

June 27, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 8103

REPORT ON BRAZIL

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

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to read and study the report on Brazil filed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] on Wednesday, June 21.

The substance of the Goodell report is provocative and timely. Its theme is the interrelationship between foreign assistance and resolution of the looming world food crisis. This problem is one in which I have had an increasing interest in recent years, which has intensified in the 6 months I have served in the Congress.

Our colleague has characterized this problem as the "greatest challenge to mankind in this century." His evidence is persuasive. Moreover, his conclusion is supported by seemingly unanimous consensus among the leading agronomists, economists, and demographers in the world. These same experts tell us that the problem is immediate. We, of course, know that but for the massive shipments of food we are making to India, famine would be rampant in the subcontinent. The Paddock brothers in their recent book, "Famine, 1975," which some reviewers find unduly alarming, predict widespread starvation just 8 years hence. The report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, released on June 17, categorically warns that we must reverse the Malthusian principle by 1985 to avoid the irreversible onset of this catastrophe.

In a world as large and complex as this in which we live, there seems little alternative to heeding the advice of the technologists, especially when their predictions have a hard scientific base, and mounting physical evidence supports their conclusions. However, a problem as complex as the world food supply is difficult to accept emotionally in an affluent society conditioned to agricultural surpluses which cost the taxpayer billions of dollars each year. Obviously, an urgent educational task lies before us to make the Nation aware of the problem we face together.

The Goodell report is a major first step to this end. Its scholarly analysis of the role of education and agriculture assistance programs in developing the productive potential of Brazil can serve as a basis for greater efficiency in the foreign assistance program. The report itself is a model for the constructive contribution each of us can make to the fund of knowledge so vital to proper exercise of the legislative function. It is perhaps the most comprehensive study of foreign assistance ever contributed by a single Member of the House.

I thank the gentleman for the fund of information he has given us and urge my colleagues to make the best possible use of his report in seeking an answer to the food problem which threatens mankind.

CREATION OF GOVERNMENT PROGRAM EVALUATION COMMISSION

(Mr. BUSH (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House a bill to evaluate all existing Federal spending programs in order to set priorities on those essential to the national interest.

The bill would create a 12-member, bipartisan Government Program Evaluation Commission charged with studying Government programs and activities and then reporting to the President and the Congress.

The Commission would report by February 1, 1969, on three main areas: First, the effectiveness of each program in comparison to its cost; second, at what level the program should be continued, if at all; and third, the relative priority the program should receive when the time comes around to allocating funds for the next budget.

With this report, we in the Congress can review the information and determine the merits of Federal spending programs, weed out the ineffective and the nonessential, and most important of all, make a congressional decision on what priorities should be set on those deemed essential.

There is a limit to the size and number of Federal programs which the economy can support without an ever-increasing public debt and spiraling inflation.

With this Commission we could measure our real needs against what we know we can afford.

The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], originated and introduced identical legislation. I am proud to join him and other Members in fighting for this important legislation.

THREE-DAY WEEKEND LEGISLATION

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which will reschedule the observance of four national holidays so that they will all fall on Mondays. These holidays are Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Veterans' Day, and Independence Day.

These 3-day weekends will allow more families to gather together to observe these holidays than is the case at present with so many of them coming in the middle of the week. They will also decrease the disruptions and absenteeism which these midweek holidays cause in business and manufacturing plants.

Most significant, Mr. Speaker, is the tremendous national support which this legislation has. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce revealed recently that 85 percent of its members favor 3-day weekends. Over 200,000 people replied to a This Week magazine poll on the question, over 90 percent of them favorably.

In the light of the important benefits which all will derive from this legislation, and the overwhelming support which it has received throughout the Nation, I

hope my colleagues will join me in urging its passage.

ABM
WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as is generally known by those who have been following the controversial issue of the deployment of antiballistic missile systems, our Government has been hoping that talks with the Soviets would bring about an agreement wherein both countries would agree not to develop ABM systems on a large scale basis. As is also generally known, the Soviets have already deployed systems around Moscow and to a smaller extent around Leningrad, while our Defense Department has fought with the Chiefs of Staff and Congress for a number of years as to why such an expensive project should not be undertaken. The hope that the Soviets would stop expanding their facilities was one of the arguments advanced by Defense.

According to the Washington Post, of June 27, 1967, the Soviets have rejected talks on the issue of the ABM facilities. White House Press Secretary George Christian, according to the Post article, has confirmed that the ABM issue did come up between President Johnson and Premier Kosygin and that Kosygin's position was generally similar to his reply to the press on television on last Sunday night. It will be remembered that Kosygin's reply on television discounted the ABM systems as weapons of aggression and "what should be considered is the entire complex of armament-disarmament questions."

Now that the Soviets have dodged the question of talks on the ABM systems, it is high time we go ahead with the development of these systems as a precautionary measure of national security. As I have stated in the past, I hope the American people follow this issue closely and make it an urgent matter for consideration in the 1968 presidential campaign.

