On the other hand, skilled workers will find their future bright and find more job openings than workers to fill them.

That is the reason why my resolution should be given consideration by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I hope the resolution will be adopted by the Senate in this session. It is a simple Senate resolution and merely calls on school authorities around the country to give serious consideration to increasing the age for dropping out and to provide the kind of vocational training which can so tremendously help young students leaving education and also help the growth of our economy.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Sylvia Porter which appeared recently in the Washington Star be printed at this point in the Record.

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

RETURN TO SCHOOL, DROPOUTS WARNED

(By Sylvia Porter)

"Return to school," urged President Kennedy in his Labor Day message to the youth of the Nation, thereby putting the White

House behind the accelerating drive to convince America's youngsters that they must stay in school until they gain the education and skills essential to fill today's jobs.

But a potential dropout, or a young man or woman who already has quit school, well might ask for more than exhortation, more than even a warning from the President that "returning to school may mean the difference between possible hardship and unemployment or a fruitful life."

In this and Sunday's column, I'll submit the "why" and "what." Make a record of these facts, no matter who you are, for in your neighborhood may be a young person whose entire life you can benefit by reciting them.

Here's the why.

In the 1960's, overall employment is scheduled to rise about 20 percent, but unskilled workers always will face the threat of unemployment as jobs are eliminated by automation.

This summer, while the general unemployment rate has ranged under 6 percent, the rate among the unskilled has been 11 percent. Among the 900,000 who were graduated from high school in June 1961, and didn't go on to college, the unemployment rate last October was 18 percent.

Among the 350,000 youngsters of 16 to 24 who quit elementary or high school between January and mid-October 1961 the unemployment rate in the fall was 27 percent.

You need a high school diploma even for menial jobs today. In Detroit industrial companies require one for a sweeper.

Even when he gets a job, a dropout is likely to get an undesirable one. A full 28 percent of the male dropouts in 1961 who had obtained jobs by October were working as farm laborers, and 40 percent were working as factory laborers or semiskilled operatives. About two-fifths of the female dropouts were working in private households or as other types of service workers. Only 1 out of 10 of the dropouts had obtained a clerical job.

As a skilled worker, though, your future will be bright. In the 1960's, an additional 2.3 million jobs are due to open up for skilled workers and 2.7 million others will become available as those holding these jobs transfer to other occupations, retire or die. This means our economy will be looking for 5 million young, educated, skilled men and women. If you are trained, you'll not have trouble finding employment.

Jobs which today don't seem to require much training, such as simple clerical or office jobs, will require training tomorrow. As automated equipment takes over more and more offices, employers will need trained personnel to operate the equipment.

The job outlook for the educated and skilled young man and woman is superb. The uneducated, unskilled dropout is likely to be unplaced or displaced. That is the "why" behind the warning: "Return to school."

AMERICAN FARMER'S GREAT JOB FOR CONSUMER-TAXPAYER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Finally, Mr. President, we are about to consider a very important conference report on the farm bill. There is some possibility we will not have a farm program this year. Unfortunately, farmers have been accused of being a burden on other American citizens, particularly on the taxpayer. I feel very strongly that this is a serious mistake; that, actually, farmers contribute more to our well-being than does any other group in our society.

In this connection, Reader's Digest, which is conservative on such subjects, and particularly on the farm subject,

published a fine article showing that American food is bought at bargain prices, and showing how the American consumer pays far less for food now than he has before in terms of wages and income. The article shows that the consumer pays a great deal less for his food in this country than he does in foreign countries; and the article spells out what this means in terms of leisure, income, and well-being. This also means a great deal in terms of our competition with the Soviet Union and communism in other parts of the world where agriculture has been such a dismal failure.

I think we should view the farm program in connection with the very fine job which has been done by our farmers in keeping the cost of food low. We are all consumers. When looked at in this way, what we have done in farm programs for our farmers is very modest.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Reader's Digest for September 1962, entitled "Why Our Food Is a Bargain," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WHY OUR FOOD IS A BARGAIN

(By John Strohm)

(John Strohm, one of today's foremost agricultural writers, has visited 70 countries (including the Soviet Union and Red China) as a correspondent, and has conducted a group of Russian farm officials through the United States. A past president of the American Agricultural Editors' Association, he is currently president of Publications, Inc., and editor of Ford Almanac. This article is the basis for a presentation Mr. Strohm will make at the Fifth International Food Congress, which will be held in New York City's Coliseum, September 8-16.)

