

or its equivalent. This level of achievement must remain fixed. With this average as the focal point, the student then is considered on service, leadership, and character. Election is by a chapter council comprising the principal and members of the faculty.

Members who fall below standards that were the bases of election are promptly warned. If a member falls in the next marking period, the case is referred to the faculty council and he is dismissed from membership.

With this background in mind, let's see how the society has been received throughout this area. Of the Greater Lawrence public high schools, this city is the sole nonaffiliate. The majority of parochial secondary schools have formed chapters. The students themselves react favorably.

One comment typifies their general feeling: "Athletes always were recognized for their ability. The brainy student never was made to feel that he or she was something special. The National Honor Society is the answer to the pride a school should share with pupils who hit the books instead of hitting the line on the gridiron."

INGALLS ENTHUSIASTIC

Let's turn to the educators to see how they feel. Superintendent Walter B. Ingalls of Methuen is highly enthusiastic. He echoes the thoughts of the students. "Athletes gain glory on the field of play but not much of anything was ever done for the real pupil," he says, as he points out that the National Honor Society has filled that void.

The Methuen system even goes further. It awards a special pin to students on the honor roll for two consecutive marking periods. "An added scholastic incentive," comments the superintendent. "This pin and the society are inspiring our kids to greater scholastic heights."

LAWRENCE PROGRAM

In Lawrence, the picture is different. There are some facets that did not appeal to a study committee charged by the school board to look into the possibility of inaugurating the program for local students. Supt. James F. Hennessey, Asst. Supt. James A. Griffin and Headmaster Daniel F. Sullivan considered the National Honor Society and the Pro-Merito Society, generally recognized as the top national organizations carrying status for students accepted to membership.

The subject was discussed pro and con for some time before the three men proposed a pin award through which Lawrence high students now are honored for their achievements. Instead of membership in a society, the pupils are presented with an L pin which, school officials hope, will carry as much status and give them as much deserved recognition as the L award does for star athletes.

CITE DRAWBACKS

The National Honor Society, though recognized as an outstanding organization by the local school administrators, has several drawbacks they felt placed it behind the L pin as far as an ideal award for local students was concerned.

The three men were chiefly bothered by such items as the following: A charter fee which could be changed at the discretion of the national chapter (the amount); local units must conform with all rules and regulations of the national organization; all pins, certificates, membership cards, rings, charms, and so forth for distribution to students must be purchased from the national headquarters; the organization sets up a percentage quota for membership, thus limiting the number of students who can qualify though they might have a top scholastic achievement. (L award affords more students an opportunity for recognition). Overall, the three-man committee felt because of the interest shown by the faculty and students, the award was one

that would go further in affording recognition for deserving boys and girls.

GREAT INCENTIVE

"A mark of distinction and a great incentive for good scholarship," North Andover's Supt. Douglas A. Chandler sums up his thoughts thusly.

And, he adds: "Anything to encourage scholarship among students is to be desired and achieved."

In Andover, Superintendent Edward I. Erickson finds that the National Honor Society contributes a great deal to the life and stimulation of the student. "It is meaningful and tiptop in every way," he says.

These are the thoughts of Greater Lawrence's foremost educators. They agree that recognition for outstanding students is a must.

The National Honor Society is the answer in three of the four systems hereabouts.

Bloody Road to Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the bizarre and shocking developments in South Vietnam in connection with the overthrow of the Diem government by force should cause every Member of this House to pause and reflect on the moral character of our foreign policy in southeast Asia. In our striving to gain friends and influence around the world, we have always avoided practices which might resemble the Kremlin's brutal enforcement of its influence in the Soviet satellite nations.

An editorial which appeared in the November 4 issue of the Chicago Daily News entitled "Bloody Road to Power," sets forth appropriate and timely subjects for the administration to ponder in this dark hour.

I am calling this editorial to the attention of my colleagues, the administration, and others who are reflecting on this most recent development in South Vietnam:

BLOODY ROAD TO POWER

If the Communists had overthrown the regime in South Vietnam, murdered its rulers, and launched a day of pillage and destruction, there would have been honor and mourning throughout the capitals of the West. Because this coup was led by Buddhists and the military, there was something close to rejoicing.

This double standard is offensive to the moral principles we profess to be upholding in Vietnam. The odds are heavy that the revolt had the approval, if not the active encouragement, of American officials. The memory of Cuba's Batista is too recent to permit any confidence that this bloody game necessarily produces favorable long-run results.

Viewed in the harsh realism of world power, however, it is probable that our immediate objectives in South Vietnam will proceed with more dispatch. Nevertheless, many Americans will experience the revulsion that sometimes comes when one who's fond of roast beef happens to visit an abattoir.

