

ability of section 5 loans has made much else possible.

In helping the local community within your territory to increase jobs, and expand the benefits of economic growth, you also are increasing your own business. It is a natural combination, and fulfills the basic aim of REA to bring progress to rural America in many forms.

However, REA leadership in stimulating community development is not always tied to a direct REA power benefit. The manager of a local electric cooperative in Pennsylvania, for example, has led the drive in his community to get four new industries, and each buys power from a private power supplier.

The manager maintains, and correctly so, that both the private and cooperative power suppliers are benefiting, the co-op from new consumers who live in its territory. But most importantly, the community, the people, will benefit from new opportunities.

I am encouraged to see the dedication and energy which local REA co-ops are giving to the RAD program. Reports from about one-third of the REA borrowers indicate that since July 1961 they have helped to launch 400 industrial and commercial projects. It is anticipated that they will directly create 30,000 new jobs, and indirectly, another 22,000. When reports are in from all co-ops, undoubtedly these figures will be higher.

More than one-fourth of these new enterprises involve processing and marketing of farm and wood products, which mean additional outlets for farm and forest products as well as new jobs for rural citizens. This is a real "double shot" in the arm.

It is also important to note that in these newly launched projects, Government financing is playing a "seed capital" role by stimulating the investment of much larger sums by private and local sources. The REA figures indicate that the 400 projects are being financed by more than \$250 million of private capital compared with about \$15 million from Federal Government sources.

These projects are scattered throughout the country. They include a lumber project in Idaho, a furniture factory in Kentucky, a commercial recreation enterprise in Illinois, a packing plant in Nebraska, and a chipping plant in Mississippi. In addition, the 600 REA borrowers report they have assisted their communities in launching a number of public facilities, hospitals, water systems and sewerage systems.

Thus, we have, with your assistance, made a good start with the RAD program, but it is only the beginning, for we have only scratched the surface of the need in rural America.

A good start means that rural electric co-operatives will have more and more to do as rural America responds to the challenge of the sixties, as it moves positively forward once again. And as these things take place, demands for power will expand rapidly.

Presently your members are doubling their power needs every 7 to 10 years. Today, the power requirements of your systems are about 37 billion kilowatt-hours. By 1970, those requirements will soar to 68.6 billion (or more) and by 1985 to almost 200 billion (or more).

President Kennedy has said that power is the key to this century, power on the farms and in rural areas as well as in the cities. At Oahe project in South Dakota last summer he said: "The role of the REA is not finished, as some would believe. To be sure, most farms now have electric lights. Most REA cooperatives and power districts are well established. But we are rapidly approaching the time when this Nation will boast a 300 million population, a \$2 trillion national income, and a grave responsibility as the breadbasket and food producer for a world whose population will have doubled.

That is the prospect for the end of this century, and the key to this century is power, on the farm, in the factory, in the country as well as the city."

The role of the REA is not finished, it is only beginning.

This, I submit, is sound policy and one that will serve the Nation well. Let us, working together, militantly carry it forward.

### It's Only Money

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we have seen a great many comments about the administration's proposals to increase spending by several billions of dollars and to reduce Government income by several billions at the same time. Perhaps few of these comments are as much to the point as the following editorial taken from the January 29 issue of the Washington Daily News:

#### It's ONLY MONEY

Sly adulteration and debasement of money probably started with the first coinage. The names of Polycrates of Samos (500 B.C.) and Dionysius of Syracuse (400 B.C.) are associated with the great monetary frauds of antiquity.

Besides setting fire to Rome, Nero reduced the precious metal content of the coinage by 10 percent and pocketed the difference. Henry VIII of England is remembered for his many wives. He also issued a silver-plated shilling, bearing his likeness. When the plating wore off, starting with his most prominent feature, he was known as Old Coppernose.

All this was done in the dark of night. During the Middle Ages the penalty for doctoring the coinage was to have the head held under in a kettle of boiling water. After Hastings, William the Conqueror decreed mutilation, such as having the ears cut off, for anyone caught fooling with the coinage.

