Roosevelt's opinion, "rightfully discriminate in favor of women."

Although equal pay has been the most urgent issue before the Commission so far, the group will cover much ground before it turns in its report. It will complete an investigation of the employment practices of the Federal Government as well as those of companies holding Federal contracts. It will study Federal and State labor laws dealing with such matters as hours, night work, and wages to see if they are benefiting women as originally intended.

It will analyze the effects of Federal social insurance and tax laws on the net income of women. (Why should a man be allowed to deduct the salary of his secretary, for example, while a working mother can't deduct the expense of a babysitter?) It will probe the differences in the legal treatment of men and women. And it will propose new and expanded services for working wives and mothers.

But broad as it is, the Commission's mandate from President Kennedy does not include the newest area of discrimination against women—outer space. The House Space Committee has been investigating complaints from a number of women that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has chosen only men as astronauts—in spite of the fact that some doctors say women are better adapted to the stresses of orbital flight. Women, it seems, must continue to fight bias even in the space age.

Teddy's Victory Hurts Entire Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial entitled "Teddy's Victory Hurts Entire Nation," written by Charles L. Dancey, in the Peoria Journal Star, Thursday, September 20, 1962, be reprinted in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD:

TEDDY'S VICTORY HURTS ENTIRE NATION

As expected, Teddy Kennedy has won the Democratic nomination for Senator in the State of Massachusetts, and we can only hope that this is as far as that farce goes.

This race (in which in the words of a top Democrat quoted in the Journal Star by Inez Robb some weeks ago "the Kennedy's own the stables, the racetrack * * * etc.") has demonstrated that there is still a lot more of "Honey Fitz" about the Kennedy clan than there is of Harvard.

The demonstration has gone a long way toward reversing the long love affair between John Kennedy and the Washington press corps, has sickened responsible Democratic leaders, and is on its way toward making the United States look pretty silly in much of the world.

This is becoming a comic-opera affair of the sort that used to be more typical of Nicaragua, or the Dominican Republic than of American democracy.

Even Mayor Daley doesn't have a brother as police commissioner, another as an alderman, and a brother-in-law in charge of poor relief in the city of Chicago.

Yet, that is pretty much the situation developing in the Government of this great leader of the world—the United States of America.

There is a lot more to "good taste" than having Pablo Cassals to a publicized concert, or inviting Nobel Prize winners to tea, and that has nothing whatever to do with knowing which fork to pick up at dinner.

The tremors have been visible for some time; the sick, queasy, unease of many of the professional folk and many of the political folk on both sides of the aisle who are close observers of the Washington scene.

Teddy's inevitable victory merely tells these folks, including many nervous top Democrats, that their fears were well grounded.

When it comes to things that really matter, obviously the Kennedy clan will do things that would make Harry Truman retch.

The whole thing now provokes a reaction less of fire or anger than one of sadness and a slight nausea.

At a time when American democracy is on trial in the eyes of much of the world, and trying to prove itself as "the way," we are making ourselves look cheap, gauche, and silly.

A little thing, but a big one—and very, very sad.

C. L. DANCEY.

Lack of Fiscal Responsibility in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, following is the text of a letter I sent to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare this past Friday, which is self-explanatory in its message:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 21, 1962.

Hon. ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CELEBREZZE: I always have and shall continue to oppose waste in spending the taxpayers' dollar.

Yesterday a 520-word telegram over your signature was sent to each Member of the House. Friends with legal training assure me this is a direct violation of the United States Code which prohibits the use of appropriated funds by departments of the executive branch for influencing legislation.

Western Union stated at straight-wire rates the cost would have been $12,800. Apparently someone in your Department did some quick footwork, anticipating unfavorable reaction, which the transaction deserved. It appears Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public will now pick up the apparently illegal check for $3,562 to send the message 2 blocks.

Recent figures indicate a great increase in personnel in your Department. It would appear it would not have been too difficult to find a mimeograph operator and a messenger, which probably would have saved at least $3,500.

Isn't it about time those in high positions of trust display some sense of fiscal sanity? Here it was completely lacking.

I shall await your justification of this expenditure.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. GOODLING,
Member of Congress.

Need for Inspiration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, in our preoccupation with programs and policies, armament and aerospace, we often forget the power of compelling ideas to alter events. Today, as all mankind searches for survival in the shadows of rockets, missiles and satellites, the need for guidance flowing from new inspiration has never been more apparent.

The following excerpt from an address delivered at the 1962 commencement exercises of Hamilton College, located in my congressional district, challenges us to reassess freedom's heritage and to think and act anew. Its author is a distinguished American, Dean Alfange, a former resident of my community of Utica, N.Y., and a famous alumnus of Hamilton College. I am confident all who read his remarks will find them a source of deep inspiration.

