

percent of the authorized total. But the national origin quotas would be abrogated gradually over a 5-year period during which unfilled quota numbers would be redistributed to countries wanting and needing them. The Congress should say yes before adjournment.

### A Youth's Tribute to J.F.K.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1964

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, after the assassination of our beloved late President John F. Kennedy there were many tributes written in his memory. One of the most touching is one which was written by a San Antonio, Tex., youth.

In a recent letter to me the youth, Jerry Boozikee, a sophomore high school student, said:

Last year on Thursday, November 21, Harlandale High students were dismissed early to have an opportunity to see President Kennedy as his motorcade came by on S. W. Military Drive. I was advertising manager and columnist for the Chief, newspaper of Harlandale High, so naturally I was on the scene. The next day the news of President Kennedy's assassination was unbelievable for myself and all Harlandale students who had seen him the day before.

The assassination of this great man moved me so much that I decided to write a memorial to President Kennedy. Not just a common memorial, but a memorial that must equal the great qualities that made him such a great President.

Jerry's tribute was first published in the Chief and the paper was later recognized by the Wall Street Journal Newspaper Fund as having one of the top 10 high school memorials to President Kennedy. It has also been reproduced in "The Smoke Signals" literary magazine and has, of course, received wide recognition by the San Antonio newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you this memorial to John F. Kennedy which appears as follows:

[From the Chief, Harlandale High School, San Antonio, Tex., Dec. 20, 1963]

IN MEMORIAM

(By Jerry Boozikee)

Harlandale students were dismissed early November 21 for a rare occasion—to get a glimpse of President John F. Kennedy as he traveled on the last lap of his journey to Kelly Air Force Base. It is a rare occasion when a city so far away from the Capital can be host, even for a few hours, to both the President and the Vice President of the United States and the Governor of the State at the same time.

It would have been a particularly meaningful day, and it would have been long remembered as the day the President waved hello to us. Indeed, it was a memorable day, felt more intensely, perhaps, by us than by most, for we were among the last to receive that friendly greeting. The next day he was assassinated. Our children will some day beseech us for the tragic details of that death.

But it is not for these reasons alone that our school was especially touched. Governor Connally went to school here. Vice President Johnson is a personal friend of some of our faculty who attended college with him. In common with all Texans, we feel the shame that the tragedy happened in our State.

Though his tenure of office was only 3 years, Mr. Kennedy will leave an indelible image in the hearts of Americans. Improved conditions in the cold war, furtherance of the cause of world peace, and important work in the field of civil rights will be remembered as a few of his great contributions to the history of the Nation and of the world. His immortal inaugural address will live as a great historical document.

We shall remember him as the great martyr of the 20th century. He gave us, the youth of the Nation, a perfect example to follow. We admired him for his patriotism, his reverence and respect for his parents and family, his concern for his fellow men, and for his devotion to the pursuit of knowledge.

President Kennedy, perhaps more so because of his tragic death, will remain etched in our minds. It remains for us to follow his example and continue the quest for betterment of our country, the world, and of ourselves. Only then, President Kennedy will not have died in vain. Like the eternal flame on his tomb, his memory will linger on.

### The All-Purpose Aircraft

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Congress recognized an Air Force need and moved to close our air defense gap by authorizing a new improved manned interceptor—IMI—aircraft. About this time, President Johnson announced the A-11 to the world, and Secretary McNamara called it an interceptor. The \$40 million authorization was dropped from the pending legislation.

Now the administration has wheeled out the A-11 in a different costume playing a new role. On July 24 the President announced the SR-71 as a strategic reconnaissance aircraft. The SR-71, once billed as an interceptor, is nothing more than the A-11 with a new designation.

Perhaps the administration is trying to create the illusion of vast improvements in our defense strategy by using the same airplane as the answer for every requirement. President Johnson should settle upon one story about the A-11. Is it an interceptor or is it for reconnaissance? It cannot be both.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a penetrating editorial on this subject written by Mr. Robert Hotz in the magazine *Aviation Week & Space Technology*, August 3, 1964.