As we note, this practice was frowned upon into modern times. It took John Maynard Keynes, in the depression years of the 1930's, to figure out that legal counterfeiting not only was respectable, it actually would help the economy. Lord Keynes probably never intended to go that far but such, in effect, is the deduction of his disciples who are as thick as hors d'oeuvres around Washington.

Since, between Nero and Keynes, paper money had been invented, probably by Kublai Khan or his mandarins, procedures were simplified. It no longer was necessary to melt up the silver and gold, adding copper or other inexpensive metal in the reissue. The printing presses merely could be turned loose to print unlimited quantities of certificates that at least looked like money.

That, in substance, is what we've been doing in the United States for a generation. The sum of this production is tabulated in a major part of the public debt, now \$305 billion in round numbers.

But just as the Romans found the new denarius wouldn't buy as much as the old one, Americans have found the new dollar has lost its punch. At last accounting it had declined in purchasing power to 46 cents as compared to what it would buy just less than 25 years ago.

And the tax cut—spending program thought up by the disciples of Keynes to get

the economy moving again involves more of the same—a great deal more.

In the administration plan it is contemplated that at the end of the 3-year program, \$8.5 billion a year in personal tax-cut money will be pumped into the economy. Every dime of this, and more besides, will be borrowed money—which is just another way of saying it will be printing press money. The deficit for next year alone is very conservatively estimated at just under \$12 billion and even Treasury Secretary Dillon can't look ahead to the year in which the budget may be balanced.

This trick practically is guaranteed to bring a quick flush to the economy. But over the long haul it never has worked in the whole history of money finagling—and never will, except as a means of siphoning away the savings of the people. It is within the power of the Government to call 50 cents a dollar but no government ever has been able to make it buy more than half a dollar's worth.

But they never quit trying.

### Part 5: Let's Keep the Record Straight— A Selected Chronology of Cuba and Castro—September 13–October 14, 1962

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, part 5 of my chronology of Cuba and Castro begins with a series of newspaper quotes on our U.S. policy for dealing with Cuba.

While the Monroe Doctrine and its application to the present situation was endlessly debated by our newspapers, our columnists, commentators, and newspapers in other countries—our Congress stubbornly went ahead adopting resolutions upholding the right of the United States to invoke the Monroe Doctrine, protect our country, and protect the entire hemisphere against an extension of the Marxist-Leninist Cuban Government.

Because of the reluctance of our NATO allies to cease shipments of materials and goods to Cuba which would be detrimental to the interests of this hemisphere, the House of Representatives boldly included amendments to our foreign aid appropriations bill which would cutoff aid to any country that permitted its ships to transport goods to Cuba. This perhaps was not what we might call a diplomatic approach but it certainly was a practical approach to the problem. It underlined the psychological approach of appealing to self-interest when the idealistic approach failed.

And on September 21, 1962, Adlai E. Stevenson admitted in the United Nations, in answering Soviet threats, that it was officially known that the U.S.S.R. was stuffing Cuba with planes, rockets, and other arms.

It began to be clear to all who followed the situation that some of our news columnists were about to find themselves

with "egg on their face," because of their weighty—and in some cases—frightened pronouncements on what we as a Nation should do or what we could not do.

