

Today they must be trying to clear the fog from their crystal balls.

Most pollsters had set the heartening trend earlier by confidently predicting victory for the losers in New Hampshire and Oregon, thus upholding the tradition of 1948, when predictions of a landslide for Gov. Thomas E. Dewey meant inevitable triumph for Harry Truman.

The fact that a measurable conclusion can now be drawn from the polls has the Democrats fidgety, since the mass-think experts insist President Johnson can't lose in November.

This, declared Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, suggests that "the Republicans will win the greatest victory in the history of this country."

Presidential hopefuls who hire their own pollsters will expect them to return with a flat prognosis of thundering defeat. A forecast of victory is the political kiss of death.

Pollster Lou Harris, who got in the predicting business in a big way as an opinion sampler for President Kennedy in the 1960 campaign, has thus far chalked up a perfect score. He has called it wrong in New Hampshire, Oregon, and California.

He insisted his polls in California were correct "as of when they were taken." Unfortunately, the elections were not staged at the right time.

What happened? Mr. Harris said Governor Rockefeller's defeat was due, in part, to "the birth of the Rockefeller baby," an event happily seen by some as a plus factor for the Governor.

Sampler Samuel Lubell gazed over bustling California and saw Governor Rockefeller as having "the edge of victory through the whole State."

But he second-guessed himself, saying that Senator BARRY GOLDWATER had "a fair chance of winning." Thus, he picked both contestants in a two-man race, an unbeatable gambit in taking the public's pulse.

Pollsters Mervyn D. Field and Don Muchmore, who operate in California, also nalled the Rockefeller pennant of victory to the mast, making it unanimous. And all wrong.

The pollsters like to point out that their forecasts require a margin of 2 percent. And since 2 percent can mean the difference between 51 percent and 49 percent—or victory and defeat—the pollstering business has obvious built-in advantages.

At any rate, Mr. Presidential Aspirant can now be expected to shudder in the late September and mutter, "This is bad, Jenkins. The polls say I'm going to win."

FOREIGN EFFORTS TO INFLUENCE OUR PARTY ELECTIONS

(Mr. HALL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have ultimate faith in the judgment of our electorate, if thoroughly and properly informed. Our system in a constitutional republic is one of majority rule—and properly so. It has been a great and successful system of government which truly supports freedom, individual liberty, and much of the world. This does not give the world press, even in friendly nations, mother countries, or the free world in general, the privilege of delving into or exerting influence upon our party system or election statutes. This is especially reprehensible when another political party or nation, which has survived by the grace of our valor, impinges its thinking and influence against a

great man and the Grand Old Party, as though it were the less able to handle its own affairs and procedures. The Republican Party is able, or it has and will so demonstrate, and this editorial supports this thesis. I commend it to the considered and prayerful thought and judgment of all:

[From the National Observer, June 8, 1964]
FOREIGN EFFORTS TO INFLUENCE PARTY ELECTIONS

Senator GOLDWATER upset lots of other folks besides Governor Rockefeller in his California primary victory the other day.

He upset the pollsters who had been predicting his defeat. He upset some Republican leaders who were counting on a gang-up to "stop" GOLDWATER. And, curiously enough, he upset those legions of "liberal" political commentators who now are prating about the need to "save" the Republican Party.

AFTER THE HOKUM AND POKUM

The postelection bleats were almost amusing, considering the source. One esteemed columnist, though candidly admitting he preferred President Johnson to any Republican, argued nonetheless that Republican voters were doing something terribly wrong in picking Mr. GOLDWATER to be their party's standard bearer. You get the impression that he, and others of his persuasion, think the Republican Party is essential—so long as it offers no real challenge to, or different philosophy from, the Democrats in power.

Not amusing was the way many broadcasters and newsmen reported results of the primary. Implied, if not always stated, was that the citizens who had voted for GOLDWATER were all political extremists or "kooks," that a thoughtful and intelligent voter could not possibly have chosen Mr. GOLDWATER over Mr. Rockefeller. Well, the fact is a majority of voting Republicans in California did, for reasons they considered good and sufficient.

