

In years of ever-increasing prosperity, relief rolls have gone up 32 percent since 1955. Negroes and Puerto Ricans have crowded into big cities of the North in search of a better way of life. Many of them arrived without jobs, skills, or housing.

A White House official said offhand that "80 percent or more of the poor families in America are nonwhite."

The President's Economic Council contends that census figures show only 22 percent of poverty cases are "nonwhite," although "almost half of all nonwhite Americans are poor."

The economic report said racial discrimination reduces their employment opportunities, while deficiencies of education and health depress their earnings.

The Council adopted as an arbitrary definition of poverty any family whose money income from all sources before taxes is \$3,000 a year or less.

Under this definition, the administration says 35 million persons, or one-fifth of all American families, are living in poverty today in the wealthiest Nation in the world.

Based on census figures, the Council says the legion of the poor breaks down into these categories:

Thirty-four percent are over 65 years of age; 55 percent have no children under 18.

One-third are children; 9 million under 12 years of age have mothers who work outside the home.

Forty-three percent of the total income of poor families comes from Government payments for welfare, unemployment, workmen's compensation, veterans benefits, and social security.

Fifty-four percent live in cities, 46 percent in rural areas. Forty percent of all poor families have some equity in a house.

On a geographical pattern, 47 percent live in the South, 25 percent in the north-central region, 17 percent in the East, 11 percent in the West.

By occupation, 74 percent of all domestic servants are considered to be poor, 56 percent of farm laborers, 45 percent of farm owners or operators, 23 percent of nonfarm laborers, and 22 percent of nondomestic service workers.

The statistics require some explanation. Government officials note these exceptions:

FARMERS

The Census Bureau says its figures deal only with cash income. Where farm families do not have to pay rent or buy food, their income is understated; many are living above the poverty level.

OLD FOLKS

The Council of Economic Advisers reports more than half of all persons over 65 have cash incomes above \$3,000 a year. Other oldsters have adequate savings to support a decent standard of living. Many own homes.

YOUNG PEOPLE

In addition to minor children, low-income families include a lot of young people who are just getting started in life or a business career.

INFLATION

The Council says that in the general prosperity since 1947, poor families have declined from 32 to 20 percent of the total population.

At the same time, the Consumer Price Index has gone up 40 percent, while the value of the dollar has declined 17 cents, or 30 percent.

Inflation has been, particularly injurious to older persons and others living on fixed incomes. It is a contrary influence to the Government campaign against poverty.

As wages and salaries have risen since the war, the Government has collected more taxes from higher incomes. The graduated income tax collects revenue on fixed dollar levels, without regard to diminishing value of what the dollar will buy.

SUBSIDIES

The Council said "poverty would be more prevalent and more serious" if many families were not already getting some kind of benefit payments from the Government.

Approximately 45 million Americans get benefits under four major Government programs costing \$30 billion a year including:

Nineteen million persons collecting \$16 billion a year from Federal old age, survivors, or disability insurance.

Four million, three hundred and sixty-four thousand veterans received pensions or compensation amounting to \$3.8 billion in fiscal year 1963; total benefits for the veterans population of 22 million run around \$7 billion.

Eight million persons on relief costing nearly \$5 billion annually.

Six million and two hundred thousand who received approximately \$3 billion in unemployment benefits during 1963.

The Federal-State unemployment insurance system covers 77 percent of all workers in paid employment today while 90 percent of all wage earners are under social security. Average benefits in 1963 amounted to \$924 a year for a retired worker, or \$1,565 a year for a retired couple.

RELIEF

Welfare rolls are the hard core of the poverty problem today. Persons on relief in the United States would fill a city the size of New York. They number three times the total population of the State of Connecticut.

The Economic Council said: "Escape from poverty is not easy for American children raised in families accustomed to living on relief. A recent study of aid to dependent children recipients found that more than 40 percent of the parents themselves were raised in homes where public assistance had been received."