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA AND  
CASTRO—PART 5

September 13, 1962: U.S. policy for dealing with Cuba: "If necessary we can take care of Cuba; and if the necessity is obvious, the Russians, despite what they now say, will acquiesce. They do not have any greater desire to fight a nuclear war over Cuba than we do. Force might some day prove the lesser of two evils for us; but it could never provide a solution for the Cuban problem" (New York Times, Sept. 12, 1962). "The only plausible employment for [the Russians] in Cuba . . . is to do more or less exactly what the Americans are doing in South Vietnam; that is, to train the local army to fight a more advanced kind of war . . . the defense of Cuba against another invasion. Whether [the Russians] are troops or technicians is at bottom immaterial . . . in the sense that the Americans cannot very well assert the right to intervene, whatever the Russians are. Doubtless, in a perfectly ordered world, the Monroe Doctrine would require the removal of these alien intruders. But in the imperfect real world, where the Americans keep troops along the border of the Communist block (in one case, within it; remember Berlin), and claim an unhindered right of access to these outposts, it is going to be awkward, to say the least, to expel or blockade the Russians in Cuba. Mr. Khrushchev has made the neatest of moves in the international chess game; take my pawn in Cuba, he says, and you risk your castle in South Vietnam—or your Berlin queen. If Dr. Castro is one day replaced by a democratic government, it will not be as a result of the one threat against which Russian advisers can give his army any real help—a regular invasion, a la D-day, from over the sea. The United States learned its Cuban lesson in April last year. The United States can perhaps help to organize and supply a rebellion, as the Communists do elsewhere; it cannot import a rebellion, prepackaged. Given enough time, and enough rope, the Cuban regime may yet produce the internal disaffection that will be its downfall. If [Dr. Castro's] support in the countryside begins to fade, one of the conditions of a successful revolt against him will have been established. And if the test ever came, it would be far harder for the Russians to keep an unpopular government in office in Cuba than it is for the Americans to do a similar job in other parts of the world which are better left unnamed. Mr. Khrushchev has no 6th or 7th Fleet to keep his supply lines open. If things go the way the United States hopes—if discontent grows inside Cuba—any further investment in Dr. Castro is going to look very risky indeed to Moscow. Patience, not a choleric lunge, is the Americans' best policy" (Economist, London, Sept. 8, 1962).

"In the hemisphere, in the United Nations, with the uncommitted nations, the reaction [to a U.S. invasion of Cuba] would be most unfavorable for us" (New York Times, Sept. 14, 1962). "The United States is, of course, able easily to blockade Cuba. But stopping ships under threat of seizure or sinking would be an act of war not only against Cuba but against the Soviet Union. The invasion of Cuba would, of course, be an act of war against Cuba. But what we could not be sure of doing is to prevent the retaliatory moves to which we would have laid ourselves wide open, moves against Berlin or against Turkey, or against Iran. For we would have acted on the rule that a possible threat against our security or our interests justifies us in going to war. We would be saying that because Cuba is in

the grip of an unfriendly European power, we have a right to blockade or occupy the island; we would be saying too that the Soviet Union has no such right to act against the American military positions in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, right on her own frontier. Let us not fool ourselves. Such an argument does not wash. It would be rejected, probably even laughed at, not only by all neutrals but by powerful elements among our closest allies. We could go to war if Castro injures us. But we cannot go to war, even against Castro, because of what he may do in the future. We cannot wage a preventive war against Castro without establishing the rule that a preventive war is legitimate against our military position in Berlin, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Thailand, South Vietnam, Formosa, Okinawa, South Korea, and Japan" (Walter Lippmann, in the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 18, 1962). "Cuba has made Mr. Kennedy look like a man with not one, but two, Achilles heels [Berlin and Cuba]. Americans are suffering from the all too familiar affliction of frustration. They think that they were ineffectual in dealing with the Berlin wall and they fear that the administration is going to be ineffectual again in dealing with Cuba . . . acknowledging that an armed invasion of Cuba would mean the deaths of thousands of Cubans, of an untold number of Americans. Not totally precluded are landings by anti-Castro Cubans, avoidance, this time, of a Bay of Pigs disaster and the start of serious guerrilla warfare. Almost everyone is perfectly aware of the dangers of Cuba becoming the scene of another Spanish civil war, in which Russians as well as Cubans would no doubt kill and be killed.

"Perhaps the chief restraining factor on bitter American impatience is that action by the United States against Cuba, including a naval blockade, might tempt Mr. Khrushchev to snap shut the trap in which Berlin finds itself. Yet the administration's own view of the world remains essentially unaltered. It is still thought that Mr. Khrushchev will not in fact risk a third and final world war over Berlin; that, whatever happens there, he still has his own difficulties and that one of them is that his own country is changing, on the whole for the better; and that an eventual easing of tensions through disarmament and bans on nuclear tests is in Russia's interest as well as the West's. Recent events suggest, however, that Mr. Khrushchev, having grasped the fact that general war has become impossible, is tempted as a result to be more rather than less provocative" (Economist, London, Sept. 15, 1962).