[From the Utica (N.Y.) Observer Dispatch, June 15, 1962]

NEED FOR INSPIRATION

(By Dean Alfange)

Forty years have wrought a new world, but not a better one. We have more security but less liberty; more income but less character; more leisure but less dignity. I fear we are living in the twilight of freedom; and our colleges and universities cannot escape their share of responsibility.

About 10 years ago I wrote a small piece on what it means to be an American, which was published in Reader's Digest:

"I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon—if I can.

"I seek opportunity—not security.

"I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the State look after me.

"I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and to succeed.

"I refuse to barter incentive for a dole.

"I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence, the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm of utopia.

"I will not trade freedom for beneficence nor my dignity for a handout.

"I will never cower before any master nor bend to any threat.

"It is my heritage to stand erect, proud, and unafraid, to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations and to face the world boldly and say, this I have done with the help of God.

"All this is what it means to be an American."

That breed of American is fast disappearing. Instead, we are developing a softer bellied breed that keeps on wanting more and more for less and less. Labor leaders want a 30-hour week with still more benefits and featherbedding to boot. Politicians want votes and play it safe by keeping quiet. And thus the downward slide continues unabated.

The stock market collapse reflects, I think, a worldwide awareness that American leadership is in a great decline on all fronts—moral, political, and economic.

This crisis of leadership, this melancholy trend away from solid values, will not be arrested by the fanatics of the John Birch Society nor by the equally fuzzy-minded

left. Nor will it be arrested overnight by anyone. But the place to start is here. The colleges and universities provide the last clear chance to reverse this trend.

We need inspirational leaders and inspirational ideas much more than nuclear weapons or flights to the moon. The Roman Empire was not destroyed by force of arms. It was destroyed by a simple idea put forward by a young Jew. The young Jew was Christ and His idea simply: "Thou shalt not kill," "Love thy neighbor." The physical power of Rome was destroyed by the spiritual power of that idea.

The need, therefore, is not alone for generals, admirals and scientists. The need is greater still for men who can inspire; yes, even for dreamers and poets.

The presevation of our peace and the survival of our heritage are both conditioned upon the restoration of America's mental health. That is our greatest present challenge; and we hope this little college will contribute its share in meeting that challenge.

College Academic Facilities and Student Assistance Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the distinguished lady from Oregon, Congresswoman GREEN, for her able and capable presentation of the conference report on H.R. 8900 this morning.

I would also like to thank her on behalf of the young people of this Nation for the long hours she has spent on the conference committee working on the legislation before us today.

I am supporting this conference report because I feel it is one more step in the development of educational facilities to meet the tremendous needs of this century in the field of education.

The president of one of my larger junior colleges in the State of Washington at Vancouver, the distinguished Dr. Dwight C. Baird, wired urging support of this conference report. He says:

> This could give some much needed help to the growth and development of the community college program in Washington. I hope you will give it your support.

May I say at this point that the State of Washington is one of the outstanding junior college States in the Nation. These institutions of higher learning have met a genuine need, for our universities and colleges are unbelievably crowded, and the present junior colleges in my district—four of them I may add—have made possible higher education for many young people who otherwise would have no opportunity for it.

The distinguished president of our great University of Washington in Seattle, Dr. Charles E. Odegaard, has also wired and said:

> Urge your support for H.R. 8900 conference report bill since universities desperately need assistance now.

Mr. Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education, which has member institutions and organizations of colleges, universities, and junior colleges, both public and private, representing more than 90 percent of the student enrollment in the United States, urged passage of the bill.

In contrast, I was deeply disturbed that the National Education Association and its member State associations found occasion to oppose the conference report. This is a saddening stiuation, for at this time in American history, education should not be divisive, but positive and approaching the complete problem as unified Americans seeking better solutions to their needs.

I had the privilege of serving as chairman in the education committee in the Washington State legislature for many years and was a member of the committee through my 22 years of legislative service. I am not a teacher, but a parent, interested citizen and taxpayer and it is from this background in the field of education legislation that I say I am genuinely sorry that education must speak group against group.

Our junior colleges, our universities, and the young people who attend them, genuinely need our assistance in programing now. The vitality of democracy lies in educated citizenship, for the challenge of tomorrow is great. We must waste none of our youth and the resources of youth. Each person, poor or rich, who has the ability to contribute to the understanding and development of America's future, must be given the tools to meet the national challenge.

The distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon has reviewed for you the history of higher education, and she has reviewed for you title II which broadens the opportunity of young people who have no other opportunity to attend a college other than through this title.

I am happy to associate myself with the members of this conference committee who worked long and hard to develop the best possible bill and I am particularly happy to join with the distinguished lady from Oregon in her support.

Amending Section 305, Communications Act of 1934

SPEECH

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11732) to amend section 305 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly aware of the good intentions of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. We all know of his intense interest in matters of national security. We all know how intensely interested every Member of this House is in our security. I do not think any one of us can say that we hold any particular claim to the interest of our country more so than anyone else. I am not an expert on foreign affairs, I must acknowledge that fact. I wish I knew more about our foreign affairs. I wish I had the answer to many of these questions with reference to Cuba, Berlin, Russia, and the Communists. However, the Constitution of the United States says the President of the United States has that responsibility. For 8 years prior to 1961 we had a man as President who should have been, because of his experience as President of the United States, who should have known since he was involved and experienced with communism, with Berlin and with the foreign relations of this country. He gave 8 years of his life and we had a lot of confidence in him. That was President Eisenhower. During the time he was President he would do the best he could.

Mr. Chairman, we have got to depend upon the President of the United States to lead and direct these affairs. I am as interested as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], and all of us in this House are interested, in the President and anyone else giving us as great assurance as he or they can as to what is best for us. We want to contribute to it in the best way we can, and we want and strive for it as an objective.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to call attention of my colleagues to the fact that the amendment says "the approval of two committees of Congress." We pass a law, and we say that it cannot be operable unless two committees of Congress approve it. My friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] talks about a review. A review is different than approval. There is a serious constitutional question involved here, but outside of that, after the amendment is adopted, then there has to be not a review but approval. If the gentleman provided for 30 days' consideration, as is provided in other matters as, for instance, the Armed Services in the selling of real estate, and so forth, that is an entirely different proposition. This bypasses the House and the Senate, and bypasses the Speaker. I am not expressing any pride. A review is one thing, but vesting in a committee the power to disapprove, why, that is an entirely different thing and is an unwise precedent, in my opinion, for the Congress to institute.

Mr. HARRIS. The Speaker is eminently correct, and I was going to come to that. That is precisely what I was leading up to. I thank the Speaker for calling it to the attention of the Members of the House much better than I.

I do think it is a dangerous precedent to give committees of the House the power and authority to override a decision of the President of the United States.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I would suggest to the distinguished Speaker, with whom I do not particularly relish taking issue, that in the first place the amendment is limited to Communists and Communist-dominated nations insofar as congressional approval through committees of specific licenses is concerned. Much of this information has to be confidential in nature and could not be made available to the House in the first place. The committee is the best place to make the decision without dealing in this area with confidential information. May I say, in the second place, that I am sure the distinguished Speaker is fully familiar with precedent with respect to committee approval and I specifically cite to the distinguished Speaker the Jones-Cramer Public Buildings Act in which the Public Works Committee of the House and the Senate were given specific authorization and authority with regard to public buildings, without the Congress acting in any of them. There is precedent for it. As a matter of fact, I understand there is precedent in the trade bill for exactly the same thing.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I insist that it would be a very bad thing to do. I hope the Committee will not approve the amendment.

Amending Section 305, Communications Act of 1934

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11732) to amend section 305 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am rather impressed with all of these amendments that spring from lack of confidence. There is nothing that I know of that we can put in legislation that is going to instill confidence in anybody. I was quite impressed with the gentleman from South Carolina, who was very honest and confessed that if it were left in the hands of the President he would not complain too much about it, but he had the idea that it would be handled by the State Department and he had no confidence in the State Department. In legislation we cannot put confidence in the hearts of anybody. It cannot be done.