More than 4 million persons receive aid to dependent children today, 2½ million are on old-age assistance, 775,000 get general assistance. The average payment per family on ADC is \$129-a-month, with some States ranging up to \$197 monthly. The national average for aid to the aged is \$62 a month. It runs up to \$95 in some States.

I Should Put My Wife on the Payroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take great pleasure in including an article by Herb Pike in the Successful Farming magazine of recent date, entitled "I Should Put My Wife on the Payroll."

Having known Herb and his good wife for many years, and having spoken at a coffee in my honor at the Pike farm home where neighbors gathered to meet me, and after hearing Herb sing his wife's praises, I agree completely with him that he should put his wife on the payroll, and I am sure every reader of this article will agree. So Herb, now you are stuck with your own proposition. The article follows:

I SHOULD PUT MY WIFE ON THE PAYROLL

(By Herbert Pike, Iowa farmer)

I married an executive. She had done time as an English teacher, then worked on

a city newspaper. If I don't put her on the farm payroll, she might start looking for an outside job to absorb her talent and energy.

If ever there's a natural man-wife partnership it is in farming. And lucky is the farmer who picks a good partner. My wife sometimes asks, "How did you know, when you took me away from my city job, that I'd make such a good workhorse?"

Every man expects his wife to be housekeeper, interior decorator, official hostess, social secretary, diplomat, foreman of the junior crew, taxi driver, tutor, and nursemaid.

But a farmer expects and usually gets much more. His wife must also be receptionist, "directionist," stenographer, bookkeeper, market reporter, weather forecaster, researcher, extra man, home cannery manager, locker plant chief, poultry expert, and mobile lunch canteen operator.

Mind power is fast replacing muscle power in farming. Time was when a poor manager was able to compensate for this weakness by hard work, by putting in longer hours. Now, machines have replaced so much manpower that management of capital is more important than hard, physical work.

Credit, too, is extended on the basis of the farmer's managerial ability, as well as his collateral. Agricultural prophets see no reversal in the direction farm units are taking toward greater size and complexity. It's the intangibles of farming which will separate the men from the boys in operating the farms of the future.

Taxwise, creditwise, and efficiencywise, the modern farmer is going to have to keep better records and be more businesslike in his methods. This is a real opportunity for division of labor between man and wife. Farmers need help with record keeping, analysis of their business, and someone to pre-read reams of agricultural information and sift it down to their own needs.

Who is better qualified to fill this important staff position than the farmer's wife? Most women are better fitted for office work than men—they are neater and have more patience. A good many farm women have had commercial training and business experience. Many have had more education than their husbands. Managing the farm office combines with household tasks and care of children much better than an off-farm job or outside farm chores, such as raising chickens. A wife who has real responsibilities in the farm business can go ahead on her own, instead of just being on call.

A knowledgeable wife is valuable as a consultant, a sounding board; someone with whom to talk things out and brainstorm new ideas. She ceases to be a competitor in spending limited resources for unnecessary consumer items. This is a problem with many young couples who are trying to accumulate initial capital so necessary in farming today.

Middle age and the obligatory notices of some of my contemporaries make us realize that my wife may be a widow some day and need to know more about running a farm. It is a fact that women may be expected to outlive their husbands from 4 to 8 years. Why? Because women not only have a longer life expectancy but are usually younger than their husbands.

Too, there are several legal advantages in having the wife a full-fledged operating partner in the farm business.

If the farm were incorporated, both husband and wife could be put on the payroll, build up pension rights, and be entitled to sickness and accident benefits the same as any other employee of the business. Partnership insurance could be carried on the key members of the firm. These costs are deductible by the corporation, yet the benefits are not taxable to the employee. Profits can be dispersed as salary bonuses or left in the firm.

Today's farm office assistant needs a place to work and something to work with. A separate room for an office is ideal. But at least she needs a desk where she can work without interruptions. She needs a place to store records and reference material. This can vary in splendor from an orange crate to a fireproof file.

Your chief of staff, like today's tractor operator, is entitled to some mechanical aids—an adding machine and possibly a typewriter. There are good used ones available for a small outlay of cash. You can justify a \$30 investment in labor-saving equipment, the experts say, for each minute saved per day. If you can bypass the drudgery of adding long columns of figures by hand, you can spend your time where it counts the most—on record analysis and planning.