On the same day, U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, declares that "the American people will not be satisfied with President Kennedy's reiteration of a do-nothing policy toward Cuba."

September 15, 1962: Press reports state that the U.S. Government has had little success in persuading its Allies to withhold ships being chartered to carry Soviet supplies to Cuba. The Governments of Britain, West Germany and Norway are reported to have begun inquiries among their ship-owners, but these are regarded as polite responses to U.S. diplomatic pressure, and center on the question whether Allied ships are carrying arms among their cargo to Cuba. U.S. officials have pointed out to these Governments that the use of Allied ships for ordinary goods releases Communist-block shipping for arms deliveries to Cuba.

September 17, 1962: U.S. Secretary of State Rusk briefs members of the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Forces Committees at a joint closed door session. "Rusk took pains to assert a direct relationship between events in Cuba and Berlin, particularly in the next 3 months. . . . It is widely assumed [in Washington] that the Russians will make the big push in Berlin before the first of

the year, but after the November 6 elections [in the United States].

September 18, 1962: Former U.S. Vice President Richard Nixon urges President Kennedy to take stronger action on Cuba and suggests a program including a naval blockade of the island and the obtaining of commitments from U.S. allies that their vessels will not be used by the Soviet Union for shipments to Cuba. He concedes that the risks of nuclear war are raised by a blockade, but asserts that "the risks of inaction are far greater." He adds that immediate action is needed to "revitalize" the Monroe Doctrine.

The present state of the Monroe Doctrine in relation to Cuba: "The policy of the United States in the Western Hemisphere is guided by two main considerations: its own national security and the peace and security of its hemispheric neighbors. On the one hand, the United States has the tradition of the Monroe Doctrine, enunciated more than a century ago as a warning to European powers that the United States would move against intrusions into the hemisphere. On the other, the United States is pledged, under the Rio Treaty of 1948 which formed the OAS, and under the U.N. Charter, to abstain from unilateral military action. The United States, nevertheless, has affirmed that it would take whatever steps are necessary to move, unilaterally if necessary, against a clear and present threat to its security and that of its allies in Latin America. . . . There is a vocal body of opinion that the Russian shipments of arms to Cuba is a clear threat to U.S. security and therefore a violation of the Monroe Doctrine demanding immediate action. This opinion holds that the Cuban buildup, in effect, constitutes the establishment of a military base by Russia in the Western Hemisphere" (New York Times, Sept. 16, 1962).

"The Monroe Doctrine has been modified to apply only to situations which directly endanger the security of the United States; 'The United States will consider any attempt by European powers to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.' . . . Soviet Russia has made this extension in Cuba, and is amplifying the activity. But President Kennedy has evaluated it thus far as not endangering our peace and safety, thereby narrowing the original scope of the Monroe Doctrine. The fact is clear. But the only administration spokesman who has publicly conceded it is Senator HUMPHREY" (Arthur Krock, in the New York Times, Sept. 18, 1962). "It is true, of course, that the Soviet lodgment in Cuba is a gross violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Yet we cannot invoke the Monroe Doctrine. Why not? The crucial point is that the American claim for the isolation of the Western Hemisphere was coupled with a renunciation of American interest in the Eastern Hemisphere: 'In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do.' . . . This basis of the Monroe Doctrine disappeared in the 20th century, in the two World Wars, the Korean war and the cold war. We cannot invoke the Monroe Doctrine without meeting the question of what we are doing all over Europe and Asia. Our right to put Cuba under surveillance, and if necessary to blockade an invader, rests not on the Monroe Doctrine but on the elementary right of a people to insure its own security. . . . This right can, however, be exercised only when there is a clear and present danger. Castro is an insulting nuisance but he is not, and is not now remotely capable of becoming a clear and present danger to the United States. So we must practice watchful waiting, and hold ourselves in readiness, never for a moment forgetting the vastly greater dangers elsewhere" (Walter Lippmann, in the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 18, 1962).