The editorial follows:

THE ALL-PURPOSE AIRCRAFT

(By Robert Hotz)

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has been searching with limited success for an all-purpose aircraft during the three and a half years of his Pentagon stewardship. But

it remained for President Lyndon B. Johnson to discover the perfect all-purpose aircraft that can meet technical and political requirements with equal ease. It is the Lockheed A-11, commissioned by the Central Intelligence Agency in 1959. The A-11 was designated during the last years of President Eisenhower's administration, began flight-testing in President Kennedy's administration and became a television star under President Johnson's tutelage.

President Johnson has appeared in nationally televised press conferences twice in the last 6 months to extoll the technical virtues of the A-11 and demonstrate its political flexibility, and all of its wonders have not yet been fully revealed. We predict that the A-11 will become a regular performer during the presidential campaign television season, although even some of its closest associates may have difficulty recognizing it in the costumes that may be devised for campaign purposes.

There is no argument among either technical or political experts on the fact that the A-11 is a cleverly bred aerial racehorse and a genuine engineering tour de force by designer Clarence (Kelly) Johnson and his Lockheed "Skonk Works" team. The area of argument, which seems certain to increase in acrimony and rise in decibels as the presidential campaign progresses, is in the various guises in which the basic A-11 has been presented to the American people by President Johnson and its unusual deployment in a political fire brigade.

At the time of President Johnson's first A-11 announcement, his administration and Defense Secretary McNamara were engaged in a bitter fight with Congress over whether some \$40 million should be appropriated for initial development of a new long-range supersonic interceptor for the air defense system. In his initial announcement, President Johnson said A-11's were then at Edwards Air Force Base, "undergoing extensive tests to determine their capabilities as long range interceptors." This was substantially correct, since the first A-11 arrived at Edwards a few hours before President Johnson appeared on television, and eventually some tests were made with rocket armament installed internally and externally on an A-11 designated YF-12A for this purpose.

We predict that the results of these tests will remain forever buried under a security blanket. Young pilots of the Air Defense Command will grow old before an A-11, YF-12A or any similar beast of this design will grace their operational flight lines. However, Defense Secretary McNamara went even further than the President and told his press conference that the A-11 had been developed originally as an interceptor and implied that the \$40 million was not for the start of a new aircraft design but simply for furthering of the A-11 program. Neither of these statements was accurate. This produced sufficient confusion among the legislators for Congress to drop the \$40 million from the budget, thus killing development of any new generation of interceptor aircraft. Skillful piloting of the A-11 scored its first political victory.

At the same time, the U.S. supersonic transport program was in the doldrums. More than a dozen foreign airlines that had made cash deposits for places on a non-existent production line were wondering whether they had bet on the wrong horse. President Johnson quickly dispelled their gloom by noting that, "the development of supersonic commercial transport aircraft will also be greatly assisted by lessons learned from this A-11 program, for example, one of the most important technological achievements in this project has been the mastery of metallurgy and fabrication of titanium metal \* \* \*."

How the mastery of titanium had been achieved in Mach 3 A-11 aircraft already

**Tribute to Morris Cafritz****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, August 12, 1964*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished Member of the other body, Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, a former Member of this House, has served on the board of the Metropolitan Police Boys' Club in the District of Columbia for nearly 20 years.

On Sunday, August 2, he delivered the principal address at the dedication of the Morris Cafritz Administration Building for the Boys' Club summer camp at Scotland, Md.

In this address, Senator RANDOLPH paid a richly merited tribute to the late Mr. Cafritz, an exceptionally fine, public-spirited citizen of Washington and a longtime supporter of the Metropolitan Police Boys' Club.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include Senator RANDOLPH's address:

Max Farrington, ladies and gentlemen, associates and members of the Metropolitan Police Boys' Club, and friends of our former coworker Morris Cafritz: It is a privilege for me to be with you this afternoon. We share in a memorial for a man who was close to the hearts of us all.

In the brief history of American democracy we have effectively demonstrated that the ultimate achievement or failure of our system will rest with the individual citizen. It is the shopkeeper, factory worker, farmer, housewife, and salesman who must, in the final analysis, bring strength, purpose, and direction.

As members of organizations or special interest groups, and in day-to-day living we exercise an influence on the thoughts and reactions of those we meet. Ours is the responsibility, therefore, to be informed. We must make every effort to be knowledgeable on the current issues and seek an understanding of our traditions and heritage. With this background we are prepared to make a more meaningful contribution to the molding of effective government and a wholesome society.

