

of survival. Lipservice to human rights no longer has value. The 20th century has caught up with those unworthy stewards who publicly proclaim liberty and justice for all, but privately try to massacre both liberty and justice for minority groups.

Historically, the American people have proclaimed and defended human rights and fundamental freedoms. That is why American citizenship has always been a prized possession. The world needs America for justice and freedom and liberty. You and I and all of us must serve this Nation that her greatness may endure. Without America the world would be in chaos.

The Founding Fathers recognized that our country had a mission, a vocation, to lead the world to new concepts of national sovereignty and individual liberty, to a new understanding of the dignity of man and the freedom of the human spirit.

On July 4, 1776, the Congress of the 13 Colonies proclaimed immortal principles of human liberty for all the world to read and today our mission, our vocation, in the providence of God, is to save mankind from slavery.

Your Excellency, the Ambassador of Lebanon, we of San Antonio are grateful to you for the honor which you have conferred on us this evening and we ask you to convey to your government our sincere appreciation of art award which you have brought to us; a distinction which will forever remind us of the glorious cedars of Lebanon.

AMBASSADOR OF LEBANON'S SPEECH AT THE BANQUET HONORING ARCHBISHOP LUCEY AND MR. PHILIP KAZEN

Mr. Chairman, Your Excellencies, honored guests, monsignors, very reverend and reverend fathers, ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered this evening to honor two distinguished guests, well known by all of us and who need no introduction.

As representative of the Republic of Lebanon, I am delighted to come here and to fulfill a mission in paying tribute to these outstanding personalities.

As an honorary citizen of Texas—a privilege that Governor Connally conferred upon me 2 months ago—a privilege and an honor that I deeply cherish, and as alcalde, an honor that Mayor McAllister conferred upon me here today—I am happy to be with you and to share your joy in honoring our two guests.

Your Excellency, tonight you are surrounded by parishioners and friends, men and women among whom you have lived, people who as individuals and as a community respected you, love you, and admire you.

Your accomplishments and your services are well known.

I would like, however, with your permission, to recall some of them to this gathering:

I am conscious of your virtue of humility; and your modesty is legendary. I hope my short remarks will not harm them, and I am confident that you will accept these remarks as a sincere expression of my personal appreciation of your merits and accomplishments.

For almost five decades you have dedicated your life to the service of God, you have ministered to the spiritual needs of your community. You have served the church in a number of capacities, and your words were always listened to religiously.

In addition to your parochial duties, you enriched your service in diversity. As director of Catholic Charities, you practiced one of the highest teachings of the church and one of the supreme virtues of mankind, compassion. As director of hospitals, you extended your care to the afflicted ones so

that in their physical anguish they found in you spiritual comfort and strength. As chaplain of the Newman Club at the University of California, you inspired the minds of the young and guided them in the true path. As you have always been interested in every aspect of the life of your parishioners, you have been elected president of the California Conference of Social Work and became a member of the executive board of the California State Department of Social Welfare.

It was natural that your dedicated apostolate led to your consecration as bishop of Amarillo, and since 1941 as the archbishop of San Antonio.

Belonging to the Apostles of Brotherhood, you turned your attention to the Maronite community in your diocese, and you have shown a special interest in St. George's Maronite Church, its pastor, and its parishioners. You have insisted that this community be served by a Maronite priest; helped its pastor, encouraged him in his duties and finally rewarded him by recommending the Very Reverend John Trad for the honor of papal chamberlain.

Your friendship to the members of the Maronite community has enabled them to preserve the rites of their ancestors in this hospitable land.

As host of His Beatitude Most Reverend Paul Peter Meouchi, Patriarch of Antioch and All the East, you expressed sentiments which echoed in our country, for the high respect that all people in Lebanon, of very creed and faith, have for the head of the Maronite community.

It is by way of recognition for your noble qualities and rich career of service, and as a token of appreciation for help and encouragement to the Maronite community that my Government has granted you a decoration of commander of the National Order of the Cedar.