1963

On the same day the U.S. State Department announces that an informal, private meeting of American Foreign Ministers will take place in Washington on October 2 to review the Soviet military buildup in Cuba and possible steps for dealing with the whole Cuban problem.

September 20, 1962: U.S. Senate adopts by 86 to 1 a resolution stating that the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending by force or threat of force its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere; to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States.

On the same day, the U.S. House approves the foreign-aid appropriation bill, including three amendments intended to cut off aid to any country permitting the use of its merchant ships to transport arms or goods of any kind to Cuba.

The House approved the foreign aid appropriation bill without restoring any of the \$1,124 million urged by President Kennedy. By a 249-to-144 vote, the measure was sent to the Senate after the Democratic leadership decided not to risk deeper cuts in a floor fight. In earlier voice votes, the House shouted its approval of three amendments to cut off aid to any country that permits its ships to transport goods to Cuba (New York Times, Sept. 20, 1962).

A resolution endorsing the use of arms, if necessary, to prevent Cuban aggression or subversion in the Western Hemisphere was adopted by the Senate, 86 to 1, after 3 hours of debate (New York Times, Sept. 20, 1962).

September 21, 1962: The Soviet Union issued a new warning that any U.S. attack on Cuba would precipitate a nuclear war. The threat was made by Foreign Minister Gromyko in a tough and uncompromising policy statement to the United Nations General Assembly. Adlai E. Stevenson replied that the threat to peace came from the Soviet Union, which is "stuffing Cuba" with planes, rockets, and other arms.

September 24, 1962: Secretary of State Rusk met yesterday with the Norwegian Foreign Minister, Halvard M. Lange, in an effort to win cooperation in blocking shipments of strategic goods to Cuba. They conferred in New York where Mr. Rusk has been making similar appeals to other allied diplomats. Italy and West Germany were said to be responding more favorably than Britain and Scandinavia.

September 25, 1962: Russian trawlers will operate out of Cuba under a plan disclosed by Premier Castro in a television speech. He said the two nations would build a port somewhere on Cuba's coast for a joint Atlantic fishing fleet.

September 26, 1962: The House of Representatives completed congressional action on a declaration of the U.S. determination to oppose with force, if necessary, Communist aggression or subversion based in Cuba. The House approved the joint resolution as anger and concern mounted in Washington over Moscow's plans to help build a port in Cuba for Soviet fishing trawlers. Moscow portrayed the project as a routine agreement for aid to the Castro regime.

Ways to guard against Cuban-based aggression and subversion were discussed in New York by Secretary of State Rusk and foreign ministers of the Latin-American nations. One proposal is the establishment of a Caribbean military organization.

September 29, 1962: Cuba stands in greater danger of attack, Premier Fidel Castro asserts, because U.S. politicians facing November elections are "trying to push the country toward aggression."

In a television address last night, Premier Castro said that in the U.S. House of Repre-

sentatives and Senate "there is a competition to see who can shout most. It doesn't matter to them that they play with the destiny of the world and play with war."

He said armed intervention in Cuba could lead to World War III.

"We know the Soviet forces are with us," Dr. Castro declared. "If the imperialists think the Soviet Government's words are merely words, they are wrong."

September 30, 1962: At a White House luncheon, the President and Britain's Foreign Secretary discussed ways to contain further Communist expansion and subversion in the Caribbean. A joint communique suggested that Britain might have changed her policy of regarding the Cuban problem as a matter of concern only to Washington.

October 1, 1962: OAS meets today to discuss Cuban crisis.

October 2, 1962: Behind closed doors at the State Department, Secretary of State Rusk assured Latin America's foreign ministers that the United States was prepared to give the necessary leadership to efforts to defeat Communist inroads in this hemisphere.

October 4, 1962: A U.S. program to penalize all shipowners who transport Soviet-bloc supplies to Cuba will be even tougher than expected. The four-point program, to be started within 2 week, will threaten foreign shipowners with the loss of all U.S. Government-owned or financed cargo if even one of their vessels engages in such trade.