In addition to being informed and perhaps equally as important, is our responsibility to be active in the community process. It has been truly said that "faith without works is dead"—and all our wisdom and knowledge are of little value if we are apathetic. We are participants and not merely spectators. As American citizens we are the most important element in our Republic and not merely the fortunate recipients of its benefits. It is the dedication and integrity of each person that dictates what we are to accomplish. It is our challenge to overcome the temptation to sit silently and allow others to carry our burdens—to assume a passive part in the tasks of our democracy and to give only slight attention to its problems and programs. This is not the seed of success, or the environment from which have sprung the significant messages and movements of the past. Such indifference will spell failure in the age of space just as it would have in a bygone era.

The philosopher William James has said: "Be not afraid of life. Believe that life is worth living and your belief will help create the fact."

Morris Cafritz believed that life was worth living. He was a doer, a participant in the

American process, a leader in community, church, and business. His life was glowing proof that enlightened participation must be the cornerstone of positive citizenship.

From a modest beginning Morris Cafritz scaled the heights of achievement. He also knew the disappointments and sorrows which come to all men of deep conviction and he withstood them. He emerged as a public spirited leader who shared his counsel, his wealth, his abilities, and his honest efforts in furthering the public interest. His was a respected voice in civic affairs. He was a cherished friend of many Members of the U.S. Congress. He has incredibly helpful in carrying forward countless philanthropic projects. He maintained a position of eminence in his chosen professional field. And, through it all, he was a devoted husband, a loving father, a faithful friend.

These qualities of Morris Cafritz may be best expressed by another reference to William James. In a letter to his sister on the occasion of the purchase of a summer home Mr. James exclaimed with joy that it had "14 doors and they all open outward." Such was the world of Morris Cafritz—an open world of many doors, all opening out.

The Metropolitan Police Boys' Club was of primary interest to Mr. Cafritz and has known the forward thrust of his enthusiastic assistance. From 1940 to 1942 he served as president of the club and for approximately 26 years he worked actively as a member of the committee responsible for the administration of this camp.

Morris Cafritz believed in young people and he believed in the city of Washington. He served the best interests of both by supporting the camp and giving generously of his time and effort. It is fitting, therefore, that we give recognition to the accomplishment of this selfless man by dedicating in his memory the Morris Cafritz Administration Building.

I am grateful that I was blessed with the friendship of Morris Cafritz. This relationship, however, was not unique, for his comradeship with his fellow man was a constantly enlarging and happy circle. Those who gather today share a common joy that this circle included them.

Morris was a gentle and a good man. By the enduring qualities of life he was a truly great man.

**Congressman Burton on the Poverty Bill****SPEECH**

OF

**HON. PHILLIP BURTON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Saturday, August 8, 1964*

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of President Johnson's war on poverty. This important legislation is a major step forward in the struggle to end poverty in America and to provide all our people with the means to achieve and enjoy a fuller life.

Of considerable interest to me is the formula by which funds under the various titles of the act will be allocated. In discussing this matter with the floor managers of the bill, including my distinguished colleague from California, Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, I have been assured that the data used for computing the number of public assistance recipients in the various States will be the latest available monthly figures.

The committee report made reference,

as an illustration, to the number of public assistance recipients for January 1964. I was assured that later monthly figures than January 1964 would be used for the purpose of computing the number of monthly public assistance recipients and that January 1964 was merely the latest available month at the time that the committee report was compiled.

I have relied on this assurance that the latest monthly date will be used, because to do otherwise would most unfairly discriminate against California, whose program to extend aid to families with dependent children was not established until February 1964 and whose caseload in this connection has not yet stabilized.

**Adopt a New Immigration Policy Now****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, August 12, 1964*

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in yesterday's New York Times urging revision of the immigration law before the end of this session. I have introduced H.R. 7740 which would do so. The editorial is completely correct in pointing out "The United States will not fully have mounted its war against discrimination until it revises its unfair immigration law." Our present immigration law based on the national origin of this country's population in 1920 is indeed discriminatory and violates our democratic principles. I urge all my colleagues to read the following editorial:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 11, 1964]

**A NEW IMMIGRATION POLICY**

The United States will not fully have mounted its war against discrimination until it revises its unfair immigration law.