Allow me now to present your excellency with this medal of the rank of commander. And in honoring you this evening, I feel that the honor is for me personally in this presentation.

Our second distinguished guest is a prominent citizen and a civic leader, an example of the abnegation to the service of the community. This man is Philip A. Kazen.

Mr. Kazen, if your name was mentioned in our country to a Lebanese he would immediately designate you as Shaykh Philip, because this family is very popular in Lebanon and you would be given this hereditary title.

Literally, the word "kazen" means "treasurer" or keeper of the treasures. But the family of the sheiks was not only the keeper of gold, it was the keeper of the old traditions of Lebanon; the traditions of tolerance, understanding and brotherhood.

Your family is originated from the north of Lebanon, and I do not know if you are related to the sheiks of Kesrouan. But I am sure you belong morally to this Kesrouany family because you performed here—you and Charles, Jimmy and (Chick) Abraham, Jr., your brothers, and Mrs. Carmen Ferris, your sister—all the civic virtues that the sheiks performed in Lebanon—you kept alive here all our noble traditions.

You have distinguished yourself as a citizen of the United States, serving your country in time of peace as in time of war in vital areas of activity. I will not recall at this time your many and well-known civic and philanthropic activities. But I wish to mention that you have been selected as man of the year in Laredo, Tex., for outstanding civic work and for championing the cause of the underprivileged.

Your knowledge and dedication has led you to become the friend of many political

leaders. Even Presidents, I am told, like to listen to your wise words.

You have served your community and your State and Nation with distinction. Like the Sheiks of Lebanon, the Kazens of the United States have justly earned a reputation for distinguished service, political acumen and generosity in friendship. You have done credit to your name, to your ancestral homeland and to your great country, the United States of America.

In recognition of your services, my government has granted you the Decoration of the Order of the Cedar. It is with great pleasure that I present you this evening with the medal of the rank of chevalier.

Before concluding, I would like to thank sincerely the Very Reverend John Trad, pastor of St. George's Maronite Church, for having worked for this gathering and for inviting me to be here this evening.

I would like also to express my sincere gratitude to all officials and friends who took the trouble to meet me at the airport and who welcomed me so heartfully. I felt, since my arrival, that I am at home among fellow citizens. Thank you.

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

[Mr. PEPPER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

[Mr. McDOWELL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINNEGAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, the last few months have shown a steady increase in correspondence I have received from concerned constituents, alarmed by the persecution of both the individual Jew and the Jewish community in the Soviet Union. A random sample of these letters expresses the fear and anxiety of many Americans over the situation and the need for us to raise our concerted voices in protest.

In our world today, where the mention of anti-Semitism immediately recalls the almost unbelievable atrocities inflicted on the Jews of Europe during World War II, it is not possible for us anymore to ignore the growing volume of reports coming from the Soviet Union concerning the Soviet campaign of harassment and repression being waged against 3 million Russian Jews. That such a campaign now exists seems beyond doubt, and the fact that it is not presently marked by mass arrests and murders does not lessen its significance. Recently many of my colleagues have expressed

awareness of and deep concern over these developments, and many individuals and groups of citizens have urged that the President and the Secretary of State inform the leadership of the Soviet Union of the sense of outrage that Americans feel towards a Government which makes anti-Semitic practices a national policy.

Much has been written dealing with the history of anti-Semitic sentiment in Russia. It is easy to remember the genocidal programs of Stalin which, were it not for this death, might well have destroyed completely the cultural and religious life of Russia's Jews, and we have been led to believe that in post-Stalinist Russia many moderating and civilizing changes have taken place. We have not been assured that Stalin's objectives have been repudiated, and we in America can take little consolation in the knowledge that the Soviet Government is now employing more sophisticated means to achieve a substantially unchanged goal.