The objection that I have to this amendment is that it brings something entirely new into our foreign relations. So far as I know, there is no precedent at all for the Members of the House, certainly not our committee, to have anything to do with foreign relations. If it were limited to approval by the Senate, considering that this relationship between the two countries was in the form of a treaty and should have to be approved by the Senate then I would say there was certainly some precedent, some reason for it. But in its present form I certainly could not approve the amendment, and I hope the House turns it down.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. On the latter point—and I, of course, have great confidence in the gentleman's opinion—the gentleman takes the position that the bill under consideration, involving foreign affairs, but coming out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, should not have been here in the first place. All I am asking is that the gentleman's committee and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate be given a chance to look at what was done for the very reason the gentleman indicates; and that is that this involves foreign affairs and the Foreign Affairs Committee should have the opportunity to consider it. That is the very purpose of the amendment. It amends the action of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in bringing it out in the first place.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman also realizes that even on the matter of treaties the House Committee on Foreign Affairs does not approve. It is the Senate that has that power of approval. These reciprocal agreements might very well be considered in the form of treaties. I did not have the assignment of this bill to our committee. As it develops, perhaps it would have been better if it had not been given to our committee. Nevertheless it came to our committee and we did the best we could with it. It is something that the administration needs, something they are very anxious to have, and so far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to give it to them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield gladly to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman seems to indicate that the House has nothing whatever to do with foreign policy, or at least very little. I am under the impression that we will be called on next week to pass a resolution dealing with Cuba. That certainly puts the House of Representatives very deeply into the matter of foreign policy and foreign affairs.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is a guideline and this bill is a guideline. In this bill we have definitely set forth guidelines and instructions and legislative history as to what we believe the President ought to do.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, only yesterday we did something more than set up guidelines and yardsticks, in the foreign give-away bill. We dealt with transportation of various materials to Cuba, did we not, and we put definite prohibitions and restrictions into the bill.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is correct; and we can do that. But it has to be approved by the Senate, also.

Constitutional Rights of American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, recently, Nelson Jose, chairman, National Congress of American Indians Constitutional Rights Committee, submitted a report relating to the constitutional rights of American Indians. I consider it to be a very good summary and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

(By Nelson Jose)

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

This is the preamble to the Constitution of this country, and in its various sections are spelled out the powers of Government and the rights of the people.

Article 14 of the Constitution states: "All persons, born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of laws."

As Indians, we sometimes overlook the fact that we, too, are all people, and that we, too, have constitutional rights. Even before the adoption of the Constitution, it was recognized that Indians possessed full rights to the lands they occupied, "until that right should be extinguished by the United States with their consent." Indians were regarded as having a semi-independent position, not as states or nations or sovereign groups, but as a separate people with the power of regulating their internal and social relations.

Neither are many Indians aware of the fact that the American Constitution developed from that of the Iroquois confederacy. Both Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson admitted that they had drawn upon the governmental philosophy of these Indian groups in charting the plan for the new United States of America.

It remained for Andrew Jackson to deviate from this recognition of Indians as independent people, and it was his influence that brought about the declaration by Congress in 1871 that Indians were no longer in this state of independence.

As we all know, for many years the Indian was then a ward of the Government, held on restricted reservations and under the complete domination of the Government. True, wardship came about through the request of Indians themselves, who wished protection from avaricious men. But Indians today are no longer wards. The protecting hand of the Government does not apply to the person of any Indian, and in ever-lessen-

ing degree—in some areas, in no degree—does it apply to his property other than trustee land.

Through the Citizenship Act of 1924, all Indians became citizens of this country. Some Indians, long before, had been granted citizenship by treaty stipulations, by special acts of Congress, or through military service. Now, in 1924, every Indian automatically became a citizen, vested with the same rights, privileges, and responsibilities of any other person of this status yet having certain special services and privileges by virtue of their Indian blood.

These special services include health care, education, and property administration as well as the exemption of taxes on property held in trust.

It can be argued that it is not possible to confer citizenship upon a people native to the country and indigenous to the soil and this would be a point well taken. However, strange indeed are the ways and the laws of the white men and like it or not, under the law we are citizens and we have these constitutional rights: We have freedom to come and go, to any place and in any way we see fit. We have the freedom to choice—to leave or to stay upon our reservations which are the lands belonging to us. There are no limitations placed upon us.

We have the rights to vote in every State on the same basis as others, whether or not we live on a reservation. In recent months, the matter of reservation voting was challenged in New Mexico when a defeated candidate for the office of Lieutenant Governor contended that ballots cast by Navajos were illegal. He said that Indians were not subject to State laws, that reservation residence was not legal residence in the State, and that violations of the New Mexico elections code could not be prevented or punished on Indian lands. The State supreme court upheld the voting rights of reservation Indians with a qualifying statement. The complexities of the Indian situation under law at times can snarl up logic and it is true that the rights to vote on a reservation which is not under the control of State laws gives Indians an advantage over other people. The Constitution does not sanction that any group have larger rights than others. Voting, however, is a privilege and a responsibility in which we should all participate. Ballots are our modern weapons and the means by which we can put men and women in office who will help us.

We have the rights to religious freedom. Many of us still observe our native forms of worship, while many of us have accepted the white man's road to God. This is our inherent right, as it is the right of others, to determine for ourselves how and in what way we shall worship.