October 8, 1962: Amid the applause of some delegates and the cries of hecklers, Cuban President Dorticos urged the United Nations yesterday to condemn the American "naval blockade" of his country. Gripping the rostrum, the bespectacled President had to shout his speech to the General Assembly. He was interrupted 4 times by hostile demonstrators in the visitors' gallery and about 12 times by applause, mainly from the Soviet bloc.

Havana sources predicted that the release of 1,113 captives held since last year's abortive invasion would be announced soon after final talks today between Premier Castro and James B. Donovan. In a move against Cuban trade, leaders of the International Longshoremens' Association planned to ask their men not to load cargoes to or from the Soviet Union and to boycott all lines servicing Cuba.

October 9, 1962: On Cuba, Secretary of State Rusk vowed U.S. aid for Cuban development if Communist rule is ended there, but he said the big issue now was Communist use of Cuba as a military and subversive base. Meanwhile, Washington said the release of anti-Castro Cubans seized in last year's invasion attempt still was not set. In Havana, however, James B. Donovan, who is negotiating for the prisoners' release, was optimistic about an early agreement.

October 10, 1962: A Cuban exile group—Alpha 66—announced that its members made a successful raid Monday on the Cuban port city of Isabela de Sagua. The exiles said that a commando group of 15 to 25 men had killed about 20 defenders, including Russians.

October 12, 1962: Britain has discussed with the United States a threat by a Cuban exile group, Alpha 66, to attack all merchant ships carrying supplies to Cuba. A carefully worded statement by a Foreign Office spokesman avoided saying that any complaint had been made. Washington indicated it was not yet ready to act against the exiles.

October 14, 1962: Responding to a radio message, the Coast Guard picked up two wounded crew members of a Cuban patrol boat and flew them to a Miami hospital. The Cubans were shot when their craft was sunk by a raiding vessel manned by exiles off the Cuban coast.

## Women Play a Good Part in Soil Conservation

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. BEN F. JENSEN**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, my quarter century of service in this House has gained for me, so I am told, a reputation of being rather tight-fisted with the people's money. I own up to the charge.

However, one place where I am quite generously disposed to spend tax dollars is in the field of soil conservation. I am even willing to support amounts in excess of budget figures for this important work.

No undedicated person is ever likely to rise to become head of the Soil Conservation Service, so there is not going to be any chance to compare good and bad administrators or administrations in this vital field. The country started out in 1937 with the daddy of soil conservation, the late great Hugh Hammond Bennett, heading the service. And now for several years we have had another director with conservation in his blood, Don A. Williams.

As a matter of fact, the country gets twice as much for its money in having Don at the head of the Soil Conservation Service, because with him we get the fine supporting cooperation of Mrs. Williams, the experienced Ruth, who is a true champion of conservation practices throughout this blessed land.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Women in Conservation Are All Alike—They All Are Doing Their Part," by Ruth Williams, from the January 1963 issue of Soil Conservation:

WOMEN IN CONSERVATION ARE ALL ALIKE—  
THEY ALL ARE DOING THEIR PART

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This "women in conservation" issue of Soil Conservation would not be complete without this personal observation by the wife of SCS Administrator Donald A. Williams, one of the many wives who have been through the soil and water conservation ranks with their husbands. A South Dakota farm girl, she has since 1935 shared with him, and with the wives of the farmers and ranchers with whom he worked, the fight against soil erosion and water waste—lived and "preached" conservation from coast to coast.)

(By Ruth Williams)

It was the spring of 1932 and I was on my way from Aberdeen to Clark, S. Dak., to see my prospective husband. It was spring and like James Russell Lowell's poem:

"Now is the high tide of the year  
And whatever of life hath ebbed away  
Comes flooding back with a ripply cheer  
Into every bare inlet and creek and bay  
And no matter how barren the past may  
have been

'Tis enough for us now that the leaves are green."