THE GOAL

For reasons known in their entirety only to themselves, the leaders of the Soviet Government are in the process of implementing a policy that if successful will destroy the relationship of the Russian Jew with his religious and cultural traditions, isolate him completely from the world outside the Soviet Union, and cast him irrevocably into a second-class citizenship within the supposedly classless society. The noted journalist, Roland Evans, Jr., writing in the Saturday Evening Post in 1962, characterized the Soviet goal as "to put an end to all the special qualities that, like a kind of cement, have bound the Jews together through the most rapacious persecutions in all history." And Moshe Decter, writing in Foreign Affairs, making precisely the same point, says:

The objective of this policy is clearly to intimidate and atomize Soviet Jewry, to isolate it both from its past and from its brethren in other parts of the world, to destroy its specifically Jewish spirit. Soviet policy as a whole, then, amounts to spiritual strangulation—the deprivation of Soviet Jewry's right to know the Jewish past and to participate in the Jewish present.

From an analysis of the operations of Soviet policy the true Soviet intention is disclosed. The existence of such a policy, as well as its objectives, is strenuously denied by Khrushchev who with other Soviet spokesmen repeatedly points to the Soviet Constitution and Communist Party statements to the effect that there is no religious persecution in Russia. They are quick to remind critics that the many nationalities in the Soviet Union enjoy a high degree of cultural and linguistic autonomy, but such protestations only serve to bring into sharper focus the undeniable fact that the Jewish religion and culture are being systematically crushed out of existence. This campaign against the Jews is at the present time definitely not a part of a wider action aimed at the other religions and nationalities of Russia. But while other religious groups receive concessions, such as statewide organizations and international affiliations, a program to isolate each Jewish community in Russia is vig-

orously enforced. Russia's many ethnic groups, some much smaller and as widely dispersed as the Jewish, are permitted such channels of communication as newspapers and journals in which to promote and perpetuate their particular cultural traditions. What instrumentalities of this nature that are permitted the Jews are at best blatantly propagandistic and hardly serve to preserve Jewish culture.

THE POLICY

In view of official Soviet protestations and denials of anti-Semitic activities, it will be well to review some events which have taken place in the Soviet Union, events which are patently anti-Semitic, protestations to the contrary notwithstanding. The initial phase in the anti-Jewish program is the maintenance of each Jewish community in a state of isolation. Such isolation is intended to help the effort toward eradication of Jewish religious and cultural life. In an article which appeared in Communism Today in 1960, Erich Goldhagen noted that the post-Stalinist leadership in the Soviet Union has attempted to right the wrongs inflicted on some nationalities under Stalin. He was quick to point out, however, that "Stalin's heirs are determined not to revoke the edict against the cultural life of the Jews." Mr. Goldhagen then proceeds to explain why isolating the Jewish communities is important to the Soviet policy:

Pursuing the goal of total assimilation of the Jews, the regime has for the past 3 years embarked on a campaign against the last fragments of communal life in Russia—the synagogues and the religious life associated with them. The purpose of this campaign, conducted through the familiar medium of the feuilleton in the press and the occasional radio broadcast, and practically reinforced by the closing of synagogues in outlying regions, is to deter the Jews from congregating in compact groups. The process of atomization is to be brought to its ultimate conclusion. By insulating the Jews from their coreligionists and conationals in the rest of the world, and by isolating them from each other, the regime hopes to extirpate the consciousness of kind and thus what it thinks is a source of disaffection from within the Soviet Union.

Within this framework provided by Mr. Goldhagen, it is possible to arrive at the real meaning of certain happenings which might otherwise seem unrelated and unimportant.

The Soviet campaign against the practice of the Jewish religion is essentially three pronged; the removal of leaders coupled with the closing of synagogues, the prevention of the training of a new generation of rabbis, and a proscription on the production of articles necessary for religious observances, including publishing facilities. In 1961, Gedalia Pechersky, a respected leader of Leningrad Jewry, was sentenced to prison for espionage activities along with five other prominent Jews from Leningrad and Moscow. In five other cities the chairmen of the Jewish congregations were deposed. Synagogues in other cities were closed down, having taken the brunt of a widespread smear campaign linking the Jewish houses of worship to espionage activities, economic crimes, and other

disreputable undertakings. In carrying out these arrests, shutdowns, and removals, the Soviet officials have carefully avoided using any openly religious charges. For example, synagogues are closed down because of failures to comply with repair requirements or for violations of building codes.