If I could show any visitor from abroad just one thing in the United States, I would turn him loose in a smalltown supermarket with \$25—the average amount the American homemaker spends weekly to feed her family. For food is our No. 1 success story, a far bigger bargain here than in any other nation.

Mrs. America pays out, after taxes, only 20 percent of the family income for food. By contrast, the Russian family must spend 56 percent. In Sweden it's 27 percent; in Italy, 38 percent; Peru, 40 percent; Nigeria, 70 percent. This means that the U.S. family has 80 cents out of every dollar of disposable income left for "other things." It means more and better education for our sons and daughters. It means better homes, better health, better living. It means refrigerators, automobiles, TV sets. And with such a relatively small part of our national effort devoted to feeding the people, we can match missiles with the Russians or race them to the moon without giving up necessities or luxuries, while the Russian people suffer acute shortages of food, clothing, and housing.

Our national ability to feed our families with more food, of higher quality and variety, with less money and labor than any other people on earth is an achievement we too often take for granted. Let's see what goes into it.

Mrs. America makes three trips weekly to the food store, takes 27 minutes on each visit to look around among thousands of items, buys 21 of them, and pays \$7.74 at the check-out counter. Does she wonder where all the money goes? Maybe she forgets that her husband works only 38 hours a month to buy food for his family. To earn a pound of butter, he works 21 minutes—while a Russian

works 193 minutes. A pound of rice costs an American 5 minutes of work; a Japanese, 25 minutes, despite the fact that Japan gets among the highest rice yields in the world. A pound of sugar costs an American 3 minutes of work; an Englishman, 7 minutes of work; a Russian, 75 minutes of work.

And lest you long for the "good old days" when prime beef was 15 cents a pound and bread two loaves for a nickel, consider the real cost of food then and now. In 1912, Granddad's family earned \$11 a week and spent 40 percent of it for food. His grandson's family earns more than \$125 weekly, spends \$25 for food—and buys more and better food.

You're better off than your dad, too. In 1931, an hour of U.S. factory labor bought only 1.4 pounds of round steak, while today it buys 2.2 pounds. It bought 8 pints of milk then—17.8 pints today; 1.5 dozen oranges then—3 dozen today. Since 1947-49 food prices have gone up less than most items in the cost-of-living index—22 percent. The cost of housing went up 33 percent; of transportation, 51 percent; of rent, 45 percent.

Moreover, while the old corner grocery with its crackers and pickles in open barrels and sauerkraut in tubs may be full of nostalgia, our food today is safer, cleaner and more nutritious.

Researchers have bred more vitamin C into tomatoes, more protein into corn, more lean meat into pork. Processors have improved nutrition by selecting crops at exact maturity, by rapid deactivation of enzymes and by cooking in a limited amount of liquid, which is then retained in the can rather than discarded. Mobile packing vans move right into the fields to film-wrap vegetables at their peak of freshness. We've improved on nature by enriching bread with vitamins and iron, by "fortifying" milk.

Improved diets have helped infant mortality to drop sharply. People are living an average 9 years longer than two generations ago. Our children are 2 inches taller than their grandparents, weigh several pounds more. And the sports pages tell us they can run faster and jump higher and farther than ever before. Children (and grownups, too) now get two-thirds of their protein from meat and dairy products, while these foods represent only 2 percent of the Japanese diet, 4 percent of the Indians'.

Instant and heat-and-eat foods can reduce the housewife's daily food preparation work from 5½ hours to 1½ hours. She buys freedom from the drudgery of kitchen chores in the form of cakes already mixed, meat already trimmed, vegetables already cleaned and washed, juice already squeezed.

The Agricultural Research Service says: Already prepared meals that cost \$6.70 for a family of four for 1 day can be fixed by the housewife herself for \$1.80 less. But should the housewife work 4 hours extra for 45 cents an hour, and save the \$1.80? Or should she devote her 4 hours to her children, to community activities, to keeping up with the world, to holding an outside job? Unshackling the housewife from her kitchen has had an incalculable impact for good on our Nation—socially, politically, spiritually and culturally.

Many instant foods actually save money. A pound of fresh frozen peas costs about 32 cents; bought fresh, they cost 70 cents. A devil's food cake, made from a prepared mix, plus two eggs, costs 41 cents; made from scratch, it costs 53 cents. Frozen concentrated orange juice costs only half as much as that squeezed at home from fresh oranges (the can of concentrate costs 2.7 cents more to process, but 3.7 cents less to transport and 8.5 cents less to merchandise).

