

proval of the proposal which was presented to us and upon which we had a chance to act and impart our stamp of approval upon it.

#### STATUE OF LIBERTY NATIONAL MONUMENT

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

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, 1965, I had the distinct pleasure to be present at the White House when President Johnson issued a proclamation adding Ellis Island to the Statue of Liberty National Monument.

In issuing this proclamation that this tiny island in New York Bay become a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument, President Johnson took cognizance of the fact that it has a deep significance for over 16 million immigrants who first set foot upon American soil when they arrived at historic Ellis Island.

This event, at the White House, was more than just an invitation to me to be present at a ceremonial event. It was a memorable occasion because my parents, both immigrants from Poland, first set foot upon the land of the free and the home of the brave, when they landed at Ellis Island.

Ellis Island came into Federal possession in the year 1800. The Federal Bureau of Immigration took over the facilities of the island in 1890 to develop it as an immigration station, and, between 1892 and 1954, when the use of Ellis Island as an immigration depot was discontinued, nearly 70 percent of all the immigrants coming to these shores used this island as a steppingstone to a better way of life.

The greatness of America has come in no small measure from the millions who passed through the gates and doors of Ellis Island. They came seeking freedom, liberty and refuge from the unsettled condition of their homeland, with high hopes of finding peace of mind and heart.

America has offered opportunity to all who dreamed and hoped for that one new and better chance to improve their lot, and found it waiting for them in America. The immigrants who passed through Ellis Island and who have attained prominence in our country made a very significant contribution to the rise of the United States to a position of world power.

America has grown to greatness because its people have a full right to citizenship throughout the Nation. They have the right to choose their position in life, be it high or low—a life of failure or success.

The proclamation of President Johnson to include Ellis Island in the National Park System will relieve the overcrowded conditions at Liberty Island and I hope that one day there will be a bridge built from the New Jersey shore to Liberty Island so that it will provide easy access to this shrine of liberty; so that our younger people can visit the Goddess of

Liberty, and that our senior citizens who came to this country through Ellis Island can again visit this door of opportunity which opened a new life for them.

Standing as a beacon, inviting all people to come under the shelter of our Nation, the Statue of Liberty stands in majestic glory as a symbol of freedom. Together with the added facilities of Ellis Island it will permit an easier access to this Goddess of Liberty.

In this time of world stress it is proper that we repeat a portion of the poem of Emma Lazarus which is engraved upon a tablet within the pedestal of the statue, which so aptly describes this Nation's acceptance of the many who still come to these shores each year.

I quote the significant portion of the poem.

Give me your tired, your poor,  
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,  
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.  
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,  
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

#### A GREAT MAN IN MEXICO

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I take this welcomed opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues and the American people in general about some of the great words of wisdom and courage recently spoken in Mexico by a man who I sincerely believe will go down in history as one of the most distinguished, inspired, and intelligent leaders of the Americas. I speak of President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, of Mexico.

Too often our news media overlooks, or just simply does not have the space, to bring us up to date about some of the transcendently important doings in our neighboring country of Mexico. I have been fortunate enough to have been receiving some of the publications widely read and disseminated in Mexico and have been greatly impressed by some of the doings and sayings of this great President, Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, of Mexico.

On June 7, Mexico commemorated Freedom of the Press Day and the President of Mexico was the guest of honor at a luncheon marking this anniversary. A distinguished Mexican journalist, Miguel Lanz Duret, on behalf of the Mexican press and journalists, made an introductory speech honoring the President. The President, in his reply, had some priceless sentiments to express in most eloquent language. I take the liberty of quoting some—translation mine:

If you dedicate yourselves to telling me in honorable fashion the truth, whether it be bright or be it gloomy, bitter or joyful \* \* \* but always the truth \* \* \* and I in turn dedicate myself to listening and heeding it \* \* \* we then shall have served Mexico loyally and efficiently.

Also:

Only can we be truly free when we learn to be truly responsible.

I intend to have more to say about the accomplishments of this great leader, be-

cause I believe we should be aware and cognizant of his great worth.

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

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

#### VALIDITY OF THE IMPORTANCE OF FARM ECONOMY TO THE TOTAL ECONOMY

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

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, recently the Council Bluffs Nonpareil printed an editorial regarding the improvement in the economic situation of farmers during the early part of 1965. The editorial is of value to legislators in determining validity of the importance of farm economy to the total economy of our Nation. It also indicates the reason why a strong farm program is imperative if we are to maintain our current farm economy. I commend this editorial to my colleagues as an indication of the concern we must feel for vibrant and comprehensive farm programs. The editorial follows:

#### AREA HOG PRODUCERS ENJOYING EXCELLENT PRICES IN 1965

Most of the experts thought 1965 would be a good hog year but nobody expected anything like this. Hogs at this writing have hit a top of \$26 in both Omaha and Chicago, a new 11-year high.

The new Government forecast shows that hog production for the balance of this year will continue far below normal. Although it has often been said that it is easy to increase hog numbers with good prices, this year seems to disprove the theory.

Actually, what is beginning to show up is the age of the Nation's farmers. Raising hogs is hard work and is no job for old men. With most farm jobs becoming easier through new automated machinery, the business of raising hogs still remains tedious, dirty and time consuming.

Right here in one of the heaviest hog producing areas in the entire country, there are many farms today that do not raise any hogs. As farms are joined together, corn production remains high but the production of livestock does not increase proportionately.

How high the hog price can go is anybody's guess. It is about \$3 or \$4 per hundredweight higher than was predicted and statistics would tend to prove that slaughter numbers will remain low enough to cause a real good year. Accustomed through the last 4 or 5 years to a marginal income, present-day prices are a welcome event.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATION'S NATURAL RESOURCES

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, New York City residents, currently suffering the consequences of bad water planning, deeply appreciate the need for intelli-

July 13, 1965

gent water legislation. As the principal city in the State which ranks first in Federal taxes paid but third to last in per capita Federal expenditures, New York is also vitally interested in water planning decisions in other parts of the country. For it is New Yorkers who are disproportionately charged with interest subsidies to water users under our reclamation laws. And it is New Yorkers who pay three times over when costly projects misallocate water to the growth of surplus crops—first for the interest subsidy, again for more costly farm programs, and finally through higher food prices.

Yet it is New Yorkers who have perhaps the least to hope for from today's bill. The most conspicuous reason for doubt is the conferee's sudden addition of section 3(d), barring the Federal Council or a Basin Commission from so much as studying the feasibility of transferring water between adjacent river basins. This patently irrational restriction was apparently added at the insistence of Columbia River Basin users to avoid diversion of water to the Southwest. Although this may be an intelligent decision in that area, it threatens to hobble critical planning in the East.

New York, for instance, is a member of an interstate compact governing the Delaware River Basin and draws waters from that source. It is also developing a water recovery project on the Hudson, designed to merge with aqueducts carrying water from the Delaware. Economic recovery of Hudson water may require mixing of waters from both sources and it will certainly necessitate integrated planning of aqueduct capacities.