We are fighting a political war in South Vietnam, and the Diem regime had lost the

support of the people. It was Diem who ousted the playboy Emperor Bao Dai, and defied Ho Chi Minh, the Vietnamese Communist leader. Three years ago, Diem defeated an attempted coup by disgruntled military and civilian elements. He gained from the Parliament the right to rule by decree, which advanced into tyranny. His apparent dedication to the prosecution of the war won the high approval of U.S. military leaders, and our policy became one of standing or falling with Diem.

Recently, however, the diplomatic corps headed by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge came to the conclusion that removal of President Diem was essential to victory. Thereupon began the economic and diplomatic pressures upon him which made it clear to his opponents that a successor regime could have the prompt recognition of the United States. One of these pressures was to stop paying the elite corps which Diem used as a palace guard, and to insist that these troops be used against the Communists.

The smoke has not blown away sufficiently to reveal whether the new regime will have to carry the onus of having been contrived by the United States. It will surely be so labeled by the Communists and by Diem's supporters, too, as Mme. Nhu has already made clear.

Perhaps it should be recalled that we are engaged in Vietnam because of our conviction that our interests would suffer grievously if Communist hegemony were further extended in southeast Asia. But since we took over the burden the French were carrying in Indochina there has been one phenomenal change in the world political outlook.

That is the demonstration, through the growing hostility between Red China and the Soviet Union, that world communism does not necessarily speak with one voice and pursue identical objectives. It is just possible that Bertrand Russell was right all along, and that the ferment in Asia was far more pro-Asian and antiwhite than it was pro-Communist.

It would be a fearful political risk for President Kennedy to speculate out loud on the possibility that we are committing 15,000 troops and a half-billion dollars a year in Vietnam in quest of an unattainable end, namely, nations emotionally committed to Western politicoeconomic ideas.

But if the new regime in Vietnam achieves no more success than the old one against the Vietcong, some fundamental reappraisal will be in order. It is pointless to get so involved in the game that we lose sight of the stakes. And it is self-defeating to grow so avid in advancing our interests that we do not care how dirty our hands get in the process.

To Sell Wheat or Not To Sell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, if it has done nothing more, the proposed sale of wheat to Russia has precipitated a great controversy among those with the greatest interest—the producers.

The following reprint which appeared in the November 5 issue of Wall Street Journal raises some rather pertinent questions:

UNCLE SUCKER?

Many Americans apparently have convinced themselves that no harm will be done by

selling wheat to the Russians at the present time. Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman is said to have discovered through unofficial polls that three out of four farmers favor such sales to the Communists. A lot of other people have dug into public thinking on this, too, and they have discovered that farmers and others favor sales (1) to reduce the surplus, (2) to get some Red money, and (3) because someone else will sell wheat to them anyway, and it might as well be us. All of these are good capitalistic motives * * *. But they do overlook all political consequences of trade with the Communists, and that is dangerous at best, disastrous at worst.

There is at least one farmer we know who hasn't overlooked the political repercussions stemming from wheat sales to the Soviets. Such repercussions occurred amazingly right on his farm on Tuesday, October 1, 1963. That was the day that bread rationing was begun in Moscow. It was the day that Khrushchev made a speech, and it was the day our farmer acquaintance decided to sell his soybeans (not wheat). How all these things got linked together in a way that made our friend fighting mad is something every American farmer should think about.

First of all, the farmer called his local elevator and asked what it was paying for beans. The answer was \$2.48 a bushel. The farmer said, "I'll be right in with a load, and pay my bill, too."

In Moscow, U.S.S.R., about that time, Premier Khrushchev told his people: "If we use bread economically, the resources we have will be sufficient for the normal supply of the population." This word, passed along like lightning to American grain traders, meant to them that U.S. wheat might not be needed at all. It scared them so much, in fact, that those contacted by our friend's country elevator withdrew all their bids on soybeans. By the time our friend got to his elevator, asked for instructions to dump, his elevator wasn't buying any beans at any price. Not one bushel could he sell them. From the time he left his farm to the time he got to town, his market had evaporated.

"Why?" he demanded.

"Khrushchev says he doesn't want our wheat," was the reply.

And so, logically or illogically, depending on how you view it, the supersensitive soybean market momentarily went all to pieces. Our friend trucked his beans home, where he waited for the market to recover. He still wants to sell beans but is not one bit inclined to sell wheat to the Communists.

"It's not that simple," he says. "If we sell them wheat in a regular manner, it would be all right. But every time we do something with those Communists, they make monkeys out of us. They made a monkey out of me on Tuesday. They're making monkeys out of our Government people right now. And the next thing you know, we won't be giving them permission to buy our grain. No, sir, we will be begging them to buy it. And then they will make it look as if they did us a big favor if they take it."