There were 100 items in the grocery store of a century ago; Mother found 1,000 items 20 years ago. Today's homemaker has a

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

18867

comprehension of the nature, the total-ity, the strategies, and the tactics of Lenin's new form of complete warfare.

Our foreign policies have failed to meet the realities of world politics. Our basic foreign policy concepts have remained unchanged for 30 years.

They have been defensive, self-decep-tive, and self-defeating.

The NATO alliance, the United Nations, international loans, foreign aid, disarmament, summit meetings, have been major features of our foreign policy. They have all proven themselves to be figments of our own gullibility.

Our negotiations, our appeasements, our vacillations, have led us only down the road of retreat and surrender, bit by bit.

Mr. Speaker, I have been saddened and frightened by the confused, evasive, and capitulating pronounce-ments emanating from our Government.

I do not, for 1 minute, expect this ad-ministration to reverse our disastrous foreign policies.

Nor can we hope, that this Congress will take appropriate action to reverse this country's march to national suicide.

Unless this country is able to reeval-uate, reshape, and reformulate its fore-ign policies, the cause of freedom is lost.

Mr. Speaker, our policies with respect to the Communist cancer cannot be re-designed by the existing foreign policy apparatus. They are too deeply imbed-ded in the fabric of our National Gov-ernment.

Only a national surge of political de-mands on the part of the people can bring about the needed reforms.

The impulse for a transformation from weak and vacillating policies to strong, firm, effective policies can only come from the electorate, the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, former President Eisen-hower and President Kennedy have both expressed their opinion that foreign policy is not a proper topic for debate in this year's political campaign.

Mr. Khrushchev has expressed the same desire.

I respectfully disagree with General Eisenhower and President Kennedy.

We should contemptuously reject Khrushchev's devious effort to prevent the American people from forcing a re-versal of this country's foreign policies that serve him so well.

On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, there is only one issue that is of vital importance to our people.

That is the issue of freedom, survival, and peace.

I make only one qualification. These national aspirations and the foreign policies necessary to retain them, should not be made partisan political issues.

I respectfully suggest that every mem-ber of this Congress present to his or her constituency the following questions of:

First. Whether or not this Nation is losing the global war to the Soviet-Com-munist forces.

Second. Whether or not our present foreign policies are adequate for dealing with the Soviet-Communist forces.

Third. Whether or not the citizens of this Nation are willing to make all neces-sary sacrifices to build up an invincible military superiority over the Soviet.

Fourth. Whether or not they favor a strong, coordinated, political, and mili-tary program that will reverse the course of this war.

Mr. Speaker, on June 12 of last year, I introduced House Joint Resolution 447.

This resolution called for a recognition by this Congress of the total war being waged against us by the Soviet-Communist conspiracy.

It called for action by the United States to counter the Soviet-Communist war with a nonmilitary, political, ideo-logical, and economic offensive.

In March of this year, 6 months ago, I sent 150,000 questionnaires to my con-stituency. The following three questions were based upon the concepts contained in House Joint Resolution 447.

I submit to you the tabulated answers to these questions.

The first question was: "Do you believe that the Soviet-Communist forces are steadily winning their goals of weaken-ing and destroying the Free World?"

The tabulation of the answers was: "Yes," 5,401; "No," 1,179.

The second question was: "Do you be-lieve that the first step in reversing Com-munist gains is to recognize the Com-munist organization, its purposes, strate-gies, tactics, and weapons?"

The answers were: "Yes," 5,213; "No," 1,245.

The third question was: "Would you support a united free world effort to neutralize and destroy the international Communist conspiracy by nonmilitary political means?"

The answers were: "Yes," 5,426; "No," 386.

Gentlemen, the future of this Nation is in your hands.

File
CUBAN SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are gravely concerned over the situation existing today in Cuba. The concern felt by our people over the Communist build-up is shared by free-dom-loving people everywhere.

The President has wisely stated that the United States will not permit a Com-munist-dominated Cuba to become a serious threat to the security of this country.

It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress should let the President know that it supports his efforts to preserve the peace and political integrity of this hemisphere.

I have introduced a resolution, there-fore, which declares that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should take all necessary steps to im-plement the Monroe Doctrine with re-spect to the current situation in Cuba.

The Monroe Doctrine is as applicable

today to the troubled situation in the Caribbean as it was when it was promul-gated by President James Monroe on December 2, 1823. Within the frame-work of that historic declaration the President has ample precedent to deal with communism in this hemisphere.

It is my feeling that the Congress and the President should take a strong stand and that the United States should make it abundantly clear that we have no in-tention of permitting a Communist threat to our security to exist in our backyard.