But the poem we memorized back in the fifth grade just didn't make sense this spring morning. Another "black blizzard" had just roamed through the Plains States and had again left it a sea of desolation. There were no songs of the birds to herald the morning,

January 31

for birds must have water and cover. There was neither—only powdery dust.

The road passed through miles of once-fertile fields and pasture—now a vast nothingness—broken down fences half buried in dust, trees trying desperately to put forth a few leaves—that is if they still survived. We were stopped at the railroad crossing as a long train of cattle cars filled with bellowing, bawling, half-starved animals on their way to Omaha or Sioux City crawled past. They should have been in green pasture with new calves.

Along the road were farmhouses, once painted white with organdy curtains and potted plants in the window. Now they are like the landscape about them—gray and forlorn, and some abandoned. The man at the next filling station, once a farmer, muttered: "I just can't take it any more." Even hope for many had become a meaningless word.

The dust bowl was only one of nature's rebellions against man's misuse of her resources. For example, I remembered the little city of Vanport, Oreg., destroyed in minutes by a flood on the mighty Columbia River, made mightier by uncontrolled water runoff from melting snow on the watersheds. Then there was a lovely little lake back from the coast a mile or so—where Don actually caught fish. A clear-cut logging outfit had raped the bordering mountains, leaving the slashings. Fire followed, and then flood silt drained into the lake, and it no longer had an abundance of fish. And who can forget the Tillamook Burn in the Cascade Mountains in Oregon. Thousands of Douglas-fir trees lay waste—a scene as desolate as the dust bowl itself. And how about the strip-mining spoils and debris in the Appalachian Mountain country at the other end of our great country?

These are all dreary pictures we would like to forget, as we would like to forget the week of October 19, 1962, with its possibility of laying waste our Nation. But we dare not forget! It often takes disaster or near catastrophe to start a movement for a better way of life. So it was that out of disaster the Nation's modern soil and water conservation program as we know it today was born 30 years ago.

Men everywhere joined in the movement and with them, as the coworkers, the moral support, the "power behind the throne," the "no dollar a year gal"—the women. I have yet to meet a wife of a conservationist or of a conservation farmer or ranches who was not conservationist in her own right. She may not build stockponds, terrace the hills, or make contour furrows; but I'm sure she's approved his conservation program, pushed it, preached it, and cut the budget so it could be done.

There is no greater pleasure than to go with Don to conservation meetings. It doesn't matter which State you go to, the women in conservation are all alike. They all are dedicated and are doing their part in conservation.

We have a Ladies Auxiliary of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts. It is an effective education arm of the association; and there are growing numbers of State association auxiliaries, and even some local district auxiliaries. You will find the conservation women also have left their mark on the public school course of study, on garden clubs, General Federation of Women's Clubs, League of Women Voters, 4-H clubs, Girl Scouts, and Camp Fire Girls. You name it and, if by chance they missed, well, just give them time.

I knew a little Camp Fire Girl several years ago who could classify land like an expert. And I've heard more than one teenager proudly express the wish in typical teenage fashion that just once they'd like something dished out, other than conservation, at the evening meal. So you see this conservation movement is not for men only, but a family affair.

## Standardization of Firehose Coupling Threads

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the International Association of Fire Chiefs Committee on the Standardization of Firehose Coupling Threads has made numerous appeals to higher authority to standardize firehose coupling threads and thus avoid undue disaster. Therefore, I have reintroduced my concurrent resolution calling for the President to appoint a commission to study the feasibility of requiring by the enactment of Federal legislation the standardization of threads on the couplings on fire hoses used by fire departments.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include both an address to the International Association of Fire Chiefs Committee on Standardization of Firehose Coupling Threads by Robert Ely, chairman, and a highly applicable and illustrative poem entitled "Tragedy."

#### REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIRE CHIEFS' COMMITTEE ON STANDARDIZATION OF FIREHOSE COUPLING THREADS

First I want to thank our committee members, Chief John Garthe, and Chief Nicholas R. Warner for their help in making our progress possible. We also want to thank Chief Ray W. Shukraft and Chief Roi B. Woolley for their invaluable assistance. The help and guidance received from your executive director, B. Richter Townsend, and your public relations director, Al Drayton, has been a great help. The support of your president, Chief Edward F. Delgman, and the entire membership has been greatly appreciated.