"Khrushchev planned the whole thing. He knew after four crop failures, he couldn't stand a fifth without buying free world grain. He did us the favor of signing a test ban treaty to soften us up. He dangled a wheat dollar in front of us and bought what he needed first in Canada. Next, like a smart buyer, he said he didn't want it anyway. Now, when he permits us to sell him some wheat, we'll let him have it at a 20-percent discount and pay for it like a new car over 18 months. Khrushchev then will effectively have control of our farm markets, and grain dealers will dance at his command. Deal with the Communists? Not me," he said.

What our friend was saying, in other words, is that Communists use economics as a political weapon. Every trade serves a

dual purpose if they can make it do so. If we ignore or take lightly the political consequences of trade with Communist Russia, Uncle Sam will be Uncle Sucker again. It has happened so many, many times. Does it have to happen again?—Drovers Journal (Chicago).

Art Hoppe in England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

or

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, one of our favorite columnists does get around the world and makes noteworthy observations wherever he may be.

I believe the readers of the RECORD will find his comments during a recent visit to England of interest and quite amusing:

WILL OXFORD LOSE ITS FACULTIES?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

OXFORD, ENGLAND.—The Labor Party, which is favored to win next year's elections, is vaguely thinking about abolishing Oxford and Cambridge as the peculiarly British institutions they are and making them into "more normal universities." Like "Oxford Normal" and "Cambridge Normal," I suppose.

So naturally I hustled up here to see what was going to be abolished. And after a day's tour my sympathies lie with the Labor Party. Or at least with the Labor Party official who might have to come up here to abolish the place. I can see him now, a plain-talking Yorkshireman probably, as he marches into the offices, say, of the president of Magdalen College.

Official: "Nice college you've got here, sir. Bit of a shame to see old Magdalen go."

President: "We pronounce it 'Mawdlin,' old boy. And the demies will be sorry to hear of your plans. We've got about 50 now, you know. All topnotch scholars."

Official: "All studying hard in their classrooms now that the Michaelmas term has started, eh?"

President: "'Mikklemuss.' And we don't have classrooms. None of the colleges do, including All Souls. Which doesn't have any students either."

Official: "Odd bit, that. Well, if you'll kindly call the presidents of the colleges together—"

President: "You mean the 21 old colleges, probably; sorry, but only 4 have presidents. Two are run by masters, two by rectors, three by provosts, four by principals, one by a dean and five by warden, including Wadham (pronounced 'Waddum') which is run by the warden of Waddum. Of course that does not include the three new foundations, five permanent private halls, five societies of women students and Nuffield College, which was only founded in 1937 so we haven't figured out yet what it is precisely."

Official: "Now look here, sir; enough of that. We plan to abolish this here university and—"

President: "Oh, the university. You're in the wrong place, old boy. You'll want to see the bedels."

Official: "The beetles?"

President: "Righto. The bedels of the Hebdomadal Council. I suppose you might say they run the university."

Official: "Now we're getting somewhere. We'll have the beetles demolish the colleges and—"

President: "Oh, you can't do that. The university has no control over the colleges. It merely provides lecture halls and laboratories through the faculties, which in turn—"

Official: "Never mind, sir. I've decided to go abolish Cambridge first."

President: "Good. But hold off until they celebrate May Week, won't you? After all, that doesn't come till the middle of June."

So I think Oxford and Cambridge are safe. They have that enduring quality of all British institutions. Which endure, if you ask me, because nobody can understand them well enough to abolish them. Including the British.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 29, 1963]

WE AMERICANS ARE UNQUESTIONABLE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WILTON PARK, ENGLAND.—It's high time I got back to telling you what an international conference is like. And you'd like it. It's a lovely life.

We have breakfast at 8:30; read the newspapers; have tea; attend a 2-hour morning session; eat lunch; chat, stroll, or play tennis; have tea; attend a 2-hour afternoon session; eat dinner; attend a 2-hour evening session; and chat and drink until 11. It's not only pleasant, but stimulating. Because if you've never attended an international conference before, you've got a lot to learn.

Like how to ask questions.

Nothing's more important. You see, they send these truly brilliant experts down from London for each session—ministers, scientists, economists, and the like. The expert opens the session with an hour-long extemporaneous address. And then the warden of Wilton Park, Dr. H. Koeppler, who is kind of our den mother, invites us to ask the expert questions. And while our warden is not only a highly intelligent but very kindly man, he dearly loves us to ask questions. Or else.

Unfortunately, when his eye lights sternly on me, the only question I can think of putting to the expert might be phrased: "What, Lord Curmudgeon, in hell were you talking about?"