I include the editorial, "The Antimissile Gap," from the Chicago Tribune of June 27, 1967, in the RECORD at this point:

THE ANTIMISSILE GAP

In an article in Reporter magazine, Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times, discusses in alarming terms our failure to develop a defensive antimissile system.

Under the "cost-effective" programs of Secretary McNamara, Mr. Baldwin says, our production of intercontinental ballistic missiles has come nearly to a stop, while Russia is turning out more and more. And as Russia closes the gap in offensive missiles, she is also moving ahead in defensive systems.

According to Mr. Baldwin, the Russians have deployed an anti-ballistic missile system around Moscow and to a lesser extent around Leningrad. In the rest of the country they have installed the so-called Tallinn dual system of anti-missile missiles, one with a long range to intercept missiles, outside the atmosphere and another high-speed, short-range back-up missile to intercept within the atmosphere.

"There is no doubt," Mr. Baldwin says, "that the communist powers have made

great gains relative to the United States in strategic weapons, nuclear delivery, and nuclear-defense capabilities in the past three to five years."

The question, as Mr. Baldwin sees it, is how long the Johnson administration can go on talking of friendship with Russia and of the desirability of a nuclear "balance," and delaying the development of an adequate defense system of our own, without jeopardizing our safety. Our slow-down in production has not been matched by Russia. Moratoriums on bomb tests have been violated by Russia.

Yet there are many influential men in and out of the administration who continue to denounce the generals for demanding faster action, and who regard unilateral disarmament as a worthy goal. Prominent among them are Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, former science adviser to three administrations, and Roswell L. Gilpatric, former undersecretary of defense, who headed a Presidential committee that in 1965 urged a halt in the production of anti-missile missiles. To maintain a defense system superior to Russia's, they said, would "destabilize . . . the balance of terror."

As Mr. Baldwin says, we had better listen quickly to the advice of others like Commissioner James T. Ramey of the Atomic Energy commission, Dr. Edward Teller of the University of California, and Dr. Harold M. Agnew of the AEC's laboratory at Los Alamos, N.M., who are urging that we recapture the initiative. If we don't it may be too late.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES IN OEO

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of my investigation into the political activities of the OEO as have occurred in Durham, N.C., by Operation Breakthrough, my office has been swamped with letters, newspaper clippings, and other articles giving accounts of OEO activities in other parts of North Carolina. As I have previously stated, the political activity, as practiced by Operation Breakthrough, could set a national precedent. This same kind of activity could take place in any city in the United States.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD several newspaper clippings and a letter, all dealing with OEO political activities in North Carolina:

BRIEF SUMMARY OF MR. MONTE'S POSITION ON THE NORTH CAROLINA FUND, AS STATED TO THE GOVERNOR ON OCTOBER 13, 1966

My purpose in seeking an audience with the Governor is to point out to the State Government what I consider to be undesirable or perhaps even illegal activities of the North Carolina Fund, a private non-profit corporation created under the laws of North Carolina and after operating in affiliation with political sub-division of the State of North Carolina. A very brief summary of this problem and why I felt the State should closely examine the N.C. Fund's activities is contained in my letter to Mr. George Esser of September 23, 1966, a copy of which was furnished the Governor's office, (See Attachment "A"); and my letter to Congressman David N. Henderson of September 13, 1966 (Attachment "B").

Mr. George Esser wrote me on September 20, 1966, stating in effect that my misgivings listed in the above letters were unfounded. Not wishing to bicker forever with Mr. Esser I included the following paragraph in my

letter of September 23, 1966 (Attachment "A"):

"As I have previously stated, I think it best that the Governor be acquainted with these facts and that he appoint the Lt. Governor or some other qualified person to investigate the Fund's activities in all eleven Community Action Agencies sponsored by the Fund. The State of North Carolina is frequently called upon to participate, through its political subdivisions, in programs of the North Carolina Fund. The North Carolina Fund as well as its affiliated CAPs is incorporated under the laws of North Carolina. I have stated certain grave and serious misgivings about the Fund which you have denied. Therefore, I feel that it would be in the legislative and public interest for the State to investigate these charges."

I furnished a copy of this letter to the Governor and then asked for and obtained this audience for October 13, 1966.

Recognizing that the Governor has very little time, I intend to merely develop, and initially document the misgivings expressed by me. Due to obvious limitations on the Governor's time, I do not intend to document these misgivings at this time as fully as information available to me would permit. However, I feel that the information below should certainly warrant an inspection by the State of this State Chartered, supposedly non-political organization which often operates with participation of political subdivisions of the State of North Carolina. I am convinced that such an inspection including interviews with others who have had contacts with the N.C. Fund would reveal that it should either be considerably modified or the State of North Carolina and all its subdivisions, and agencies should withdraw all support and endorsement of the N.C. Fund.