How does one keep tabs on subject material? We have alphabetically arranged file folders for each subject: Building, cattle, concrete, corn, etc. For a numerical code refer to the article; "A Top-Notch Filing System," page 32, Successful Farming, December 1963.

Farm magazines, best source of current information, are stacked on shelves until the end of the year; then articles of value are filed in the subject file.

Clipboards headed crops, livestock, farm policy, etc., are good for holding current information until it can be read. Spring clips with magnetic bases are handy for holding memos in the car, in the shop, or near the telephone.

We try to keep original records as close to the source of information as possible. Crop weights are recorded by fields in a book in the scale house. Farrowing records originate on a tag over each pen, are transferred into a permanent book later. Farm gasoline to be used for highway travel is recorded in a notebook on the visor of truck or automobile. I also carry a diary in my shirt pocket for meter readings, livestock counts, planting dates, harvest dates, and oral agreements. Machinery manuals are kept where most often needed—in the farm shop, in a covered file box.

It is encouraging to see that an increasing number of farm couples are securing capital, organizing efficiently, and employing both men and machines to advantage. They have the ability and the time to pursue the intangibles in farming, to keep adequate records, and to make sound decisions.

Debauchery of the Legislative Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Rules Committee has an inescapable duty to investigate whether two of its employees, one of whom had occupied the highest staff position in the Senate, were faithful to their trust. President Johnson is deeply involved in this inquiry as Baker was his chief assistant. However, it did not seem to matter to the majority that Sherman Adams was President Eisenhower's assistant.

There is a serious possibility that this investigation may come to an innocuous end or it will be sidetracked. However, vigorous insistence by the public and an active press will keep the investigation open. I was pleased to see in the

March 12, 1964, issue of the Washington Star an editorial exposing the attempts of the committee chairman to sweep the matter under the rug.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial at this point:

WHITEWASH

Those who have been trying to identify that unpleasant odor floating around the Senate side of the Capitol need go no further. It's whitewash.

There is every indication that the Senate Rules Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator JORDAN of North Carolina, is preparing to give up the ghost in its "Investigation" of the Bobby Baker scandal. Apparently the committee, or the controlling members of the committee, have had enough. They don't want to develop the whole truth for the edification of the public.

The excuse offered is that there are no other useful witnesses who might be called. This is nonsense.

What about Senators? What about party girls? What about unexplored statements regarding campaign funds? What about Jay McDonnell, who was fired as assistant to Bobby Baker, because he didn't agree with all aspects of the Baker method of operation? What about a lobbyist named I. Irving Davidson, who might have some important testimony to give?

Most important of all, what about Walter Jenkins, longtime aid to Lyndon B. Johnson?

Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, has just given the committee an affidavit from Don R. Reynolds, Silver Spring insurance man, which raises grave questions respecting Mr. Jenkins. Shouldn't these be explored—at least to the extent of trying to pin down the truth?

And what about the deal in which Mr. Reynolds said he bought \$1,280 worth of useless advertising time on the Johnson television station in Texas after he had sold a \$100,000 life insurance policy to Mr. Johnson? Mr. Reynolds has testified under oath that he discussed this advertising project with Mr. Jenkins. Mr. Jenkins has never been called to testify. But he has denied in a sworn statement that he had any knowledge of the arrangements between Mr. Reynolds and the station.

Is this not important? Mr. Jenkins was a Senate employee at the time. Why has he not at least been called as a witness and cross-examined in an effort to clear up this apparent discrepancy? Mr. Reynolds undoubtedly paid for the time. Somebody made the arrangements. Why is the committee so afraid to explore the matter?

Whitewash is a useful commodity for sprucing up fences and outbuildings. But it serves only one purpose in this instance—to leave in the public mind a deep and fully justified suspicion that the Senate Rules Committee is trying to cover up a major scandal with far-reaching ramifications.