The extent to which the Soviet campaign against the synagogues themselves has been successful is apparent from a statistical comparison with the numbers of places of worship open to other religions in Russia. The 40 million members of the Russian Orthodox faith have available some 20,000 churches, 1 church for every 2,000 believers. The 350,000 Lutherans in Estonia and Latvia have 100 churches, one for every 3,500. By contrast, there are some 60 or 70 synagogues which serve nearly 1 million Jewish believers, 1 synagogue for every 15,000 or 16,000.

Shortly after the Bolshevik revolution of 1917, all of Russia's yeshivas, academies for the training of rabbis, were closed down. In 1957, Khrushchev permitted the establishment of a yeshiva as an adjunct to Moscow's Central Synagogue. No sooner had the institution begun operations than the Soviet Government took steps to render it ineffective. In 1962 nine of the yeshiva's students, a large majority, were ordered to return to their native Georgia to vote in the Supreme Soviet elections. They were not then permitted to return to Moscow on the pretext that a housing shortage existed there. While the Soviet Government maintains that the Moscow yeshiva exists and operates, its imposition of severe restrictions on that operation can only lead to the conclusion that the yeshiva must stand as one rebuttal to anti-Semitic allegations while at the same time contributing no material assistance to the viability of the Russian Jewish community.

Like all established religions, Judaism for its rites and worship requires certain religious articles. It has been Soviet policy to render the procurement of these articles as difficult as possible. In March of 1962, a prohibition was placed on the public baking and sale of matzoh and shipments of matzoh from Jewish communities in the free world have been diverted, delayed, or confiscated, so that the Jewish faithful were denied the use of the unleavened bread which has been an indispensable part of the Passover ritual since the Exodus from Egypt. In the article referred to earlier, Moshe Decter points out the extent of Soviet pressure against the religious articles of Judaism:

Judaism is permitted no publication facilities and no publications. No Hebrew Bible has been published for Jews since 1917. (Nor has a Russian translation of the Jewish version of the Old Testament been allowed.) The study of Hebrew has been outlawed, even for religious purposes. Not a single Jewish religious book of any other kind has appeared in print since the early 1920's.

He showed that other religions in Russia received rather liberal treatment in this area, and the ban on Jewish religious publications is not part of any overall attack on religions in general.

1964

This in brief summary is the strategic mode of attack on Soviet Jewry. Given a proper amount of time and freedom from interference, it should be able to wipe out the practice of the Jewish religion within the Soviet Empire. The Soviet policy against Jewish cultural life goes hand in hand with that against religion. It is quite similar and involves a cultural strangulation, isolating the Jews from all the instrumentalities of cultural expression.

Much has been written about a possible relationship between anti-Semitic activities and the economic difficulties which have plagued the Soviet Union, especially those which have taken the form of private enterprise schemes and which are reportedly causing serious problems for Soviet economic planners. There can be little doubt that the Soviet Government will continue to use the Russian Jews as the prime scapegoats upon whom to heap the blame for the invasion of the capitalist spirit into the Soviet economy. It would seem, however, that such a policy would be but an adjunct to other expressions of anti-Semitism, revealing little as to the why and wherefore of these expressions.

It has been suggested that anti-Semitism is connected with Soviet foreign policy in the Middle East. One of the common charges levied against Russian Jews attempts to associate them with purported Israeli activities in intelligence and espionage. It has been contended that the Soviet Union recognizes a threat to itself in any identification that Russian Jews might make with Israel. In addition to this, it may be thought that anti-Semitism at home serves as a useful corollary to a pro-Arab policy abroad.

Mr. Speaker, it matters not what the reasons are for the Soviet Government's anti-Semitic policy and practices. What is important is that they exist. Under one guise or another, man has persecuted his fellow man from the beginning of recorded history, but past experience has taught us that we cannot remain apart or silent. Though it is an internal problem of another country, we must speak out and implore the Soviet Union to live up to its own constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion. We must continue to cast a searching spotlight of all such oppressions wherever found if we are to see the day when they are no longer a matter of policy or a matter of mind.