While it is fair to say that this is all being done a decade too late, it is equally fair to wonder whether S. 21, had it been enacted in 1955, would have helped or hindered. If it had passed then, some \$30 million would by now have been spent by the planning authorities of the Hudson and Delaware Basins, all of it subject to the bar on studying or recommending inter-basin water transfers. What New York is now doing it would have had to do alone, and against the entire weight of well-financed and contrary water policy.

Section 3(d) of the present bill is just the last and most dramatic instance of the regrettable weakening which this bill has undergone. As it passes today it represents something less than a halting step forward, because it enlists at least \$11.7 million a year of Federal and State planning money to the flag of a still-balkanized Federal water policy. New Yorkers who desperately seek a little more water to spill down the drain may rightly imagine that this bill means only a little more money instead. Although I support it, I will shortly introduce new legislation designed to bring national water policy closer in line with the needs of the Nation's population centers.

*Fe (Mr) Waggonner*  
TWO WARS—TWO ENEMIES

(Mr. WAGGONNER (at the request of Mr. Moss) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of all my fellow Members an editorial which appeared in the July 4 issue of the *Shreveport Times*, "Two Wars—Two Enemies."

Much that is contained in this editorial is common knowledge here in Washington, though it is little talked about. Much of it represents the opinion of many Members who, for various reasons, find it politically unwise to take this position. With but a single exception, I wholeheartedly endorse what is stated here. The exception is that sentence in which the writer states that except for the Republicans, Mr. Johnson would have no real political leadership behind him as to Vietnam. The backbone of his support is bipartisan.

I cannot count on the fingers of both my hands the times I have stood here in the well and stated my support of the President's strong stand in Vietnam and these sentiments have been strongly echoed on the Democratic side of the aisle. But, aside from this, the editorial makes telling and true points of undeniable fact and I urge you to study it.

The *Times* editorial follows:

#### TWO WARS—TWO ENEMIES

Former Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens (under Eisenhower), returning from a Presidential mission to southeast Asia, told Mr. Johnson that present American forces of more than 70,000 men in South Vietnam must be doubled—soon, if we expect to keep the Communists in full check during the summer monsoon season (now underway) when high winds, squalls, and cloud banks tend to nullify the supreme air power of the United States.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff are understood to have told the President that the American forces may have to total 300,000 by early next year if we are to do more than spar back and forth with the Reds.

Other military authorities estimate that if the Communists turn to real war—which seems certain—the United States may have to send in approximately 800,000 men, the total used in Korea.

The situation is so critical right now that, according to Washington dispatches, President Johnson has himself awakened at 3 a.m. every night to receive the reports from Vietnam on casualties, American bombing and other combat (it is then around noon in southeast Asia).

In this critical situation President Johnson is fighting two wars with two enemies. One enemy is the combat Communist enemy in South Vietnam. On our success against it rests the future security of freedom against communism.

The other enemy is made up of numerous individuals and organizations in this country who seek to undermine the President, politically or otherwise, in his conduct of the combat war overseas.

These are the radicals, the so-called intellectual liberals, segments of college faculties and student bodies, the liberal press, substantial segments of the clergy, and radical and leftist and liberal television commentators; as well as one of the TV networks, which seems so often to find "news" in anything that will hamper the President's Vietnam war efforts and further the activities of those who fight him in this country.

If the United States—and the free world—lose the war in Vietnam, it will be because the war here in the the United States was lost first.

If the radicals and leftists and liberals and the conglomeration of this and that from beatniks to bishops have their way, Mr. Johnson will be undermined and will have to carry out another back-down and no-win appeasement of communism of the type that marked the administrations of two of his predecessors in Korea and Cuba, in Berlin and the Congo; in fact, to some extent in every confrontation we have had with communism at the international level since World War II approached its end.

Right now, leadership in this country against Mr. Johnson in his efforts to bring victory in Vietnam gravitates somewhat toward ROBERT F. KENNEDY, "the Massachusetts Senator from New York" and brother of the assassinated President, and Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas (both Democrats); as well as in, of course, the liberal and radical advocates in the big liberal newspapers and on the TV networks.

There is no need to document the fact that "the Kennedys" of today and "the Johnsons" are, behind the scenes, vigorous political enemies. Today's Kennedys accepted Mr. Johnson in 1960 simply because their brother insisted on having the Texan as his running mate. They never wanted him politically or socially or in any other way.

After the assassination, BOBBY KENNEDY assumed that the 1964 vice presidential nomination was his without asking—until Mr. Johnson, suddenly, publicly, dumped him.

"The Kennedys" clearly have been waiting a chance openly to buck the President of the United States on some major issue—and few could doubt, indeed, that ROBERT F. KENNEDY hopes in some way to deprive Mr. Johnson of renomination in 1968 and perhaps to get the nomination for himself.

The peg on which to hang an attack on the President came with the Dominican trouble—Vietnam was not a good peg at the time because President Kennedy was involved. Senator KENNEDY seized on the Dominican situation to turn against the President. Then he made a speech, inimical to the President as to Vietnam, in the Senate a few days ago, after first telephoning various Senators to be sure to hear him, tipping off newspapermen as to the "importance" of what he would say, and generally building up a big ballyhoo. The speech obviously was meant to hamper and harass the President of the United States in his conduct of war with a foreign power. It opened the doors for an avalanche of radical and liberal attack on the President. Such attack now had "Kennedy prestige."

Senator FULBRIGHT constantly advocates negotiation with the Communists on Vietnam on the basis of the 1954 negotiations which created the present nations of southeast Asia. It is violation of those negotiations by the Communists that has brought on the present war. What does Senator FULBRIGHT want the Reds to do; sign again? And if they do, and we do, what will that mean? And just how can we negotiate with the Reds when from Moscow to Peiping to Hanoi they jeer at the mere thought of negotiations. Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, followed KENNEDY with what seemed almost a vicious and slurring attack on the President's policies. All these men are Democrats.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democratic Party leader in the Senate, who has never made a secret of his opposition to the President's Vietnam policies, tried to get himself off his own hook the other day by criticizing the Republicans because a GOP House leader said that the President might lose Republican support if he yielded to the appeasers—the radicals and liberals of the Democratic Party. But for the Republicans, Mr. Johnson would have no real political leadership behind him as to Vietnam in the Capital. The Republicans are willing to

July 13, 1965

stand behind him as long as he stands up against communism but they are not going to follow Mr. Fulbright and the Bobby Kennedys, and if Mr. Johnson follows the Fulbrights and the Bobby Kennedys he need not expect GOP support—or support around the Nation, either.

But, Senator MANSFIELD tried to make it appear that the Republicans were making themselves "the war party." We don't think either party is "the war party." But the clear facts are that all of the wars we have fought in this century—and there now are four, all overseas—came under Democratic administrations and we have been in no war in this century under a Republican administration except to the extent that the Korean war was inherited for a brief period.