Soviets Shut Down Bakery for Matzoth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago the Soviet authorities announced that they would permit the opening of a matzoth bakery in Moscow to serve the Jewish community.

Now we learn that this small service

has been discontinued. Only 2 days following its opening, the bakery was closed last Friday for alleged "sanitary reasons." The fire department ordered the establishment closed for business after the bakery had produced not nearly enough of the matzoth to meet the needs of devout Jews during Passover.

This incident is yet one more indication of the regime's continuing discrimination against the Jewish cultural and religious traditions.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert Mr. Henry Tanner's account, appearing this morning in the New York Times, at this point in the RECORD. The article follows herewith:

SOVIETS SHUT DOWN BAKERY FOR MATZOTH (By Henry Tanner)

Moscow, March 15.—Moscow's only matzoth bakery has been closed by the Soviet authorities after only 2 days of operation.

Chief Rabbi Yehuda Lev Levin, said today that the bakery, which had been set up in a rented dwelling, had been closed temporarily and for sanitary reasons. He appeared to hope that he might get permission to reopen it later this week.

The bakery was opened last Wednesday to produce the unleavened bread for Passover, which begins March 28. According to unofficial Jewish sources, it produced only 220 pounds of matzoth on the first day and a similar amount on Thursday.

Members of the Jewish congregation said the closing on Friday was at the request of the fire department. The action came at a time when it had become clear that there would not be nearly enough matzoth to satisfy the need of devout Jews during Passover.

There were angry scenes at the Central Synagogue this morning as elderly Jewish men and women, who had come to collect their share of matzoth, had to be turned away emptyhanded.

Many of these persons said they had turned in the flour for their matzoth at the synagogue and had been promised an equivalent amount of unleavened bread.

Now they have neither flour nor matzoth, they said. Flour is fairly difficult to get in Moscow these days and buyers often have to queue for limited quantities.

Matzoth supplies are also reported to be insufficient in Leningrad and Kiev, two other Soviet cities with large Jewish populations. In Leningrad the Central Synagogue has not been able to make matzoth even though it has its own baking facilities, according to unofficial reports.

Georgia is the only part of the country where matzoth has been baked in approximately sufficient quantities in past weeks, private reports said.

The Central Synagogue in Moscow was permitted to improvise a bakery to alleviate the plight of devout Jews since state-run bakeries were ordered to stop baking matzoth 2 years ago.

There has been no ban on the baking of matzoth by individual families. If a person bakes more than is required for his own needs and sells the surplus, however, he is breaking Soviet laws against private commerce.

Last year three persons were given jail sentences for the illegal sale of matzoth.

SUPPLIES FROM ABROAD

Earlier this month Georgi Lieb, president of the congregation of Moscow's second synagogue, said he expected shipments of matzoth from abroad to alleviate the shortage.

He said that about 10,000 pounds of matzoth would be sent from Denmark by Dr. Isaac Levin of New York, president of the American section of Agudus Israel, and that 1,500 pounds would be sent by Britain's chief

rabbi, Dr. Israel Brodie. There are also reports of offers from Belgium and Israel.

The Soviet authorities are reported to be allowing private shipments from abroad.

"The Challenge of Citizenship"—A Speech by Daniel J. Lutenecker, of Burlington, Iowa, the Winning Contestant From Iowa in the Annual "Voice of Democracy" Contest Conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the winner from Iowa in the VFW's "Voice of Democracy" contest this year is Daniel J. Lutenecker, 2019 Sunnyside Avenue, Burlington, Iowa. His speech, "The Challenge of Citizenship," reminds all of us how the "little things" which many people tend to take for granted or ignore altogether, are the very essence of greatness out of which this country has developed and grown strong.

His speech is an admonition to heed the little things and to make the most of them. I take pleasure in calling this speech to the attention of my colleagues. His remarks follow:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP
(By Dan Lutenecker)

Little things. Thousands of little things have made America and the entire world what they are today. Through the years it has been the average person strengthened by an inner fortitude and determination, who has laid the foundation for events which have shaped the world. Take, for example, the scared little boy, who stuck his finger in a dike in Holland and saved his town from being flooded; the scientist, who dropped an apple and discovered the laws of gravity; the little man who flew a kite and stated the fundamental elements of electricity. Such actions are like puny, shriveled seeds which grow and mature until finally they result in something worthwhile. See what these small beginnings have brought us—light bulbs, modern appliances, space travel, and so on.