Much has been made about the closeness of the vote. Citing the fact that GOLDWATER won by only 58,231 votes (1,089,892 to 1,031,661 for Rockefeller), the pundits talk darkly about the deep and unbridgeable chasm that this supposedly reflects within Republican ranks. Differences of opinion there certainly are; that's what makes a horse race and a political race. But one has only to go back to the Presidential election of 1960 (Kennedy 34,227,096 votes to 34,108,546 for Nixon) to note that a close vote in this country is neither unusual nor catastrophic. The marvel of the system, after all, is that when all the shouting, the clawing, the hokum, and the pokum are done, the final decision is made by each citizen in the solitude of the voting booth. And that decision is then respected by all.

So we are not much perturbed by the breast beating of outsiders over California's decision last week. Senator GOLDWATER still has a way to go to win the Republican nomination. Governor Rockefeller has a perfect right, if he chooses, to continue to compete for the prize as do any other Republicans. And next month, when the democratically chosen delegates convene in San Francisco for the Republican convention, we're certain they can pick their best man—without the hypocritical advice and consent of those who wish the party no good.

PYRAMIDING TAX BENEFITS ENCOURAGED BY ARA

(Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, manipulations of the Area Redevelopment Administration program, which originally had a noble purpose of attacking "pockets of poverty," are becoming more and more common and taking many forms and directions.

Some going concerns are utilizing ARA for startling tax breaks. ARA Administrators, who should be trying to close "tax loopholes," are encouraging their use and even enlarging the loopholes.

One example of this growing manipulation is the case of the Cooper Tire & Rubber Co., of Findlay, Ohio, which parlayed the ARA and a local industrial aid bond program into an \$11 million factory and tax bonanza at Texarkana, Ark., without risking any of its own cash. It did so by trading "free competitive enterprise" for a socialistic-type expedient of getting the city and Miller County to build the plant for it.

First, city voters approved, 1,750 to 150, a \$7,035,000 bond issue paying 4 percent which the ARA bought, obligating the city, not Cooper, to pay back the money out of rentals on the factory.

Second, the city voters approved, 1,806 to 156, a \$2.2 million bond issue paying 4 1/4 percent interest which was sold to a Chicago bank. The ARA agreed to let this satisfy Congress requirement that 20 percent of any ARA venture be financed by a bank—even though the Chicago bank actually invested none of its money directly in the Cooper operation, but only in a city revenue bond.

Third, Miller County voters approved, 2,430 to 248, a \$1,100,100 bond issue which the ARA said would satisfy its requirement that 10 percent of any venture to be put up a local development organization, public or private. The county turned the money over to the city to help build the plant.

Fourth, Texarkana city voters approved, 1,774 to 150, a \$550,000 bond issue paying 5 percent interest to be sold in toto to Cooper Tire & Rubber Co. For thus investing in its own plant, Cooper gets its 5 percent interest every year entirely tax free of the usual 52 percent Federal income tax on corporate profits. Not only that, but because it actually pays the interest indirectly to itself in the form of rent, Cooper gets to deduct the amount as a business expense from its Federal taxes, a double windfall.

Cooper has a lease to rent the Government-owned plant for 25 years at a price that will pay off both the bonds and interest. This provides another tax break because Cooper can deduct all the rent as a business expense, thus paying for its own plant in 25 years, whereas under the Internal Revenue Service depreciation allowance depreciation allowance would have to be stretched out over 45 years. Then, as the cherry atop this happy pudding, Cooper gets to buy the \$11 million plant at the end of its lease period for a nominal \$100,000. And of course they get to deduct that \$100,000 from their Federal taxes as a business expense, too.

If cases like this are encouraged and promoted by ARA administrators, both the ARA and the philosophy of tax-free municipal bonds will be jeopardized.