One TV network hammers relentlessly at the President by constantly emphasizing, on its daily "news show," things which could arouse public emotions against the President's course. A little girl was killed accidentally in Dominica. It was on the network air endlessly with the blame placed on government forces which the United States was pictured as supporting, but which it was not supporting.

Nothing is so precious as a child's life. But the United States knowingly killed tens of thousands of children and women and men—with one bomb at Hiroshima. The British, with conventional bombs, killed more children in one German city than the United States did at Hiroshima. They had to. We had to. That was war. We have war now.

In Vietnam, a TV broadcaster stood out in the jungle with half clad people around him and talked about this hopeless war.

Who is he to say that war being made by the United States of America against communism is a "hopeless war"?

An "artist group" carries paid advertising in newspapers denouncing the President on Vietnam, as does a ministerial group, a college faculty group, and another group which presumably would describe itself as intellectuals. They are insignificant in numbers, unimportant in intelligence, but millions of people don't know it. As long as they have money [where do they get it?] to pay for getting themselves heard, they get heard.

Liberals and radicals play up—in horror—atrocities, and the "violation of democratic processes" ordered in Saigon. They forget that democratic processes become meaningless in time of war. Atrocities occur in all wars. The Germans massacred more than 70 unarmed American prisoners of war at Malmedy in World War II. Seven American soldiers were found on a roadside in the Korean war, their faces shot away with machine-gun fire, their hands tied behind them. In South Vietnam the people think it is wonderful when an enemy soldier or civilian is executed. That is why there have been executions and will be many more in this war.

If the liberals and the radicals have their way—if they win the war at home—the United States will lose the war in Vietnam.

It's about time for the American people—American leadership, nationwide—to rise against these forces which want America to lose the war against communism; the hot, combat, tortuous, dirty, shooting war overseas.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. ERNESTINE WASHINGTON AND OTHERS**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1965.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, I have received a sub-

pena, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court as a witness in the case of the *United States v. Ernestine Washington, et al* (numbered U.S. 5379-65, U.S. 5380-65).

The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicate that the Clerk may not either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpoena appear without the consent of the House being first obtained.

The subpoena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is present for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very truly yours,  
RALPH R. ROBERTS,  
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF  
GENERAL SESSIONS, CRIMINAL DIVISION.

The President of the United States.  
To RALPH R. ROBERTS,  
Clerk of the House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol.

You are hereby commanded to appear before the Criminal Branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions forthwith on the 13th day of July, 1965 as a witness for the defendants, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the Honorable John Lewis Smith, Jr., chief judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, and the seal of said court this 12th day of July, A.D. 1965.

WALTER F. BRAMHALL,  
Clerk, District of Columbia Court of  
General Sessions.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 469) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 469

Whereas in the cases of the United States of America against Ernestine Washington, et al. (criminal cases numbered U.S. 5379-65 and U.S. 5380-65), pending in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, Criminal Division, a summons was issued by the said court and addressed to Ralph R. Roberts, the Clerk of the House of Representatives directing that he appear as a witness before said court on the 13th day of July 1965, forthwith: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Ralph R. Robert, the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized to appear in response to said summons as a witness in the cases of the United States of America against Ernestine Washington, et al.; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the summons aforementioned.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**THE WILMINGTON MORNING NEWS, WILMINGTON, DEL., LOOKS AT THE WORLD IN TURMOIL**

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

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, last week the Wilmington Morning News, of Wilmington, Del., published four editorials under the title of "World in Turmoil."

The purpose, as its editors stated, was to "explain what we understand U.S. policy to be, why we believe it is impor-

tant that it go in the directions it is going, and to point out where we believe certain changes in emphasis may be in order. Every once in a while, it seems to us, a newspaper owes it to its readers and itself to pull back from the bustle of events and examine the intellectual foundation of its day-to-day opinions."

The editors of this leading newspaper came to these conclusions:

First, there should be even more emphasis on economic and social programs than there is now. The Organization of American States should have some standing organization, staffed with economists, political scientists, and the like, that could be mobilized on short notice for situations such as that which occurred in the Dominican Republic. The editors hastened to point out that this was not to say that the United States should not continue to maintain a strong and mobile military force in the hemisphere, but only that such a force will not solve most of the long-run problems the United States faces.

Second, the United States should remove itself as completely as possible from the business of bilateral aid dispensing.

Third, the United States should be firm, both in its support for democratic institutions and in defense of its interests throughout the developing world.

Fourth, the United States should be patient with the developing nations.

The Wilmington Morning News concluded that:

It is in this (developing) world, it seems to us, that the future of our civilization may well be determined. And, while every effort should be made to resist the temptation to be overdramatic about the urgency involved in meeting the demands of the people of these areas, it would be a tragic mistake to underestimate the challenge their awakening presents to the United States. We do not believe that special privilege is their just reward, but we do believe that deference and tolerance should characterize the U.S. attitude toward their aspirations.

I found these four editorials informative and rewarding reading, and very well thought out. I commend the editors of the Wilmington Morning News for presenting them, and I recommend them to my colleagues for their information and consideration. I include them here as part of my remarks:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News,  
July 5, 1965]

**WORLD IN TURMOIL—PART I**

On this, the 189th anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence by the Continental Congress, let us consider a few inflammatory lines from a very inflammatory document. We do so because we believe they are pertinent today, and because they effectively set the tone for this, the first in a series of editorials on U.S. foreign policy.

The lines: "Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that when ever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils

July 13, 1965

are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security."

The language, of course, dates these thoughts as those of Thomas Jefferson. But change a phrase or two and they are as fresh as today; the words could easily have just been uttered in a basement in Caracas, or rolled off a mimeograph machine in Saigon. One of the central facts of life in this year 1965 is that this message has spread to every corner of the globe, and men everywhere are convinced, or ready to be persuaded, that it is their right and duty to throw off a "long train of abuses and usurpations" and "to provide new guards for their future security."

Since the end of World War II, the world has literally been turned upside down politically. Institutions that stood for centuries have been wiped away in a moment; values that had been cherished for generations are now ridiculed to the cheers of millions.

For Americans, these 20 years have been particularly disquieting, and instead of welcoming what has been happening, the great majority of the citizenry of this land of Jeffersonian heritage has looked upon what has been transpiring with bewilderment and, in many cases, alarm. Why? We leave that to the sociologists and psychologists, though we suspect that the answer is somehow related to America's long history of isolation and its material prosperity. It is enough to say that for too many Americans the world has become a map on which nations are tinted in two colors, theirs and ours.

Such thinking is perhaps the more prevalent because of the success of the Soviet Union and its friends in exporting dialectic materialism. So adept have the Communists become at taking advantage of social upheaval and economic disruption to serve their own purposes that a large body of Americans can maintain the fervor that all that is happening is simply the execution of a plot by a clique of schemers seeking world domination.