Likewise, it is these little things that form the challenge of citizenship. Too often when we think of the good citizen, we think of a man like John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who seemed to give everything, even his life, for his country. Indeed, the history books are full of men such as this. They died at Bunker Hill, at Bull Run, at Gettysburg. They died in the Pacific, on the shores of Iwo Jima, in the skies over Korea. Heroes like these, whose names will live forever, produced our image of the good citizen. But in our dreams we forget that it is the ordinary citizens, playing ordinary, everyday roles that make America strong. To remember this in my everyday life, wherever I might be, whatever I might be doing, is my challenge and the challenge of every American citizen.

But how about today? First of all, the most important factor is an interest in the well-being of our Nation, a sense of responsibility that has grown and thrived throughout our lives.

Responsibility is essentially an awareness of little things and herein lies the challenge of citizenship. Do we obey traffic signals? Do we do our share of work at home? Do

we do our best in school? Do we play a team game? Do we volunteer to do a job that needs doing? These are what good citizens do. Everytime a citizen does these little things and many other like them, he is helping to make our country stronger. Remember, a nation is no stronger than its weakest citizen. Our history proves this. It reflects what we have done as a team, as a group, not as individuals.

Likewise, I personally am merely a small cog in the wheel, but I help it to run efficiently and if I would break, the whole wheel would be weakened. As a member of a new generation, I am the lifeblood of this Nation, but if I would be poisoned or infected, the entire Nation would be poisoned. Democracy is no longer a cause in America that must be won with guns and heroes; it is an example that must be lived by every hard working and responsible citizen.

Furthermore, on the more positive side, suppose each of us spent a little more time every day in reading the news and keeping abreast of current events. The result would be a new America, vigilant and strong, but ever humble. This is still another way of how I personally can be a working member of our Republic. Instead of just trying to "stay afloat" I can strive for goals that are better, higher, and more noble, trying to improve self, community, and nation. Only through such efforts and accepting the challenge of citizenship can the American of today meet the impact of world change.

Thus, the challenge of citizenship is putting myself out just a little bit at home, at school, or on the job. It means doing everything well and not being influenced by the crowd. In this little way, like the boy who stuck his finger in the dike, I personally can help to break the bonds of prejudice, apathy, and suffering which constrict America through their evil influences. After all the soul of America, founded on order, courage, justice, and tolerance, is composed of little men with little ideas, but men who have the great fortitude and unique generosity to carry out those little ideas in their everyday lives. This is the American challenge. This is the challenge of citizenship.

Wheat Sales to the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, many of us have pointed to the dangers of U.S. wheat sales to the Soviet Union, even while our Government has protested Allied trade with the Communist bloc.

But what would happen if the shoe was on the other foot? Ray Henle, editor in chief of Three Star Extra, carried nightly over NBC Radio Network, raised that provocative question on his broadcast of March 6, 1964.

What if the United States wanted wheat and sent out feelers to the Soviets in hopes of making purchases? Could we expect the same treatment we are now giving the Soviets?

I should like to call my colleagues' attention to Mr. Henle's broadcast by inserting it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THREE-STAR EXTRA BROADCAST: MARCH 6, 1964

(By Ray Henle)

Can you imagine what the situation would be, with respect to trade with the Soviets,

if the tables were turned? Rather easy to figure it out, isn't it? If the United States and the American people were short of wheat, short of machinery, short of practically everything that meant better living for us * * * and the Soviet Union and the Russian people had an abundance of wheat and machinery and the rest of worldly goods * * * and the American people and the U.S. Government put out feelers that they would like to buy wheat and machinery and the other things, what would the Soviet Government do? Run over itself to offer us wheat and other things? With credit terms and shipping in any old kind of bottom just to get it to us in a hurry? Open the floodgates of trade without any price attached thereto?