Immigration quotas are now assigned to each country on the basis of the national origin of this country's population as of 1920. This system was designed quite deliberately to give preference to immigration from northern Europe. But immigration from this area is never large enough to fill the assigned quotas. Since the vacancies cannot be transferred, the real effect of the system is to cut down immigration far below the authorized total and to shut the doors to many people from less favored lands.

As Attorney General Kennedy told Congress recently, this system is a source of global embarrassment to the United States. Other nations—especially those whose citizens are discriminated against—reject and resent the implication that they belong to "lesser breeds." Our rules keep out many scientists and others with special skills, talents and attainments this country needs. And they separate thousands of families of American citizens with close kin abroad.

This is, in short, a system that should be abolished, and President Johnson, like President Kennedy before him, is sponsoring a program to abolish it. There is no intention of raising the immigration total above the 165,000 a year now authorized—a small enough number for a nation approaching 200 million in population. And immigration from any one country would be limited to 10

## Results of 1964 questionnaire

	Yes	No	Not sure
In general, do you favor—			
1. Federal civil rights legislation.....	1,999	1,013	270
2. U.S. participation in the nuclear test ban treaty.....	2,282	705	308
3. The recently enacted Federal tax cut—			
A. Regardless of Government's deficit spending.....	445	719	78
B. Only with a substantial cut in spending.....	1,717	328	86
C. Only with a balanced budget.....	1,290	288	95
4. Wheat sales to the Soviet Union—			
A. On a straight cash payment basis.....	2,231	265	54
B. On credit underwritten in part by tax dollars.....	219	789	73
C. Not at all.....	553	689	74
5. Medical care for the aged—			
A. Under social security (King-Anderson) regardless of need.....	791	774	123
B. Under Federal-State (Kerr-Mills) limited by need.....	1,519	346	148
C. Keeping U.S. Government out.....	931	391	134
6. Federal aid to education (other than existing programs)—			
A. At the college or postgraduate levels.....	1,665	1,007	249
B. At the elementary or secondary levels.....	1,092	1,172	217
7. A constitutional amendment permitting voluntary nondenominational Bible reading and prayer in public schools.....	2,337	870	122
8. Major new Federal programs to reduce poverty.....	1,390	1,376	472
9. Gradual reduction of Government price supports for farm commodities.....	2,845	178	294
10. A tax deduction or credit for parents paying tuition for their children's education beyond high school.....	2,571	592	176
11. Continued U.S. support of the United Nations.....	2,634	419	151
A. If so, even if Red China is admitted.....	1,695	1,079	284

12. In general, do you think Congress did a good job or a bad job last year?

Good, 377; fair, 1,504; poor, 850; no opinion, 336.

13. What do you believe the United States should do in Vietnam?

(a) Pull out entirely, 605;  
(b) continue our current advisory and support role, 984; and  
(c) substantially increase U.S. commitment, 1,218.

14. Much of the success of our system of Government has been credited to the doctrine of separation of powers between the courts, the executive (including departments and agencies), and the legislative. Which branch of Government do you think is doing the best job of insuring the continued success of our system of Government?

Legislature, 1,034; courts, 548; executive, 327; FBI, 11; taxpayer, 2; Treasury, 2; military, 1; and Internal Revenue, 1.

## COMMENT

It is interesting to compare this year's questionnaire replies with last year's. Approval of a balanced budget and reduction in the national debt were so overwhelming last year as to be almost unanimous. Thus, those questions were not repeated. Last year, the greatest amount of uncertainty resulted from the question "Do you favor the administration's conduct of foreign policy?" Seven hundred and twenty-seven answered "yes," 1,575 voted "no," and 918 "not sure." This year, the greatest amount of uncertainty resulted from the poverty program question.

Although the medicare questions differed slightly from last year to this, the Kerr-Mills plan is still the method of medical care for the aged apparently preferred by the majority. It is also interesting to note that last year a substantial majority favored a sharp reduction in foreign aid. This was evidently the national consensus, for, indeed, foreign aid was substantially reduced last year. Continued U.S. support of the United Nations (one of the strongest votes last year, 2,622 "yes," 502 "no," 261 "not sure") is even more pronounced this year and such support would apparently survive the admission of Red China.

Having served as an elected representative for 14 years, I am, of course, pleased that a substantial majority consider that the legislative branch of the Government is doing a better job of insuring the continued success of our system of Government than the courts or the executive and also rated Congress as doing a "good" or "fair" job.