We have the rights to freedom of speech, to hold our own meetings, to say and write what we think and to express our opinions. We have this privilege, but we do not exercise it enough. Our voices should be heard and our thoughts given wings. Often our silence confuses people, for silence can be interpreted as acceptance. We must ask for what we want, and ask and ask again, without being discouraged if there is no answer or the answer is no. This is also true for others—the continued asking, however, will make its own impact.

We have the same protections of the due processes of law as anyone else. We may hire our own lawyers and except in the case of certain major crimes, our tribal courts are recognized by both State and Federal Governments as the authority on reservations.

We are entitled to the same social security benefits as other Americans, and this includes special assistance for the aged, the orphaned, the physically and mentally handicapped, and those in need of temporary relief. Indians who go into the cities and become eligible under the laws of residency are entitled to these welfare assistances. This is not often understood and charitable groups will deny Indians aid in the belief that this is taken care of by the Federal Government. It must be understood by Indians, however, who can then protect themselves when such rights are endangered.

We are free to work anywhere and in any type of occupation without restriction. We even have special hiring and retention rights in Federal positions which service Indians.

We are entitled to all extension services provided by the Government to any citizen. Our farmers can secure the advice of agricultural experts along with other farmers; our women can have homemaker services; our youngsters can form 4-H Clubs.

Our veterans are entitled to participate in any of the programs open to veterans.

We are a free people, Americans all under one flag and united in love of country. Freedom is not given to us, or to anyone else. It is ours. To borrow the title of a wonderful book, we are "Born Free," and as we made use of our freedom and call upon our constitutional rights, we strengthen ourselves and our country. As Indian citizens, we need to grow in our understanding of what we can do with this freedom we have.

The People Must Continue To Elect Their Public Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been reliably informed that there is a move on foot to do away with the election of county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation boards at a duly called election of their neighbors, and instead, to have the county boards appointed by the respective State ASC boards, or from national headquarters, which does not appeal to me at all.

During the past 30 years the present system has evolved a broad foundation of experience and know-how.

An overwhelming majority of these committeemen and their office staffs are devoted and dedicated citizens who hold a trust and an obligation—and who are elected annually by their neighbors to see that the ASC farm program is carried out in a fair American way to conform with the intent of the Congress.

An interlying strength of this system is the decentralization of operations at the point of contact with our farmers. Authority and responsibility for the administration of the program is placed on the individual county committees. Final application of farm programs is under the constant check of fieldmen, program reviewers, internal auditors and investigators. Further, day-to-day supervision and direction of all farm programs is divided up among 50 State committees—each responsible for the direction of county offices in its State.

The more than 3,000 elected ASC county committees in the 50 States constitute a vital element in the applied legislation. They stand as an example of that American principle wherein we elect all our public servants to insure that the rules are applied in a fair and impartial manner. Generally speaking, these farmer-citizen committees have served in the high tradition of civic endeavor.

This public service would cost millions more annually if these services had been delegated to paid full-time employees.

The farmer committee system is truly American and should be recognized as such and continued as such.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in conclusion, that I would hope to see the time come and soon, when politics is kept out of our ASC farmer committee system completely. However, even though I know there are relatively few cases where committees have been unduly influenced, such as the one in Texas recently, still I do not want to see the farmer-elected committee system traded for a State or Federal dictatorship.

Revolt and Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal of September 19.

There is no question that the people are becoming increasingly doubtful as to the value of the foreign aid program to the strength and welfare of the United States. The editorial makes this very clear in the closing sentence where the proposal is made to make "fundamental reforms."

The time for these reforms is now:

REVOLT AND REFORM

All this year the attacks on foreign aid, in both Houses of Congress, have been unusually severe. And this week a House Appropriations subcommittee voted to cut $1.5 billion out of the President's request for new funds of more than $4.7 billion in the current fiscal year.

Whatever figure Congress finally agrees on, it is significant that this is the largest reduction in foreign aid the group has ever proposed and that the full Appropriations Committee yesterday went along with most of the cut. Combined with the other congressional criticisms of the program, these actions show that many lawmakers are not only rebelling against the incessant and excessive spending; they are also beginning to sense their responsibility for forcing foreign-aid reforms.

Certainly the administration, for its part, has shown little disposition to effect basic reforms. It has rearranged the bureaucratic machinery, an exercise which has been performed over and over in the past. It has devised the Alliance for Progress subsidies for Latin America, an undertaking which is already demonstrating that it was both ill conceived and oversold.

What has been left undone is the formulation of an effective aid policy. Our military aid is so heavy because our diplomacy has failed to persuade others to do more in their own defense. As for economic aid, the basic trouble is not waste, flagrant though that often is. The roots of the trouble, we think it should be clear by now, are these: The assistance has gone on so long on such