Well, hardly. More likely we would be presented with a set of counterdemands. Get out of Berlin, get your troops home from Europe, button up your bases, withdraw from Vietnam, come to terms on disarmament. Those likely would be a few. The Soviets would use their advantage to further advance their world aims and their foreign policies. Can anyone doubt that?

Merely to state the likelihood gives a picture of how little we in this country tie our God-given advantages to a program of wringing from our opponents concessions which would advance our lofty world aims of freedom. Instead we rush with open hand—our chamber of commerce plans to come out for even more liberal trade policies—our Government just can't do enough to show our opponents how really nice we are—wanting nothing in return. Not even a better chance for our lofty principles to succeed. It's a funny world.

H.R. 10412

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues will be interested in the bill (H.R. 10412) I introduced to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny deduction for rent, taxes, or interest incurred for the use or occupancy of an industrial plant financed by tax-exempt obligations.

The objective of my bill is to put a stop to a very clear case of abuse in using tax-exempt industrial development revenue bonds for financing industrial plants and facilities for lease to private persons. I refer to the arrangements between a corporation and a municipality under which the corporation which leases the facility from the municipality itself buys the tax-exempt bonds issued in the name of the municipality to finance the acquisition of the industrial plant. Such a corporation is obviously able to do its own financing without governmental aid. It uses the municipality as a go-between to gain access to tax-exempt financing. This devious route enables it to enjoy both a rental reduction reflecting the interest savings derived from the tax exemption of the bonds and tax-exempt interest income, despite the fact that its investment in the bonds is subject only to the risk inherent in its own business.

My bill embodies the recommendation of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, created by the Congress in 1959, on which the gentle-

man from North Carolina, Congressman FOUNTAIN, the gentlewoman from New Jersey, Congresswoman DWYER, and I have the honor to represent this House. The Advisory Commission is composed of members actively representing both executive and legislative branches of all levels of Government in our Federal system which gives its recommendations a balanced quality.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, in its report on Industrial Development Bond Financing, has identified a variety of abuses which require urgent attention and has outlined for the States some guidelines for keeping industrial development bond financing within tolerable limits. Hopefully the States will act promptly. I know that the financial officials of a number of States are actively at work on this problem under the able leadership of the comptroller of the State of New York, Arthur Levitt. However, when the leasing corporation itself buys the tax-exempt bonds, the misuse of the municipal tax exemption privilege is so brazen, that the remedy cannot wait for action by numerous State legislatures. It is for this reason that the Advisory Commission urged the Congress to act at once in this limited area. This explicitly is the purpose of my bill.

The abuse of the tax exemption privilege of municipal bonds has concerned many Members of this House for several years, and increasingly so. The financing technique, invented just a quarter century ago by a Southern State for the purpose of attracting industry, has now spread to nearly half of the States and is under consideration in several others. If competition for industry subsidized by the Federal income tax exemption is allowed to spread unrestrained, State and local governments will neutralize one another's efforts and the public investment, including the substantial loss of Federal income tax revenue, will have been largely wasted. In short, the entire development is potentially self-defeating.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing radically new or revolutionary in a community's efforts to attract business and industry within its borders to provide employment and help to support local government. When, however, it seeks to achieve these ends at the expense of other communities, and the U.S. Treasury, to the detriment of its own fiscal stability, the practice cannot be allowed to continue unregulated. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that despite our crowded calendar my bill will receive early attention.

Competition in Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the March 6, 1964, edition of the Titusville Herald, Titus-

ville, Pa., points out the seriousness of the problem of "dumping" and the need for remedial action.

The editorial is as follows:

COMPETITION IN STEEL

Competition from overseas continues to plague the U.S. steel producer. Imports of certain kinds of steels have increased in recent years to the point where some domestic fabrications have been completely excluded, according to steel men, from their own local markets.