U.S. foreign policy for the past 20 years has reflected this disquiet among Americans. With respect to the winds of change that have swept the world during that period, the questions for policymakers have been three: Does America oppose all revolution because it is being used as a tool by the Communists to further their aim of world domination? Does America tolerate revolution, but keep ever watchful for the real enemy—communism—and sacrifice revolution when there is a chance it might serve communism? Does America encourage revolution and identify with it, being convinced that to oppose it is a greater danger in the long run than communism ever will be?

At various times, U.S. policymakers have answered yes to each of these questions. That the results of those responses has been varied is apparent by the unsatisfactory position in which the United States finds itself today in some parts of the world. But in general, we believe it can be said that U.S. foreign policy has been most successful when it answered yes to the last question. We say this, acknowledging that in a conglomerate world there can never be only one solution for every international problem.

Nevertheless, to say this is to suggest that there should be a reexamination of many of the precepts of U.S. foreign policy that have become axiomatic in the past 20 years. This we intend to do in subsequent editorials on U.S. foreign policy in relation to the Communist world, to the developed world, and to the underdeveloped world.

Central to our thinking throughout this discussion is an optimism about the future of the United States, and a pride in the durability and flexibility of historic American values. We believe the world is a better place today than it was 20 years ago, a better place than it was 189 years ago. True, it still leaves a lot to be desired, but this is no cause for despair—it is rather, cause for rededication and initiative.

#### WORLD IN TURMOIL—PART II

Ask 100 Americans what is the principal threat to the United States in the world today, and, we suspect, 99 will say communism. But then ask what they mean by communism and the answers will be as different as the answers.

This may not have been true 20 years ago, when the Soviet Union was the fountainhead of Communist ideology and the acknowledged military master of Eurasia. But today communism is a bit of everything: Wars of liberation, the Russians, brainwashing, Titoism, Red China, commodity dumping.

States with collective political systems clearly continue to threaten the United States, but they no longer present a unified threat, because there is no longer a unified Communist world. The current difficulties between Russia and China are evidence enough of this.

And yet, it must be admitted that there is still a strong sympathy among Communist states for each other, a sympathy which could lead to their joining together in the event of some international showdown. But is it realistic to continue to conduct American foreign policy as if there were a unified threat, or as if a showdown is the most immediate threat? We do not believe it is, in the face of the evidence of the past 10 years, when the U.S. main problems have been a guerrilla war here and a coup there. But much U.S. policy continues to be built on the premise that the principal threat from the Communist world is a military one and, more particularly, a nuclear one.

The lesson of the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 was that this is no longer true, for the Soviet Union indicated quite clearly then that it was not willing to risk nuclear war to further its expansionist policies.

But what of China, the only other Communist country which will have nuclear armaments in the conceivable future? The answer is not clear. Mao Tse-tung has boasted of fighting a war with the West, losing 300 million people, and still winning, and there has been nothing from China to indicate that nuclear war is not in its plans. Yet this is not a wholly satisfactory answer from the U.S. point of view, for it is too indefinite. The United States is still left with the awful question: Is or isn't nuclear war with China a possibility? China will not provide the answer, because it is to her advantage to keep her intentions a secret and keep her opponents off balance.

We believe the United States should operate on the assumption that such a war is not inevitable: if it were, the Government would be guilty of the greatest negligence if it did not fight that war now, when its chances of winning are best. To say that it is not inevitable is not to abandon nuclear capability, and is not to face the future without trepidation. It is also, however, not to be without a sense of optimism for the future, and an optimism with some basis in experience. Red China is a developing society, and the more developed a society, the more unthinkable nuclear war appears.

But if the threat from communism in the future is neither a unified one nor a nuclear one, what is it? To quote George Kennan: "The ideological contest, as the Communists see it, is not only an intellectual competition but a political competition. It is a political

competition that involves not only the minds of men, but also, their fears—a competition that does not entirely respect what is in men's minds because it does not fully recognize the organized expression of popular will."

In such competition, anything goes: Wars of liberation, terror, subversion, propaganda; the real opponent is never directly involved. He depends, instead, on others to be on the platform or in the jungle, while he supplies the financial and moral support. And, because the opponent never shows himself publicly, there is the ever-present danger of seeing him where he isn't or not seeing him where he is.

Compounding the problem is the fact that this competition is taking place in a world that is already undergoing social revolution. Was the revolution in Santo Domingo a Communist affair, or was it a legitimate protest? And if it was legitimate was it in danger of being taken over by Communists or was it not? The answers to these questions are not certain 2 months after the event, yet they have great implication for U.S. policy.

Perhaps the United States can afford to act as it did in one Santo Domingo, but what is to be done when the revolution is in a country less accessible to U.S. power, or when three or four such events occur at once? Policy should be prepared for this eventuality, and it is clear that neither the older regional organizations of the world, like the Organization of American States, nor the newer treaty organizations developed by the late Mr. Dulles are adequate to do the job. They have not worked in southeast Asia, the Middle East, or Latin America.

Because these organizations are geared to combat a threat that exists now in vastly altered form, they lack flexibility and are not particularly susceptible to reorganization. And yet the United States, as powerful as it is, cannot win this competition alone.

What then? Consideration might be given to the gradual abandonment of these organizations, and their replacement with new groupings which would have economic and social reform as their primary focus. These new organizations could also be anchored by some other power than the United States. Serious study might also be given to the United Nations international police force suggested by several European countries and endorsed by President Johnson.

The steps in this direction should be studied and accompanied by political and economic policies that recognize and encourage individuality among Communist states. To continue to think of communism in the terms of a monolithic world conspiracy promises the United States no benefits and possibly great harm.

#### WORLD IN TURMOIL—PART III

The United States is fond of looking east across the Atlantic and rubbing its hands in satisfaction at the fine job it has done in Western Europe. The Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, two of the greatest creations of American foreign policy, helped Europe out of economic chaos and pulled her away from the political brink so effectively that she is now a strong rival for her old benefactor.

A consequence of this pride has been the development in the United States of a maternal attitude toward Western Europe, with all the attendant emotionalism. When General de Gaulle questions U.S. policy in Vietnam, or Harold Wilson offers alternatives to American nuclear policy, the reaction in this country is much like that of the mother who discovers her child can think for himself and that thinking for himself includes questioning mother: It had to come, but it isn't really welcome.

But Europe has grown tall now and, as unpleasant as it may be, America must face

libraries. Two weekly radio series, discussing books and our libraries, are broadcast in Johnstown, and tape recordings are carried by four other Cambria County stations.

A weekly column appears in the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat, publicizing new books and the library's program.

Collections of books have been placed in four hospitals, three rest homes, and Johnstown's Senior Activities Center.

Book collections are sent to 15 schools having no libraries.

A home delivery service for shut-ins is provided.

All new books are ordered, cataloged and processed for the Cambria County libraries by the Barnesboro and Johnstown units.

A course in reference work and materials was given to all librarians. Heads of new libraries are trained in procedures and techniques.

Book review sources and book selection aids are provided for each library in Cambria County.

A teletype service has been provided at the main library, linking the system to many of the great libraries of the Nation.

A photo-copying service is provided at the main library.