THE WASHINGTON CLIMATE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington climate as evidenced by the recent Bobby Baker case indeed provides us with some strange analogies. I have read several editorials in regard to the pressures put on Federal employees to purchase tickets to Democrat fundraising affairs. Some of the editorials have not minced words in castigating President Johnson for permitting this to happen and yet on other days some of the same papers contain flowery editorials

for this administration. Not nice or as we are taught to like it, but the people of the United States have long since realized and appreciated the difference between the office of the President and the person himself—a political figure.

The conclusion seems to be that political immorality is an accepted fact in that the means by whatever illegal deeds justify the end. Last month, an editorial in the Washington Star contained this:

There is only one practical solution for muzzling the big bite. That is for the President of the United States and the national committees of the political parties to put a stop to the "biting" practice, once and for all.

The Star editorial was in reference to the alleged widespread violations of the Hatch Act, limiting political activity among Federal employees, in connection with the Democratic \$100 salute to President Johnson affairs in May.

Republicans in the House and Senate have initiated investigations into the all but proven violations, but President Johnson and the Democrats have been characteristically silent on the subject. This silence on the part of the Chief Executive of the United States is not at all surprising.

Lyndon B. Johnson has a record of being notoriously against moves to take the Federal civil service out of politics and this was no more exemplified than in 1964—the 25th anniversary of his votes against the Hatch Act.

But, before reviewing the record of Lyndon Johnson, it would be well to review the situation as it exists today under his administration:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 26, 1964]

WINKING AT THE LAW (By Walter Pincus)

Since 1962, the Democrats have made a strong effort to get those Federal employees who were appointed to their positions—so-called schedule C jobs—to buy \$100 tickets each year to one major party function.

Currently, there are about 1,440 schedule C positions of which, according to a civil service spokesman, about 80 percent are filled. Some 400 of the persons holding down these jobs, however, are regular civil service and not political appointees.

Winking at the Federal laws that prohibit solicitation of Federal employees in Federal buildings, the Democratic National Committee has designated sales coordinators in each executive agency. Quotas have been established normally based on the number of schedule C positions in a given department combined with a 10-percent increase over the past year's ticket purchases.

In 1962 it was possible to go through the political spending reports filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and determine how many tickets were sold in each Federal department. For instance, according to the Star article, on January 12, 1962, 25 \$100 contributions were reported from the Agriculture Department. Secretary Freeman has long been known for his politics-above-everything approach to government, both as Governor of Minnesota and as Secretary of Agriculture.

However, since 1962, the Democratic National Committee has shuffled its reports and it is no longer possible to de-

termine exactly where the contributions came from:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 26, 1964]

This year, the dinner promoters have taken to marking the solicitation cards distributed to the executive departments with a number so that when the contributions come in directly to the committee they can easily be traced to the department of origin and credited to that department's quota.

The Democrats did not stop at the schedule C employees, however. Joseph Young, writing in the Washington Star of May 17, said this:

Thousands of career employees in grade 9 and above have received invitations from the Democratic National Committee in the past few weeks. Many thousands of others had received invitations and followup letters during the past 3 months.

And the Democratic National Committee apparently has devised a new wrinkle to pressure Government careerists into attending.

During the past week employees of grade 13 and above in the Agency for International Development, which is seeking legislation to "select out" employees without regard to civil service laws, received invitations.

The invitations they more or less expected. But what chilled them was their civil service grade number written in ink in the corner of the invitation cards.

AID employees feel this is a not-too-subtle way of telling them their agency expects them to attend if they hope to avoid the fate of being "selected out" of their jobs, should AID get this authority.

The Democratic National Committee's money-raising scheme was not confined to AID employees:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 20, 1964]

(By Joseph Young)

Representative NELSEN, Republican, of Minnesota, charges that Rural Electrification Administration employees are being coerced into buying the \$100 tickets.