CUBAN MENACE TO INDEPENDENCE OF THE PEOPLE AND GOVERN- MENTS OF THE WESTERN HEMI- SPHERE

(Mr. SCHENCK (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, all of us are deeply concerned about our Government's policy toward Cuba. Publisher Dwight Young, of the Dayton (Ohio) Journal Herald, raises some pertinent questions in his "Talking It Over" column of May 25, 1964. I am glad to call this column to the attention of the Congress and the Nation.

Mr. Young's column follows:

TALKING IT OVER (By Dwight Young)

Does the average U.S. citizen have any realization of the serious menace to the independence of the people and the governments of the Western Hemisphere that Fidel Castro has become?

Do the countries of the free world, notably Britain, France, and Canada, that persist in selling badly needed goods to the Castro regime on extraordinarily liberal terms, fully understand the dangerous game they are playing?

And does our own Government that for several months has been busily engaged, over the protests of American taxpayers, in shipping huge quantities of grain products to Russia at ridiculously low subsidized prices, realize how wobbly and illogical its own position is in continuing to upbraid its old free world allies for their persistence in carrying on business as usual with Cuba?

If it doesn't it's dumber than this corner ever thought it could become. How can we object in good conscience to Britain, France, and Canada trading on a normal, commercial basis with Cuba while we continue to trade with Russia? Do we have any commitment from Moscow that nothing we sell to the Soviets will, in turn, be reshipped to Cuba? Indeed, we don't, and even if we did, it wouldn't be worth the paper it was written on.

Castro is a Russian puppet. He deliberately chose that course. When he first came to power in Cuba he was wined and dined in Washington. Whatever his sins of the immediate past may have been—and some of them were pretty black—they were forgiven. The American Society of Newspaper Editors displayed him as their convention headliner. The State Department joined in entertaining him lavishly. Momentarily he was Latin America's fair-haired boy.

But Fidel Castro had different ideas—far different. He was power hungry and he envisioned himself as a second Lenin or Stalin or Khrushchev in the Western Hemisphere. He wasn't long in publicly alining himself with the Khrushchev power machine. As Moscow's eager protegee he has performed invaluable service to the Communist world in fomenting trouble in the Western Hemisphere and has been well recompensed.

In its all-Ohio edition last Friday morning the Cleveland Plain Dealer carried on its front page a revealing story of the extent of Castro's current machinations in Latin America.

It was written by John P. Leacacos of the PD's Washington bureau, on information supplied by an unnamed "high administration source."

The article reveals Castro is spending as much as \$20 million annually in Latin American governmental deviltry. More than a million dollars a month is being expended. Mr. Leacacos was assured, for travel and

training 500 carefully selected residents of other Latin American countries who have been transported to Havana where they are trained in Communist indoctrination tactics.

That has been the Castro revolutionary program the last 2 years and it is continuing full blast in 1964. These trainees, when sufficiently indoctrinated and familiarized with the most modern Communist techniques, are sent home to begin undermining their own governments.

Among the countries across the Caribbean that have felt the force of such subversive techniques in the last 2 years are Chile, Bolivia, Venezuela, and Brazil. These are among the better known ones. There are several others where the sinister Castro's interference is strongly suspected of having substantially established itself.

How much longer is the Government of the United States going to continue its present palpably ineffectual tactics in dealing with the increasingly desperate situation in Castroland?

How much longer are we going to keep on cringing before Khrushchev's publicly proclaimed threat to defend Castro from any type of military attack originating in the United States?

How much longer will every red-blooded American in Congress, or outside, who has the guts to declare our present Cuban policy intolerable and a national disgrace, and who demands the adoption of stern measures to rid the Western Hemisphere of Castrolism forever, have to endure the ignominy of being spotlighted by Washington's peace-at-any-price boys as a warmonger?

OKIE AT OXFORD: DAVID BOREN

(Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, within the last 2 weeks David Boren, one of our neighbors here in the Washington area, has written us some very interesting and worthwhile letters.