A study is underway of means by which more persons can be reached by all libraries. Copies of a library brochure have been sent to all homes in the two counties.

A half-hour film has been made, depicting the Cambria County libraries, bookmobiles, and the entire program. This film is available for lending to any interested organization.

Cambria and Somerset Counties are fortunate in having this vigorous library program. Many more county governments should support their public libraries, for this support in most cases provides the chief means by which residents of villages and rural areas may have access to books. The responsibility for providing public library service must be accepted by county commissioners all over the country.

City public libraries now have two major responsibilities and challenges. The first is to reach the city's own adults and children who are not now using libraries. The second is to carry to surrounding towns and countryside the advantages of city library collections, staffs, and techniques.

*John J. Duncan*  
 Our Purpose in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
 OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include therein extraneous matter has been previously granted.

We have been reading and hearing a great deal of those who are spreading doubt, confusion, and distrust over the aims and purposes of the United States in Vietnam.

One of the best articles I have read on this subject was written by Don Whitehead, and appeared recently in the Knoxville News-Sentinel, Knoxville, Tenn.

I believe this is a very excellent presentation, and I am pleased to insert this article in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues:

DON WHITEHEAD REPORTS ON OUR PURPOSE  
 IN VIETNAM

From the most surprising of all sources, there is arising across the country a miasmic mist of isolationism which is spreading the germs of doubt and confusion over the honorable aims of the United States in Vietnam.

The fog is rising from many college and university campuses where intellectual groups—a minority but nevertheless a vocal one—profess to shudder at our naked sword challenge to Communist expansion and aggression in Asia.

Twenty-five years ago many of these same people were crying for U.S. intervention against nazism and fascism when it seemed that the legions of Hitler and Mussolini might engulf a great part of the world. They were internationalists and wore the badge proudly. They scorned the isolationists of the day who cried out against any involvement in Europe.

They were all for freedom for all nations in those days. Freedom from aggressors. Freedom from the Gestapo. Freedom from dictators pushing people around, slaughtering millions in gas chambers, and brutalizing those who opposed them.

Now they would have us beat a retreat from Vietnam. They deplore any escalation of the fighting in that war-torn little country and make it sound as though the United States were responsible for the stepped-up fighting. They ignore the fact that the Communists escalated the war. They will not or cannot see that Vietnam is only a single battle in a worldwide war against aggressive communism.

They shed no tears for Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Cuba, North Vietnam, and China whose people had no voice in choosing their government and are ruled by brute force.

They cry not for the freedoms lost by these millions. They carry no placards calling for the Russians to pull back their tanks and divisions behind their own borders. They stage no sitdowns protesting the Communists' grabs for power. They pass no resolutions denouncing the North Vietnam attacks on South Vietnam or Cuba's efforts to subvert governments in Central and South America.

They stage rallies and cry out against President Lyndon B. Johnson because he has stood firm in North Vietnam and balked, at least temporarily, a Communist takeover in Santo Domingo. They refuse to place the blame where it belongs—on the Communists who deliberately follow a policy of communizing the world by force, subversion, threat or whatever means proves most effective.

Now that nazism and fascism have been conquered as a world threat, these onetime internationalists would have us pull back into our shell as though communism was nothing more than a matter for academic debate. Their attitude presumes that Communists are men of reason speaking the same language we speak. And they know better.

These professors who are so vocal against the administration policy of meeting force with force should be teaching their students that a Communist dictatorship is as vicious as the Hitler-Mussolini variety. They should be teaching that communism threatens the freedoms of discussion, protest, inquiry, self-expression, and all that is held dear in the academic world. These freedoms die when communism takes over—and the intellectuals are the first to feel the iron fist.

There is a simple way to end the hot war in Vietnam and the tensions of the cold war. That is for the Communists to give up their fight to impose communism on the world by force and subversion.

Until that day arrives, we have only two choices: Surrender or fight back. And I applaud President Johnson for fighting back.

Twelve-Mile Coastal Limit Is Excellent  
 Beginning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
 OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of July 11, 1965:

TWELVE-MILE COASTAL LIMIT IS EXCELLENT  
 BEGINNING

A bill proposing protection of U.S. fishing rights for a distance of 12 miles from our shores certainly is a recognition of a grave problem.

It merits the approval of Congress. However, at the same time, Congress should recognize that the proposed law touches only the surface of a much larger problem.

The United States, and 10 other nations, presently recognizes a 3-mile territorial limit. It is a general rule of thumb for national defense, established in 1703 on the basis that 3 miles was the effective range of a cannon, and therefore the distance a nation could reasonably be expected to defend.

From the standpoint of security today, 3 miles is a laughable range for larger guns or missiles. The problem, however, includes a scope much larger than national defense.

Most nations in the world claim territorial limits up to 10 miles. Cutting across these is a confused plethora of disputes, national edicts and treaties.

Most South American nations on the Pacific seaboard, for example, claim fishing sovereignty within 200 miles, which closes a valuable area to U.S. fishermen.

In May of 1964, Canada gave notice it would enforce a 12-mile fishing limit, which gave rise to frictions and problems in the northeast, northwest United States, and Alaskan areas.

Japan and the United States have agreements on salmon and other fishing in Alaska. Additionally, the United States and Russia agreed to Alaskan fishing jurisdictions in six areas last year.

Further complications arose on June 10, 1964, when Russia, the United States, and 20 other nations agreed to sovereign rights to a depth of 200 meters along continental shelves—about 20 to 25 miles. Japan refused to recognize the agreement, which includes most natural resources, not only fish.

Fishing rights are only one of the problems. Of equal or greater importance are questions of natural resource development and national security.

The Continental Shelf of the United States is an extension of the mainland, believed equally rich in oil, gold, metals, and other precious resources. It is an undeveloped frontier that could be exploited with more emphasis on the current acceleration of oceanographic research.

Other nations show recognition of these facts. Last year more than 6,000 Russian and Japanese boats were sighted near the U.S. shores. Sophisticated electronic equipment on many of the vessels indicated they were interested in intelligence work and charting of natural resources as well as fishing.

The United States, it is true, is showing a greater interest in oceanography. This must be coupled with a realistic recognition that the valuable resources on the Continental Shelf also must be protected from poaching.

July 13, 1965

A3716

The protection of a fishing limit for 12 miles is an excellent beginning. It also is vitally important however, for the United States to begin efforts to protect all of its vital interests off our shores.

### Hope for Cities

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the applause can still be heard from the 140 million Americans who work and live in urban areas. They are applauding the action of the House in passing the bill authorizing the new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

There are many problems facing the urban centers of this country which need the top-level representation they will receive when the Department of Housing and Urban Development becomes law.

The Eugene Register-Guard, a fine newspaper in my district, pointed out the need for such a Department in an editorial on June 18, 1965:

America's most crucial domestic problem is no longer the farm economy but the problem of city living. Our Nation is bulldozing 1 million acres a year into the urban sprawl. The Nation just has to give increased attention to cities.