Your committee has continued to urge the use of national standard firehose threads and standard gasket grooves on all couplings and fittings used for fire protective purposes. It has been a pleasure working for you and we appreciate your continued support on this worthwhile project.

From history we find that standardization of firehose coupling threads was the main topic of the first convention of the International Association of Fire Engineers in 1873. Concern in 1873 was caused by confusion due to misfits of hose coupling threads experienced in the great Boston fire of 1872. Ninety years later we are still trying to get all sizes of firehose coupling screw threads converted to the recommended national standard dimensions.

According to the New York Times, non-standard firehose coupling threads were a contributing factor in the disastrous fire aboard the aircraft carrier *Constellation* on December 19, 1960. Forty-nine workmen lost their lives and there was a property loss of \$47,942,000. A lot of threads could be standardized for that price. Refer to the New York Times of December 28, 29, and 31, and January 4, 1961.

We are happy to report that the U.S. Forest Service has converted their 1½-inch firehose coupling in southern California to the national standard thread and they are now in the process of converting their equipment in northern California.

Yes, progress has been made, but as long as any firehose coupling threads are in use

that don't comply to the national standard dimensions there is still work to be done.

We suggest that each divisional organization of the International Association of Fire Chiefs appoint a committee to assist in the standardization of firehose coupling threads in its particular district. Our international committee will assist in any way possible. We have had experience in the standardization program which should be a help. Methods have been developed to rethread existing equipment at considerable savings. We are also open for suggestions and will welcome any assistance to help get the job done.

In last year's report we enclosed a copy of our letter to the President of the United States informing him of the use of so many nonstandard firehose coupling threads and asked that he take the necessary steps to aid and assist the fire service in standardizing all firehose coupling threads nationwide. Our letter was answered by Mr. Barent F. Landstreet, Deputy Assistant Director for Emergency Community Services, Department of Defense, and as yet there has been no help from the President or Office of Civil Defense to help get firehose coupling threads standardized.

The International Association of Fire Chiefs 1960 Resolution 5 asking OCDM for matching funds to help defray the costs of the equipment necessary to accomplish the standardization has apparently been ignored. We urge OCDM to reconsider the resolution and assist the fire service in the standardization program.

On September 27, 1961, Congressman Bob Wilson, of California, had our letter to the President of the United States, with the supporting material on firehose coupling threads read in the House of Representatives and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. You may find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix on pages A8028 and A8029 of the October 10, 1961, issue.

The fire service is on record asking that all coupling threads be standardized and has notified the responsible people of our country of the dangerous condition that exists with the use of so many nonstandard firehose coupling threads. The fire service cannot be held responsible for loss of life and property by fire where nonstandard firehose coupling threads are a contributing factor if the fire chief has gone on record in writing to his superiors asking that their nonstandard firehose coupling threads be converted to the recommended national firehose coupling screw thread dimensions as soon as possible. Have we protected ourselves in writing?

The NFPA, NBFU, and IAFC have adopted standards for the coupling screw threads for all 10 sizes of firehose used for fire protective purposes. The American Standards Association has adopted seven of these standards. However, the 4-, 5-, and 6-inch sizes which were the last to be adopted by the NFPA, NBFU, and IAFC have not been adopted by the American Standards Association as yet. It is desirable to have these standards adopted by the ASA as it will make the NFPA, NBFU, and IAFC coupling thread standards more secure and will help to get wider adoption of the standards. There has been a committee appointed by the ASA to study the firehose coupling threads.

Having worked with the development of the 4-, 5-, and 6-inch standards and through the recommendation of your executive director I have been appointed to represent the IAFC on the ASA coupling thread committee. A meeting of the ASA coupling thread committee will be held soon.

Funds should be appropriated for traveling expenses so that I can attend the meeting and help to get your IAFC 4-, 5-, and 6-inch thread standards adopted as the American standard.