I hope that the President will take immediate and positive action to imple-ment the Monroe Doctrine.

INCOME TAX LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-man from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, again I call the attention of this House to leg-islation I have introduced to provide an exemption from income taxation of the first \$3,000 received by an individual as an annuity, pension, or other retirement benefit.

On August 29, I explained to this House in detail the purpose of this leg-islation. At that time I called for the support of the measure by my colleagues and urged that the Ways and Means Committee give the bill its fullest atten-tion with the view of acting on it before the current session adjourns.

I rise again today to reiterate this ap-peal. My bill, H.R. 6504, is a sensible and reasonable approach to a serious problem. It corrects an existing inequity in the tax law which currently exempts some retirement programs, partially ex-empt others, and applies full taxation to still other annuities.

When an individual retires he usually must adjust to a substantially reduced income. With living costs what they are today, and the gradual decline in the valuation of the dollar, the average per-son has considerable difficulty in building up even a small nest egg to provide re-serve funds during his later years of life. Thus, faced with reduced income and larger outlays, an individual can ill afford a further reduction in his income by having to pay taxes on a small pension. As a result many workers who approach the retirement age cannot see their way clear to retire. They often work beyond the normal retirement age and thus are deprived of a few years free of the rigors and anxieties of a full-time job. That is why I do not think it is fair that retired individuals be required to pay income tax on a small, modest retirement income.

This bill is not establishing any new principles. Actually, all it does is ask that all retirees be given a reasonable exemption as currently accorded social security and railroad retirement annu-ants. Its enactment would fulfill a cardinal principle of a fair tax system—that similarly situated individuals should be taxed similarly. How can anyone argue against this type of justice? That

is why equity demands that we take favorable action on H.R. 6504, the bill to allow an exemption of \$3,000 on annuities, pensions, and other retirement benefits.

I fervently trust that my colleagues in this House will join in urging early committee action on this bill so that full opportunity can be given to the House to vote on it before the adjournment of the 87th Congress.

HIESTAND DEMANDS TAFT-HARTLEY BE INVOKED

(Mr. HIESTAND (at the request of Mr. MILLIKEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I think we should demand that President Kennedy invoke the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act to prevent the closing down of five great Aero-Space factories by the impending strike. The strike is scheduled to begin Saturday, September 22. Congress enacted the Taft-Hartley law to provide for just such emergencies as this. A national industry vitally important to the security of our Nation is threatened.

The law clearly directs the President to appoint a board of inquiry to determine whether a national emergency exists. This must be done immediately in order to prevent the strike. If this board decides that a national emergency does exist, the President must ask the courts for an injunction outlawing the strike and declaring an 80-day moratorium during which time the employees and employers shall continue to negotiate. At the end of the 80-day period, the employees shall take a vote by secret ballot upon the employers' last and final offer.

This is the legal and duly authorized method of settling national emergency strikes. The informal and extra-legal fact-finding committee of George W. Taylor, of course, can advise the President but they cannot replace the law. It appears that this committee was constituted for the purpose of evading the Taft-Hartley procedure. The families of the workers who will be deprived of their income deserve more consideration. The defense of our country deserves better, also.

Whether the President will invoke the Taft-Hartley provisions is clearly up to him, but it appears that a devastating strike which could throw many thousands of people out of work and seriously delay our defense and space effort is the alternative. I think the proper course is crystal clear and I hope the President takes it.

DIALOG

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. MILLIKEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance of Czechoslovak Exiles in Chicago, a group of dedicated citizens who

give their special attention to reminding us of the critical situation of the peoples in their homeland and all the other nations behind the Iron Curtain, featured in their monthly bulletin of September 1962 an article describing the socialistic philosophy of the special assistant to the President, Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. They point out the danger that this type of thinking may present to the United States.

The article is entitled "Dialog," and is a penetrating analysis of Mr. Schlesinger's controversial and extreme views, which I insert into the Record at this point:

MARGINAL NOTES TO OUR DIALOGS

(Dealing with the Schlesinger manifesto)

To complete the picture of today's "Dialogs" it is necessary to make known that Mr. Henry J. Taylor, Scripps-Howard columnist, sent this year to Mr. Schlesinger a letter, asking whether the professor still believed what he wrote in 1947. Taylor knew that many men, who, in their youth, were bearers of various ideas, often acquired wisdom through the ages. It turned out that Mr. Schlesinger was not one of them. His answer read as follows: "I neither withdraw nor apologize."