Mills here have tried to counter this influx in appeals to the U.S. Tariff Commission. Under the law the Commission can raise duties if the offended industry can prove "dumping." This term is applied to any foreign producer who sells to U.S. customers at lower prices than he charges at home.

Now a new urgency has arisen. The Common Market has raised its duties on imported steels by 50 percent. The nutcracker is in operation at both ends. It will become harder to export into Europe, while mills there go on beating competition in this country by dumping low-cost steels.

Something, obviously, will have to give. U.S. steel producers carry an enormously heavy wage cost load. The industry can do so only if its products are marketed in crisp fashion. Any serious slowdown could force retrenchment.

Though raising tariff barriers has been the traditional response to conditions like these, mankind has come to recognize this as the lamest response. Possibly the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations will help solve the dilemma.

Eat "Top-of-Iowa" Beefsteak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the old axiom "It Pays To Advertise."

Even the "better mousetrap" theory of the beaten path would not work unless somebody tells the prospective consumer.

Thus, I am delighted to reveal today through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the action of the Iowa Senate last week in passing a bipartisan concurrent resolution dealing with one of Iowa's greatest products, sirloin steak.

At one time or another each of you have eaten delicious tender Iowa beefsteak, whether or not you realized it at the time. Now, Iowa beef producers will alert you to your opportunity to do so with knowledge.

Iowa corn contains the richest nutrients, and when it is fed to cattle, the meat produced therefrom is the most tender, the most succulent, you can hope to find in any market or restaurant on earth.

So, treat yourselves, ladies and gentlemen. Insist on "top-of-Iowa" sirloin next time you desire a tasty steak. If your store or restaurant does not have it by that designation yet, you may still be buying Iowa-fed meat, only tell your supplier you would like to have the certified article next time around.

The text of the Iowa Senate concurrent resolution follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

(By Hansen, Elijah, Lucken, and Griffin)

Whereas the price of beef is of concern both nationally and locally in the United States; and

Whereas one of the goals of lawmakers, economists, and beef producers is to locate new markets for the sale of beef; and

Whereas the State of Wisconsin has promoted the sale of Wisconsin cheese and the State of Idaho has promoted the sale of Idaho potatoes; and

Whereas, such cuts of meat as New York cut, New York strip, and Kansas City steaks are known throughout the United States; and

Whereas the Iowa Beef Producers' Association originated the idea of naming a new steak to promote Iowa, its great beef industry, and the sale of beef; and

Whereas a Des Moines restaurant operator, Lyle McNabb, originated the idea for a steak cut from the top of the sirloin; and

Whereas the Iowa Beef Producers' Association conducted a contest in 1962 to name and promote the sale of the sirloin cut; and

Whereas Iowa's newly designed steak was presented to the public at the annual meeting of the Iowa Beef Producers' Association on April 18, 1962; and

Whereas Mrs. Richard Bogner, Fairfield, Iowa, was awarded the prize for naming the steak "Top of Iowa" and received 50 pounds of "Top of Iowa" steak for submitting the name; and

Whereas Iowa has been slow in comparison to other States in promoting products for which the State is known throughout the world; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the General Assembly of the State of Iowa recognize the Iowa Beef Producers' Association for its effort in promoting the "Top of Iowa" sirloin and that each member of the general assembly encourage and give unlimited support to all efforts promoting the sale of the "Top of Iowa" sirloin so that "Top of Iowa" will become known throughout the world as one of the choice prime beef cuts and the State of Iowa will be known as the producer of "Top of Iowa."

Whitewash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., in their edition of March 12, 1964:

WHITEWASH

Those who have been trying to identify that unpleasant odor floating around the Senate side of the Capitol need go no further. It's whitewash.

There is every indication that the Senate Rules Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator JORDAN of North Carolina, is preparing to give up the ghost in its "Investigation" of the Bobby Baker scandal. Apparently the committee, or the controlling members of the committee, have had enough. They don't want to develop the whole truth for the edification of the public.

The excuse offered is that there are no other useful witnesses who might be called. This is nonsense.

What about Senators? What about party girls? What about unexplored statements regarding campaign funds? What about Jay