Article 10(b) of the Articles of Incorporation of the N.C. Fund expressly forbids the organization from participating in politics or from substantially working to influence legislation. I have asserted that the N.C. Fund has not observed this requirement of its charter. The following matters are examples of incidents giving rise to this assertion:

(1) At a N.C. Fund sponsored meeting of CAP Directors on or about February 3, 1966, at the Holiday Inn in Durham; Mr. Tom Hartman, George Esser's Assistant, stated in Esser's presence without disavowal by Esser, that none of N.C.'s Congressmen and Senators were representatives of the poor and that therefore the poor should work against them. Mr. Hartman especially attacked Senator Jordan. The North Carolina Fund ran a tape recorder during this meeting and if Mr. Esser feels that the reference in my letters on this matter are untrue, he certainly should produce the tape to clarify this matter. Other CAP Directors were present and should be asked about it.

(2) Miss Barbara Jean Cooper, who was trained by the N.C. Fund as a "Community Action Technician" relates that her training was almost exclusively dedicated to an indoctrination of the concept of political exercise of power by the poor under the direction and control of the paid Community Action worker. She was even required by her superiors to do campaign work for a fund employee, Mr. Tommy Dial, who was then running for office in Robeson County. Miss Cooper complained of this to Mr. Royce Jordan, a Field Representative, and presumably responsible official of the N.C. Fund, who told her that this was a legitimate and even desirable thing for her to be doing.

(3) The N.C. Fund through its representatives Mr. Royce Jordan and Mr. Jim McDonald defended Mr. L. R. Morgan and Mrs. Maggie Blow of the Craven Operation Progress staff for having expended without authorization Craven Operation Progress Federally derived funds for Democratic Primary Voter registration purposes in May of 1966. This activity was done in deliberate circumven-

tion of and without the knowledge of Craven Operation Progress's Executive Director. When Mr. Esser was asked about this action, he defended it. This defense by Mr. Esser was made although he was informed by Craven Operation Progress that that organization had been instructed by the Federal Government not to expend monies in the area of voter registration.

(4) In memorandums listed below, officials of the N.C. Fund flagrantly solicited efforts from other supposedly non-political organizations toward influencing enactment of and the contents of the Economic Opportunity Act renewal of 1966:

(1) May 5, 1966 from George Esser, Executive Director.

(2) May 26, 1966 from Mr. Esser.

(3) June 10, 1966 from Mr. Tom Hartman, former Assistant Director.

(4) July 15, 1966 from Mr. Esser.

I have asserted that the management of the N.C. Fund has endorsed and supported a doctrine of racism or racial polarization which would fall within the popularized category of "black power". The following are some of the reasons giving rise to this assertion:

(1) At the above mentioned meeting of "Fund" related CAP Directors sponsored by the N.C. Fund held on or about February 8, 1966, in Durham, Mr. James MacDonald of the "Fund" staff outlined in the presence of Mr. Esser, what he felt to be the "Fund's" and each CAP's role in the area of "Human Relations". Most of us present felt that Mr. MacDonald's plans called for the implementation of racial polarization popularly labeled "black power". At that time, concern was expressed by some of those present. Subsequent events have, in my opinion, borne out the fear that the N.C. Fund's efforts in "Human Relations" were to be in the nature of creating a third political force primarily concerned with "black power".

Examples of these subsequent incidents are to be found in the widely publicized "Woodland People's Conference" of this summer which was sponsored by the N.C. Fund and the recent N.C. Fund created incidents in Forsyth County covered in the Winston-Salem Journal Sentinel of October 2, 1966.

In his letter of September 20, 1966, Fund Director, Mr. Esser seems to be particularly displeased about my implying that staff members of the N.C. Fund "rant". I assert that staff members of the N.C. Fund do in general "rant" which is defined as: "to talk in a loud, wild, extravagant way; declaim violently; rave."

In a news release of April 19, 1966, to the Winston-Salem Journal, Mr. Esser stated that the N.C. Fund supported a study by a Professor Field of the administration of the "Fund" affiliate in Forsyth County. On pages 15 through 18 of a "study of organization and administration" of Experiment in Self-Reliance (the Forsyth County program) by Professor Arthur Jordan Field, dated April, 1966, appears a discussion based on extensive tape-recorded interviews with "Fund" staff persons which leaves no doubt that Professor Field concludes that Fund staff "rant" if the measure of "ranting" is to be at all governed by irrational and unrealistic relations between strongly stated and urged methods and dimly seen goals. My own dealing with "Fund" staff, and apparently Professor Fields as well indicate that they do in fact rant.

I reiterate that the above statement is a brief summary of my misgivings about the N.C. Fund and the reasons for them. However, I feel that this statement is sufficient to justify public statement of concern by the State Government and an examination by the State Government as to whether,

(1) The State should participate either directly or through its subdivisions in activities of the N.C. Fund; and

(2) The N.C. Fund is operating within its charter.