I support this editorial when it states that more attention must be given to urban areas. I hope the Senate will join with us in the House in supporting President Johnson's proposal to create a Department of Housing and Urban Development, which will assist urban areas in getting the attention they need in the form of a Cabinet-level representation.

With consent, I place the editorial in the RECORD:

#### HOPE FOR CITIES

Municipal leaders, plagued with problems of urban growth, appear at last to be assured of Cabinet-level representation in the Federal Government.

The House has passed a bill authorizing a new Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Senate is expected to add its approval and President Johnson will thus sign into law another measure which Congress refused to serve up to the late President Kennedy.

Mayor Henry Maier, of Milwaukee, Wis., president of the American Municipal Association, reminded Oregon of some of the problems facing American cities when he addressed the League of Oregon Cities in Portland last November.

Calling the central city the "dustbowl of the Sixties," Mr. Maier argued that America's most crucial domestic problem is no longer the farm economy but the problem of city living. Our Nation is bulldozing 1 million acres a year into the urban sprawl. Yet cities receive only one-thirteenth as much Federal aid as the Nation's farmers.

"In the final analysis," Mr. Maier said, "the problems can only be solved through reallocation of national resources. The Nation just has to give increased attention to cities."

The measure will combine existing activities of the Federal Housing Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Federal National Mortgage Administration under an 11th Cabinet member. From the municipal standpoint, the move will also provide American cities with the kind of representation Mr. Maier talks about in the highest council of the Federal Government.

### A Cheer for American Imperialism

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article that appeared in the Sunday, July 11, New York Times magazine, "A Cheer for American Imperialism." The article, by Henry Fairlie, political writer for the Spectator and the Daily Telegraph of London, presents one Englishman's view of the way the United States meets its world responsibilities. It is an unusual exposition and suggests that perhaps semantics may be troubling us more than substance as we view America's role in the world today.

The first part of the article follows:

#### A CHEER FOR AMERICAN IMPERIALISM (By Henry Fairlie)

Is America an empire? It is a question which no American cares to ask himself and, if you ask it of him, he returns a hasty negative. "Imperialism is not in our blood. You are still thinking in terms of the British Empire." I have got used, by now, to the answers. But it seems to me a question which needs not only to be asked but to be answered with some frank regard for the facts. To an outsider, the fact that America is an empire is the most obvious fact of all.

The idea of empire, I realize, fits uncomfortably into the severe and sparse conception which the Americans have of their destiny. Their Nation began its life in rebellion against a colonial power, and consequently the mere suggestion that they may themselves be an empire is taken immediately as an accusation. "It is that word. It is just that word," says one American with whom I have discussed the question over and over again. Call it, then, by another name—though none is so short and convenient—but the fact will remain.

"I am a Berliner," President Kennedy proclaimed, in perhaps the most far-reaching words he ever used, and, if they meant anything at all, they implied a shared citizenship of what—if not an empire? "I am a Berliner" has no meaning if all he was talking about was a treaty obligation to defend West Berlin. But that, precisely, was what he was not saying. To say "I am a Berliner" is exactly the same as to say *civis Romanus sum* and *civis Britannicus sum*. Common to all three is the idea, not simply of protection, but of protection arising from common citizenship of an empire.

But I should begin by enumerating what seem to me the facts of empire, as distinct from the plainer facts of America's power.

1. International police, or "peacekeeping," operations are in themselves the most obvious obligation of empire; and no serious person that I know (whatever his view of the specific actions in Vietnam and the Domini-

can Republic) denies that America must, from time to time, engage in such operations. To employ force abroad without the declaration of war is, in fact, the first attribute of empire.

2. More specifically, to endow American forces with a combat role—a phrase which could have been rendered so simply in Latin, and would have been understood by any emperor, or, for that matter, any legionary—is to endow them with the same responsibility as once belonged to the Roman and the British soldiers on the frontiers of empire. That American soldiers in farflung provinces of the world should have a combat role seems peculiar only if one does not acknowledge the fact, and so the duties, of empire.

3. When military police actions lead directly to a local and political engagement in these farflung territories, empire exists. As one American commentator wrote recently of the Dominican situation, "Despite Washington's carefully orchestrated campaign to cloak the political negotiations in the trappings of the Organization of American States, they remain very much a U.S.-managed operation." Exactly, and that is empire.

4. "Until the international community is ready to rescue the victims of clandestine aggression," Adlai Stevenson said the other day, "national power will have to fill the vacuum. It is the most costly, the most dangerous, and the least desirable kind of peacekeeping." May be. But, meanwhile, this stark admission that, in the absence of any other world order, national power must fill the role is as clear an acceptance of imperial responsibility as one could wish for.

5. Empire means that the need for it is accepted in the provinces perhaps even more readily than at the center; and, freed from the necessity to mince his words, Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, ironically one of the leaders of India's struggle for independence, wrote recently to the New York Times: "There is not the slightest doubt that if America withdraws and leaves southeast Asia to itself, Communist China will advance and seize the continent \* \* \* and the empire of China under Mao and his successors will be firmly established." To resist this empire, he looks to the protection of another.

6. Near Phoenix, Ariz., 500 Luftwaffe pilot officers are now being trained by the U.S. Air Force for tactical command duty, including the delivery of nuclear missiles. Some of them have already passed the course, with appropriate graduation ceremonies, and been awarded the freedom of Arizona. In much the same way, the Roman legions were recruited from native populations, the legionaries themselves becoming privileged citizens; and Sandhurst turned out superb native officers for service in the empire. Symbolically as well as actually, the Luftwaffe officers are, however ironically, the representatives of empire.

7. Above all, there is the achievement of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. He has created, during his years in office, an American force which can be disposed around the world with a minimum of difficulty and domestic disturbance. To an outsider, this force seems to have the inspiration as well as the practical attributes of empire; its mission, certainly, is the peace and security of an empire. But, perhaps even more significant, this is the achievement of Mr. McNamara which has been least questioned, which has been almost tacitly accepted by the American people—as if they understood their unending and inescapable imperial role.

So one could go on. Even the American critics of America's present policy use the language of empire. Whatever may be said for or against the idea that there are distinct spheres of influence properly "belonging" to one or other of the great powers, it is an im-

known. I wanted to share his comments with my colleagues.

**Mr. Ralph Wheeler's Idea of a Good Politician:**

This isn't advice, but my idea of a good politician.

Stick to your party and its principles.

Win on your own merit.

Think twice before downing your opponent's idea, for it might be better than yours.

The unspoken word is sometimes a person's greatest asset.

Kiss the babies. Admire the ladies, and shake hands with the men.

God help you for he is the only One who can.

*Fe On Derwinski*  
**Appeasing the Reds**

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President is under increasing pressure from the organized left and many innocent Americans who have been caught in its web of propaganda aimed at our policy in Vietnam. An article by columnist William S. White, which appeared in the Saturday, July 3 edition of the Chicago Daily News, is especially appropriate in its emphasis on the dangers of appeasing the Reds, a subject that should be thoughtfully studied:

#### APPEASING THE REDS

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The big push is now on to compel the United States to submit to Communist blackmail in Vietnam in the name of a peace that would be a Munich of the sixties—a surrender to the veiled blade of Communist aggression as Munich was to the naked blade of Hitler.