In a letter to President Johnson, Mr. NELSEN, who formerly was REA Administrator, charged that REA officials are selling the tickets to the employees on the agency premises in violation of civil service rules which prohibit solicitation of political funds or selling of political party tickets in Federal buildings.

Mr. NELSEN said he has received complaints from REA employees in grades 13 and above that they are being called to the office of their boss and told to buy the \$100 tickets. In some cases their checks are being accepted right in the building.

The New York Herald Tribune on May 26, 1964, reported:

The tactics being used by fundraisers selling \$100-a-plate tickets for the Democratic Party's "Salute to President Johnson" today are bringing quiet complaints from high-level employees of several Federal agencies.

Objections involve the fact that these people are being solicited for tickets at their desks and even in their bosses' offices.

Federal law prohibits solicitation of political funds on Government property—and thus in Government buildings where civil servants work.

One official said: "The solicitation card someone placed on my desk had my home address written on it. Since they had my address, why didn't they just send it to me at home? That's what angers me."

A more specific example of the pressure used to get civil servants to purchase the tickets is contained in a letter from a former employee of the Rural

Electrification Administration to Congressman NELSEN. Although the letter refers to tactics used in selling tickets to the 1961 inaugural, the same methods were reportedly used for the May 26 salute this year. Here are some excerpts:

A few weeks before the Kennedy-Johnson inaugural celebration, I received a letter invitation to donate \$100 to the Democratic Party. I can only speculate that my name, home address and telephone number were given to the party headquarters by my employer, the REA * * *. Then a few days later, I received a telephone call at my home from a lady who identified herself as a volunteer worker for the Democratic Party, but she did endeavor to convey that I was under a moral obligation * * *.

All would have been readily dismissed had it not been for a subsequent request for an official appointment to a (higher official's office) through the official communication channels of REA.

Mr. _____ made the appointment at 3 p.m. during a regular working day. He reviewed the salary situation * * * implying that my salary * * * and civil service grade classification were solely due to the efforts of the administrator, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the administration, and, further, that out of gratitude, I should financially support the party with a cash contribution of \$100 * * *.

A ticket was then taken from a drawer in his desk and offered. I was then advised that, if necessary, I could buy it on the installment plan—\$50 down, and the rest later.

I replied that I had worked for the REA for 24 years and never publicly affiliated myself with either political party heretofore and was not about to break that precedent at the moment. I thought I had earned my salary and would continue to work faithfully and conscientiously up to the limit of my ability.

My feeling as I left the conference was that Mr. _____ showed great disappointment and that he might be inclined to use his influence to my disadvantage in my civil service career. A few days later, I was contacted for employment elsewhere and tendered my resignation with REA.

U.S. News & World Report, in its June 8 issue, reported that "similar tactics have been widely used in Washington in recent weeks." The magazine reported that other agencies where pressure has been reported are the State Department, Veterans' Administration, Small Business Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Post Office Department. Significantly, U.S. News & World Report also said:

Employees report that the solicitations, previously confined to highest level officials, now reach all the way down to salary levels of \$6,676 a year.

By the end of May, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, and Representative ANCHER NELSEN, Republican, of Minnesota, had both asked for investigations into the alleged violations of the Hatch Act. Senator WILLIAMS introduced a resolution in the Senate requesting the Attorney General to look into the charges and Representative NELSEN requested the Civil Service Commission to investigate the allegations.

On June 17 the Civil Service Commission announced that it would investigate the charges of pressure being brought on Federal employees to purchase the \$100 tickets. On June 24 the Senate passed

the resolution which asked the office of the Attorney General to review the charges.

What will come of either or both of these reviews is hard to say. Democrats will probably make every effort to do to this investigation what they did to the Bobby Baker inquiry—stop it cold in its tracks.

The possibility of a full disclosure is dimmed even more by the attitude of White House Press Secretary George Reedy, who said on May 26:

I don't believe anybody has ever solicited for a ticket to these dinners.—Philadelphia Inquirer, May 27, 1964.

The refusal by the White House to help expedite a look at the allegations could be safely predicted by past votes of Lyndon Johnson on the issue.