He is a young man who graduated from Yale University last year with outstanding honors. Presently he is a Rhodes scholar at Balliol College in Oxford, England. David Boren introduced me as president of the Yale Political Union when I spoke at the Yale Campus last year. I have watched this young man for several years and believe that he has a tremendous future. His letter of May 1 addressed to my wife and me and the enclosed articles should be read by every Member of Congress. It might be well to point out that David Boren's father was formerly a distinguished Member of this body. I refer of course to former Representative Lyle Boren, of Oklahoma.

The letter from David Boren and the enclosures follow:

BALLIOL COLLEGE,

Oxford, England, May 1, 1964.

DEAR FRIENDS: I am now back in Oxford and settled down for the spring term which will last until the 20th of June. Oxford is a far different place in the spring. The famous college gardens are beginning to come into bloom and the walk along the river looks a great deal better in the sun than in the fog and ice.

This term I will be studying economic organization under Mr. Balogh, the chief adviser to Harold Wilson, Labor Party prime minister candidate. It remains to be seen how well we will get along but at any rate it should be quite an interesting term. Mr.

Balogh is definitely an eccentric who often slumps on to the floor, fiddles with a rubber band, or simply pretends to snore and be asleep while his students are attempting to read their essays to him. He has given tutorials on train platforms, in the bathtub, and in Blackwell's bookshop with the students following him down the street, reading as they walked along. These habits are to say the least disconcerting but yet Balogh never fails to catch a mistake on even the smallest of details. I'm also reading moral philosophy under Mr. Montefiore, a well-known Oxford philosopher who has the ability to make a complete shambles out of what one thinks has been a well-written essay.

Rowing will also continue to take up some of my time. We work 5 days a week and in no time I should be a mere shadow of my former self. We rowed at Henley for a week before term began. The small picturesque town is really the capital of English rowing and several well known regattas are held there.

This is also the season for the famous Oxford balls that colleges hold to celebrate their anniversaries. Balliol had theirs last year on the 700th anniversary of the college. At the end of last term I attended the Conservative Association Ball at Blenheim Palace, home of the Duke of Marlborough and birthplace of Winston Churchill. It was really an impressive event. May morning was also recently celebrated. The night before the first of May, many students stay up all night and float down the river in punts (small boats) ending at sunrise beneath Magdalen College Bridge. The Magdalen choir sings from the top of the college tower and there is folk dancing in the streets.

All in all this term should be a stimulating and pleasant one. Another highlight will be the annual Princeton-Harvard-Yale dinner in London with Arnold Toynbee, the famous historian, as guest speaker. There will also be special performances at the Stratford theater in Shakespeare's hometown in honor of the 400th anniversary of his birth.

The British elections will be held in October. I am serving this term as a university conservative association representative for Balliol. The election prospects for the Conservatives are very bad and have declined a great deal in the last 2 months. Prime Minister Home lacks the ability to inspire enthusiasm. The only thing that might prevent a Labour victory is the growing opposition to the program for nationalization of industry. Recently the Labourites also hinted that the state might seize all privately owned schools and some land. So far they have soft pedaled this proposal but if it is made a major issue, it could hurt labor because much of their support comes from non-socialists who are simply tired of the Conservatives after 13 years.

This summer I will be traveling with my family in July and August in Western Europe and am really looking forward to it. The fall term will not begin until the first week in October when a horde of new Rhodes scholars will be arriving. One is coming from Oklahoma and two from Yale. Of the 32 new American scholars, no less than 9 will be in Balliol. Some of the English students are calling Balliol "Little America" and are threatening to meet the new scholars with placards reading "Yankee Go Home."

My main purpose in writing this letter is to tell you about my recent trip to Eastern Europe during the Easter vacation for 5 weeks. I traveled with Dan Rowland from Yale and a Balliol friend, Russell Bryant, who is from Jacksonville Beach, Fla. Once again I am going to rely mainly upon articles which I have written for the paper. I apologize for doing so, and I know that many of you are disappointed that because of a lack of space and in order to assure clarity in a newspaper article, it is necessary to leave out many of the conditionals and exceptions, and to rely upon less sophisticated and more di-