Voices in the Senate are joined by many European voices in demands that this country deal with and thus legitimize the Vietcong insurgents in South Vietnam who are, in plainer words, the spearheads of a Communist invasion directed from Red China by way of North Vietnam.

All the forces of international and unintentional pacifism are gathering in supreme effort. The sum of their case is that the United States must be more reasonable toward those who break the world's peace by open military assault upon South Vietnam.

The nation that now all but alone carries the burden to resist the new Communist imperialism finds itself attacked far more virulently, at home and in Europe, than are those who carry forward this cynical pattern of conquest.

A U.S. Senator, FRANK CHURCH of Idaho, joins the clamor for what, however fuzzed over, would amount to recognition of the Vietcong as though this marauding bandit-Communist group had a legitimate place at any peace table. He is saluted by other Democratic soft-liners in the Senate and is echoed by a former British foreign minister still very close to the British Labor Government, Patrick Gordon Walker.

The United States is prepared to allow the Vietcong to sit at any honest peace table, but not to grant them status as bargaining agents. Even in this we go dangerously far. The day we permit them real participation would be the day we set the seal of consent upon the concealed-blade technique of Communist aggression.

Yes, the push is on. And those prepared to take up their adult responsibilities in a tough world must face it that their only reward is likely to be the consciousness of duty done. For the other side has all the appealing words—"peace" and all that. And the hammering grows harder and harder from domestic politicians and foreign politicians—and much of the European press—who simply want out of Vietnam and out from under our solemn obligations there.

One can see this pounding in the outcries at President Johnson for committing two dreadful crimes at the recent anniversary meeting of the United Nations. One crime was to withhold an immediate promise to pick up even more of the tab for running the U.N. so that the Russians and others could continue to refuse to pay even a small share. The other crime was the President's tactless determination not to cut and run in Vietnam and his even more tactless act of identifying the aggressor out loud.

It is a strange world. Those who do their hard duty are denounced for it and those who wish to cut and run are the "reasonable" men.

#### Excise Tax Reduction

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. CHARLES A. VANIK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the past weeks since the excise tax reduction has taken effect, I have been attempting to call to the attention of the American consumers and retailers the problems that have arisen in passing the reduction on to the consumer.

In this continuing effort, I wish to insert an article from the Fairchild News Service publication, Home Furnishing Daily, which outlines some of the problem areas in connection with the excise tax reduction.

Popular demand is the only course to the benefits of the tax cut. While many of us can campaign for "truth in prices," all of our efforts have little meaning if the public is apathetic about the absorption of this tax.

I again suggest that retailers take advantage publicly of this excise tax reduction by making clear statements in all of their advertising about lower prices on an item-by-item basis, as a result of the excise tax reduction. Any retailer would be wise to take advantage of this splendid opportunity to show the consumer of his desire to be fair and not subject the consumer to the mercy of the marketplace.

#### The Fairchild article follows:

#### TAX REPEAL SPURS PRICE CRAZY QUILT, PUBLIC IS APATHETIC

Repeal of Federal excise taxes has brought—

Consumer apathy.

Some retail willingness to cut prices below levels provided by the tax repeal.

A sharp attack on those producers who have not reduced their prices.

A crazy mixed up condition in the electric housewares field where some manufacturers have been laggard on posting new prices.

Since repeal went into effect Tuesday, a cross-the-Nation spot survey by Fairchild News Service indicates:

Major appliances made modest gains, with more substantial increases expected. Air conditioners in several cities were still sluggish because of continued cool weather, although New York reported gains.

Electric housewares remained about steady, with gains of a more modest nature than major appliances expected in the future.

Home entertainment products remained stable, with gains predicted.

In the New York area, customers aren't stampeding to their favorite store to buy any of the products with newly lowered prices.

Sales in all categories remained fairly steady, and retailers failed to note any definite gains that could be attributed to the tax removal.

Bigger ticket items picked up modestly, and air conditioner sales have been brisk the past 2 days, although retailers credited hot humid weather rather than the tax elimination.

As several dealers commented, "we would have sold air conditioners during this period even if prices had gone up 6 percent, instead of coming down. When it gets this hot those who want one are not going to sweat out the weather just to save a couple of bucks."

Home entertainment volume remained steady.

In Cleveland fair improvement in sales of major appliances was noted by department and specialty stores as a result of the excise tax action.

No great amount of increased business was noted, however, on sales of television and electric housewares which had been holding up well. The weather apparently was continuing to put a damper on any real activity on air conditioners.

Major appliances, however, have been in the doldrums for the past 2 or 3 weeks, with many buyers and retailers indicating they believed this stemmed from the tax repeal talk.

In St. Louis, retailers believe the potential lift to sales following removal of excise taxes is substantial, but they emphasize that it is much too early to attempt measuring the results.

There has been no mad rush to buy, although heavy rainfall Tuesday and Wednesday and the likelihood of scattered showers through the remainder of the week were blamed with holding down store traffic.

In Atlanta, while there has been little consumer reaction to price reductions in hard goods, retailers are optimistic the tax repeal will give lagging sales a needed shot in the arm.

All retailers agreed it is too early to determine what long range affect the repeal will have on the appliance-television business, although they expect it to pick up within the next several days and accelerate into coming weeks.

Air conditioning business has been miserably cool this season, but cool weather and not price is blamed.

In Charlotte, N.C., retailers are not in accord on consumer reaction to the excise tax repeal, although all report there was more reaction to prospects of the action 2 weeks ago.

Some say the situation has made no noticeable difference in business, that this is a quiet season when attention is focused on vacations and not housewares purchases, and that the tax repeal will be a boon to future business.

Others, however, say the repeal has had some effect, and will further spark customer buying in the future.

Electric housewares ads tied to the tax have been almost nil as dealers await guidance from manufacturers.

In Los Angeles, excise tax repeals had little or no positive effect on hard goods sales this week, retailers said.

"The public still is confused," observed one key chain official. "Many customers still

think they are entitled to 10 percent reductions."

Most retailers had reduced prices on many major appliances and home entertainment equipment in advance of a date the tax repeals were made law. These price cuts in most cases were based on early excise tax figures circulated by suppliers.

Distributors and retailers reported new-price posting by electric housewares manufacturers has lagged, compared with major appliance and TV producers, but that new portable appliance prices steadily were being received this week.

White Stores, Inc., in its anniversary sale ad continues to list some price comparisons, but most stores are content to talk savings generally rather than price specifics. White's anniversary sale ad lists a Catalina brand 15-cubic-foot "no-frost-refrigerator-freezer at a regular price of \$349.95, with a tax reduction of \$10 and a "new sell price" of \$339.95. A trade-in offer in the ad, however, brought the price down by a total of \$51.07 to a low of \$288.88.