THE SPOILSMAN

In January 1883 the Pendleton Civil Service Act became law. Republican President Chester A. Arthur signed the law which established the merit system in the Federal Government.

Fifty-six years later, during the first full term of Lyndon Baines Johnson's career as a U.S. Congressman from Texas, the Civil Service Act and Congressman Johnson began a series of open conflicts.

On the one hand was a sound civil service system free of partisan politics and on the other hand was a Federal employee system perched on the political fence, waiting to be knocked over by one or the other of the political parties.

Lyndon Johnson, then, as today, chose the route of politics—politics above a sound public administration system—politics without regard to the taxpayer's money—politics as a demoralizing factor in sound execution of the public policy.

The 1936 and 1938 elections had seen widespread evidence of coercion of relief workers and others by the forces of the New Deal. Administrative pressure had forced the defeat of a bill in 1938 to remove Federal employees from politics. But in 1939 a bill was introduced to prohibit intimidation and coercion of voters, particularly those receiving Government relief payments; to make it illegal for Federal officials and employees to use their authority or position for the purpose of influencing elections; and to prohibit Federal employees, with certain exceptions, from taking an active part in politics.

Two recorded votes were taken on the bill. On the first, a motion to recommit the bill to the Judiciary Committee and probably kill it, the House voted 146 to 232 against the move. Congressman Lyndon Baines Johnson, of Texas, voted "yea."

A few minutes later on July 20, 1939, the House, by a vote of 241 to 134 passed the bill, which was to become better known as the Hatch Act, after Senator Hatch, of New Mexico, the chief author. All 157 Republican votes were cast for the bill. The Democrats split, 82 for and 133 against. Congressman Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, voted "nay."

On July 10, 1940, the Hatch Act was amended in the House to include provisions restricting political activities by State and local employees whose func-

tions are financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government. The amendments also regulated campaign contributions and expenditures. The bill was passed 243 to 122. The Republicans voted 151 to 1 in favor, while the Democrats split 90 to 120. Again, Congressman Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, voted "nay."

In 1942 the House voted on additional amendments to the Hatch Act but the Senate did not move the bill. The effect of the House action would have been to have removed the poll tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections. The bill passed the House by a vote of 254 to 84. Again, Congressman Johnson, of Texas, voted "nay."

The Senate version of the Agricultural Appropriations Act of 1945 contained an interesting omission from the House version. Specifically, the Senate struck from the act a provision which prohibited Agriculture Department employees from engaging in political and lobbying activities as well as an amendment prohibiting employees from demanding that farmers join AAA programs in order to receive draft deferments or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article.

The vote in the House was on the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. A yea vote was against the antipolitical activities provision and a nay vote was for its inclusion in the law. The motion was rejected 123 to 219 on June 20, 1944. As could be expected, Congressman Johnson, of Texas, voted "yea." All 173 Republicans voted against the motion while the Democrats split 122 to 48.

Finally, the Johnson record of being against every recorded bill to keep the civil service out of politics, moved to the Senate. On June 21, 1950, the Senate passed a conference report on additional Hatch Act amendments by a vote of 42 to 32. The amendments would have allowed Federal employees living in nearby areas to participate actively in local elections as Democrats, Republicans, or Independents. In cases involving minor Hatch Act violations, a new provision was added which allowed the imposition of lesser penalties—not less than 30 days' suspension as against mandatory dismissal under the law as then written. It was contended by the opposition that the lesser penalty provision was too mild, and was a weakening of the Hatch Act. Need there be any question? Of course, the freshman Senator from Texas, Lyndon B. Johnson, voted for the bill. The Republicans split 2 to 32 and the Democrats voted 40 to 0. President Truman subsequently vetoed the bill and it was not passed over the veto.

IS IT ANY WONDER?

Is it any wonder then, that now President Lyndon B. Johnson, would condone the practice of the Democratic National Committee in 1964 of a wholesale invasion of the political protection supposedly provided civil servants by the Hatch Act?

However, this entire matter involves something much more serious than mere political-issue talk for 1964. It becomes more apparent as this admin-