## Fact Magazine

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio transcript of the August 3 program of Fulton Lewis, Jr., carried over the Mutual Broadcasting Network. This subject dealt with an effort by Fact magazine to smear the Republican nominee for President by a survey designed to solicit comments from psychiatrists regarding his mental stability. Today I wish to call attention to a second broadcast by Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., on August 4 on the same network. In this broadcast Mr. Lewis points out the background of the publisher of Fact magazine. This background include his conviction on a charge of sending obscene material through the mails. The broadcast follows:

## FACT MAGAZINE

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this is Fulton Lewis, Jr., speaking from the Mutual studios in Washington, D.C. I'll have my news and views for you in just a moment.

Last night, ladies and gentlemen, I gave you a report on a project which has been undertaken by a new bimonthly magazine published in New York City under the title Fact, in circularizing—by their own statement—"a group of respected psychologists and psychiatrists" over the Nation with a questionnaire asking them the question:

"Do you think that BARRY GOLDWATER is psychologically fit to serve as President of the United States?"

The circular makes note of the fact that a recent survey by the reputable medical magazine Medical Tribune showed that while MD's generally are 2 to 1 in favor of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER for President, psychiatrists are 10 to 1 against him. It asked certain loaded questions such as "Does he seem prone to aggressive behavior and destructiveness? Does he seem callous to the downtrodden and needy? Can you

offer any explanation of his public temper tantrums and his occasional outbursts of profanity? Finally, do you think that his having had two nervous breakdowns has any bearing on his fitness to govern this country?"

I reported that Senator GOLDWATER has never had a nervous breakdown and that the Medical Tribune had informed me that 4 years ago the magazine had conducted an identical poll to its recent one, that time as between Richard Nixon and John F. Kennedy, and that the results were that the MD's as a whole were 2 to 1 in favor of Nixon but the psychiatrists were 10 to 1 against him—the same proportions that came out of the present poll—and that inasmuch as there was never any question about the psychological fitness of Mr. Nixon 4 years ago, conclusion was that the political opinions of the psychiatrists must have been based on considerations other than psychological fitness.

Tonight, I want to go a little deeper into this picture and behind the scenes, somewhat and take a closer look at Fact magazine who is behind it.

On January 13 of this year, the United Press International carried an item under a New York City dateline, stating that a man named Ralph Ginzberg had announced the publication of a new bimonthly magazine, which would be sold for \$1.25 per copy, and that he had ordered an original run of 100,000 copies for the first edition. And it quoted Mr. Ginzberg as stating that "in presenting the truth, we will not hesitate to offend big business, the church, the State, or even, if necessary, our readers."

Mr. Ginzberg is publisher of the magazine, and the owner and financial backer. The magazine accepts no advertising. They reported today that they have a net paid circulation of 200,000 at the present time.

Now, about Mr. Ginzberg's background.

He had three other publications in the past, one by the name Eros which was advertised as "A journal of erotica," another called Liason magazine and something called a Housewife's handbook of selective promiscuity.

The Post Office Department got on his trail on charges of sending obscene material through the mails and the case was presented to a Federal Grand Jury in Philadelphia which subsequently indicted him on the charges and he was brought to trial.

He waived a jury trial because, he says, he felt so confident of winning that he didn't want to go through the trouble and expense and time consumption of selecting a jury, and decided instead to stand trial before Judge Ralph C. Body.

Judge Body held the trial, considered the evidence and Ginzberg's defense, found him guilty and sentenced him to 5 years in Federal prison and \$42,000 fine. He has since appealed the verdict, but as of the present time those two sentences stand against him.

Now one of the newspapers in New York City is the New York Post, probably the most extreme liberal newspaper in the United States, which has as its editorial-page editor and columnist the well-known James Weschler, who undertook to make some observations about Mr. Ginzberg's present questionnaire to the psychiatrists over the Nation, published last Thursday, and considering the source, I think you may be interested in hearing it. Mr. Weschler writes as follows:

"A new self-styled 'muckraking' magazine called Fact is privately circularizing psychiatrists and psychologists with this inquiry:

"Do you think that BARRY GOLDWATER is psychologically fit to serve as President of the United States?"