Some of the stores mention savings on last-year models in the air-conditioning line. Others push annual summer sales and special purchases throughout appliances and electric lines.

Sales have yet to react too strongly to the tax repeal. "It hasn't come yet but we think it will" is the opinion of many dealers.

In Cincinnati, major appliance business has soared since the tax lift and home entertainment sales have shown moderate gains, but local retailers are thanking the weatherman, not the Government.

The hottest day of the year (92) hit Tuesday, bringing a sudden and long-awaited consumer rush on air conditioners, fans and refrigerators, dealers reported.

The upsurge has brought with it retailer optimism that customers looking for relief for what appears to be a sustained heat spell, will take advantage of the tax cut while they're at it by making other purchases in both white and brown goods.

At this point, retail prices are reflecting a greater reduction than provided for by the tax cut. Most dealers are basing new prices on a new cost to them plus 10 percent markup.

In Dallas it's almost like a game of "button, button, who's got the tax cut" as the trade advertises excise tax repeal, seasonal reductions, and special purchase buys in housewares, home entertainment and appliances.

One store reported a number of extremely irate customers who were expecting a full 10-percent reduction at retail. This store has been in sale events for the past several days, but the picture has been confused by consumer expectations for wide-scale 10-percent cuts. "Our prices have been adjusted to reflect the tax cut," this dealer said.

Several stores are going the complete limit, dealers reported, with reductions in home entertainment lines slashed drastically. One retailer told of a \$100 price cut on an upper end stereo that had only a \$56 tax repeal.

Housewares prices dipped somewhere from 5 to 7 percent on the small electrics.

Price promotions in appliances, for the most part, were confined to statements such as "passing on the tax cut savings" \* \* \* "reduced more than excise cut" \* \* \* "Federal tax repealed—buy now and save."

In Washington, the excise tax repeal did not produce an initial customer rush to the stores. Some merchants said activity during the first few days following the tax cut showed some improvement but they do not feel it resulted from the excise repeal.

"It's too early to tell," said one buyer, who added that business has shown no change since the Tuesday effective date. Another said traffic has improved but attributes it more to the hot weather which has stimulated air conditioner business.

One retailer pointed out that several stores advertised reduced prices prior to the effective date to stall off a consumer buying cutback. "We haven't noticed any increase in business since Tuesday, but we reduced prices early," said one.

In San Francisco, there has been little variation in sales volume since the repeal went into effect.

Most retailers were too involved in their own confusing situations to give more than token recognition to sales.

"I'm in no position to answer," one department store buyer said; "I'm up to my neck in it." The buyer said his store's policy was to pass savings on fully to the customer. "In many cases we're giving more," he said. "We're giving too much and the prices were not established by us. He said a legitimate \$27 retail adjustment was coming out to \$40.

"This was another golden opportunity for us to stabilize our profit structure," he said.

### California Develops Farm Labor Surplus With Active Recruiting of Domestic Workers

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most encouraging article from the June 27, 1965, edition of the Los Angeles Times, which tells the remarkable success story achieved by the American economy this year in finding work for many thousands of U.S. citizens in the fields and on the farms of the West.

The article, written by the Times' labor editor, Harry Bernstein, is primarily concerned with the highly successful transition California's agricultural industry has been able to make from its former major reliance on a foreign labor supply, to an almost complete use of domestic workers this year.

But it also illustrates the outstanding capacity of American agriculture generally to shake off its past unhealthy dependence on imported foreign labor, and by improving wages and working conditions, to attract a sufficient number of skilled, dependable U.S. fieldhands to meet critical harvesttime labor need.

The Times' article follows:

SURPLUS LOOMS IN FARM LABOR, TIEBURG PREDICTS

(By Harry Bernstein)

California will have a surplus of farm labor for the rest of the summer, State Employment Director Albert Tieburg predicted Saturday.

In an assessment of the State's multi-billion-dollar farm industry, Tieburg told the Times:

"It now looks as though we will have a surplus of workers through the summer months. The State's needs will sharply increase by the early part of September, but it is possible we may be able to get through even that crisis period without foreign workers."

And Washington officials are now convinced that by next year there will be no need for any foreign workers.

#### TOMATOES POSSIBLE

Last year at this time there were 34,000 foreign workers in California. And by September 15 of last year there were 63,900.

Tieburg said his estimates are preliminary, and that he hopes to have more precise estimates of labor needs by July 15.

The crop most likely to need foreign workers, he said, will be canning tomatoes.

"But it is possible that the tomato harvest needs could be met if some drastic changes are made to make the jobs more attractive.

"The tomatoes now are loaded in 50-pound boxes. This pretty much eliminates husband-wife teams and women workers. If the box sizes could be cut and rates on a piece-rate basis raised substantially, field sanitation increased and other benefits provided, the labor needs might be met."

But tomato harvesting, he noted, is an especially difficult job, compared with tree crops, and it will not be easy to attract enough workers especially because the peak labor need in the State comes just as young workers are starting to return to school.

Nevertheless, Tieburg said, the State may be faced with the paradox of having a surplus of farmworkers even in the fall, and still face a shortage of workers in the tomato harvest.

While the final estimates are not yet available, it is known that the tomato harvesting machine is in part responsible for estimates that relatively few foreign workers, if any, will be needed for the early fall.

The huge machines, which can pick 100 tons of tomatoes a day, each replace about 40 workers or more.

Last year there were less than 100 such machines in operation in the State.

This year, according to Robert Holt, president of the Tomato Harvesting Association, the number is 262, "and by next year it should be over 500 machines."

#### CUT IN NUMBER

This means the number of workers needed this season will be cut by over 6,000 from last year because of the machines. And by next year, the machines will be able to replace another 10,000.

Also, the growers last year had planted 143,000 acres of tomatoes. This year the number has been cut to 110,000.

Holt said he originally recommended the acreage cut because of a heavy carryover of canned tomatoes from last year.

In other words, the original suggestions to growers that they reduce their acreage of tomato plantings by 23 percent this year was based on an oversupply of canned tomatoes, not on an anticipated labor shortage.

But Holt said the canning companies moved their carryover from last year much faster than expected, and so the acreage cutback ended up being due in part to the expectation of labor shortages.

Workers are still pouring into California at an unprecedented rate, but Tieburg said the rate is decreasing rapidly and will be down sharply "as the word spreads that we have no urgent farm labor needs."

Department of Agriculture inspection stations along California's borders estimated that about 100 cars a day are coming into the State with farm workers, compared with about 25 a day at this time last year.

#### COUNT DROPS

Holt said the tomato growers are not nearly as optimistic as Tieburg, who said he is "hopeful" but not confident that the tomato growers will be able to get by with only a few foreign workers, if any.

Tieburg pointed out that the number of domestic farm workers in the State drops rapidly from early September to the middle of October each year, and begins to drop even earlier because of a return to school.

The aim this year, Tieburg said, is to keep in farm labor jobs the thousands of workers who normally leave the farms just as the