If Mr. Schlesinger were a mere Harvard University professor, conclusions to his ideas would not be perhaps necessary. However, the fact that Mr. Schlesinger is at present the special assistant to the President, and as such, one of his principal advisers, can hardly be overlooked.

By his ideas, Mr. Schlesinger is openly manifesting that he has dedicated himself to the task of promoting socialism in the United States of America. It is needless to deny that his deductions have been presented in a very attractive form and that he has endeavored to emphasize parliamentary procedure and to preserve liberties as well. However, speaking "en passant," there is in the Soviet Union, as well as in the United States of America, a formal parliamentary procedure; nevertheless, they do not enjoy liberties known to the Christian world. But even so, many will find Mr. Schlesinger's manifesto in theory quite attractive.

It is by no means necessary to amply discuss the pros and cons of socialism. Generally speaking, its good points exist in theory only, whereas the practice clearly reveals the shortcomings. Existing results of the buildup of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could hardly establish a bright example to be followed. It makes no difference if a Socialist buildup is achieved by brutality and guns or by deceit and guile. Professor Schlesinger does not differ with Marx and Lenin in aim, but in procedure and tactics solely. To prevent the arrival of a sudden and tough Marxism, he is recommending the acceptance of a gentle and gradual one.

For that purpose, and in order to achieve the subjugation of the American Nation's mind, he and his ideological associates will have to use every adroit verbal acrobacy, dialectical subtleties, humanitarian and melodramatic appeals and theoretical and semi-truths—if you want to catch a bird, you have to lure it. He knows very well that to influence people you do not ask them to think, but rather, you plant thoughts in their minds.

Preserving liberties under a Socialist buildup is nothing but mere utopia. This fact has been indirectly admitted by the professor himself through his diction; liberties "could be," instead of "would be," preserved. Of course, if what the professor means by liberty exists at present in the Soviet Union and in the satellite countries, then his deduction

is absolutely correct. Do not "liberties" also exist there, and, do they not enjoy "the new and real expression of democracy"?

In spite of all theoretical assurances, we do not share the opinion of easily persuading anyone that socialism (i.e., the ownership by the State of all significant means of production) would not bring a tremendous increase of power to a centralized government. Thus, President Woodrow Wilson said in 1912 in New York: "The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power. When we resist the concentration of power, we are resisting the powers of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties."

In the eastern part of the world we are witnessing today the existence of a monolithic state organization, which by its natural character makes an individual become a manipulatory unit, suppresses his initiative and personal responsibilities, and governs by merciless oligarchy and by awkward bureaucracy.

The basic problem facing the United States of America today is to find the means to protect individual freedom, action and responsibility without slowing down those processes and techniques which a modern industrial society must employ if it is to develop. Taking into consideration the experience and outcome of socialism up to date, it can be fairly said that Schlesinger's "Alice in Wonderland" barely constitutes an answer.

Certain intellectual circles in the United States of America have strong leftist leanings. It makes no difference if it is an accident of history or a carefully laid plan. It remains a reality that this course has important backing in very high and influential places. A group of these intellectuals decided that in order to definitely save America from the inevitable adoption of either fascism or communism, there had to be some changes made. These changes then should unequivocally be based on certain selected aspects of Marxism, which, in their opinion, would enrich and stabilize American democracy.

While the American Nation is guarding the front door of its national home against communism, the back door remains open. Its new and cunning enemy is shrewdly avoiding the odious name of communism and slips into favor through a "sheep's garment" of different nomenclature. One time it is called "welfarism," "New Dealism," "State monopoly capitalism," "centralized government," or "democratic socialism." The common denominator with Marxism remains the same. The aim is identical, whereas the methods are different. It is of little or no significance if the planned subjugation would be performed through the "iron chains of communism" or by the "silken threads of socialism."

To bring their "new religion" to victory, Socialists have to endeavor to create a general state of mind, in which belief in God should be considered to be an abnormality and a symptom of social disease. It is matter of no coincidence that Professor Schlesinger blames the worker for his belief in religion.

In conclusion, it is to be stated that contemporary society certainly cannot live by a law of the wilderness wherein only the stronger can survive. It does not mean, however, that the desired social justice should be brought by a reactionary and, in practice, failing system, which is the best method to enslave mankind. There are, in spite of that, still many enthusiastic prophets of socialism. With them, disagreeing is honestly possible. It seems, however, that in contradistinction we could also find those individuals and groups driven solely by "gloriae et potestatis sacra fames"—"the cursed desire for glory and power." They