This would be very bad form. It's not so much the question. It's the way I put it. The proper method is to begin by telling the expert what you think. Or, more accurately, what a lot of other people think. Like: "There is a considerable body of opinion in East Peoria, Sir Jocelyn, as confirmed by 16 Gallup polls, a WCTU survey, and the entrails of a love-sick sheep, that * * *." And so forth. And if you go on for at least 10 minutes, you can then ask him what the hell he was talking about. Because nobody will be listening. Including the expert. Who will use his turn at the microphone, anyway, to make a point he forgot to make in his speech. Such as the increased egg production in western Oxfordshire.

Of course, how you ask your 10-minute question depends on your nationality. If you are Spanish, you must include a defense of Spain's economic development. The Portuguese are different. They must include a defense of Portugal's colonial policy.

The Italians just get emotional and never, ever mention statistics. The French are precisely the same except they're very belligerent about it. The Germans, on the other hand, must do nothing but cite figures in their 10-minute questions. Which invariably take 20 minutes to ask, due to the length of German verbs and the requirement that any public statement in German must be soporific. As for the British, they don't care what they say as long as they phrase it properly.

That leaves us Americans. Well, we just kind of bumble along, asking brief questions out of naive curiosity and usually unintention-

tinue the tradition of outstanding poetry in the United States. He is a former recipient of the Ford and Amy Lowell Traveling Poetry Fellowships, and besides his teaching at the University of Massachusetts, he is also a poetry editor of the highly regarded Massachusetts Review.

He was recently coeditor with Paul Engle of "Poets Choice" and is considered a leading student of American poetry. But more important than all of the awards he has received is the highly sensitive and meaningful verse that is among the best being produced at this time.

It is a great honor for me to have received permission to insert in the RECORD a complete poem—copyright—by Joseph Langland, which was inspired by hearing 300 children singing in Northampton but the kind of poem, given Langland's unique talent, that could have been written elsewhere. It could not have been written, however, by any other poet:

UPON HEARING 300 CHILDREN SINGING IN JONATHAN EDWARD'S CHURCH, NORTHAMPTON, MARCH 6, 1961

I heard 300 children singing sweetly together,
Cleanly in robes, their bright eyes looking at heaven,
And their voices floating out of their innocent faces
Under the nave, High under the chancel windows
They met the rainbowing sun, and they sang together.
I heard 300 children marching along together
With hearts all gay and their shapely mouths all smiling,
And over and under and through them the great bass organ
Ground out processional laws in the modes of their sermons,
Delivered in chorus before all their mothers and fathers,
Three hundred children, all singing under those shadows,
Admonished the devil, and all in the clearest soprano
Roaming the vales of our tears with a jubilant leisure
Under the stern director. But under the shadows
The pipes blew faintly in the forests beyond their meadows,
Hearing 300 children singing so sweetly together
I remembered that once I was singing, so many together,
And the sanctifications were lost in a fable of Sundays
And fabulous Mondays; and yet I was glad to be chanting
In such casual guises as now I am nevermore singing.
I heard 300 children ascending the hymns and carols
While fathers and mothers sat in the dark rows, smiling,
And thought: how delightful, innocent, charming and proper
It is for our children to sing, who must walk through shadows
And the long long valleys upwards to mothers and fathers.
I heard 300 children communing at decorous alters.
I forget what they sang (maybe something as glossy as morals)
But their faces shone in their songs, and I dreamt that evils
Foregathered among them and stalked around in their singing.
But still they sang on to sons and their sons' generations.

I heard 300 children wound in the wisdom of ages
And all of them cheery about the dark words they were chanting,
Yet clever enough for their words. Oh, their minds so clearly
Moved with the music and sun I forgot they were singing,
Being father and son and grandson and greatgrandfather
Hearing 300 children at play in the heavenly chancels
And 300 children at song in the blossoming meadows
And Adam at morning out walking with Eve by the apples.

Meet Our Medical FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, no group of men and women serve their fellow citizens with greater devotion and more effectively than the officers of the U.S. Public Health Service. These physicians have forsaken the assurances of a remunerative private practice in order to undertake a difficult, sometimes hazardous and always very modestly paid job of fighting epidemics, discovering new cures, and eliminating practices that cause disease. Their reward is the knowledge that each of their successes saves not one life, but often thousands, and the satisfaction that comes from playing a challenging and exhilarating part in the fight against disease.

One aspect of this fight is described in Parents' Magazine this month in a lively and interesting account of the work of the Communicable Disease Center of the Public Health Service entitled, "Meet Our Medical FBI." The article is adapted from the book "To Save Your Life," a selection of the Junior Literary Guild, authored by Natalie Davis Spingarn, executive assistant to the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut, ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.

Mrs. Spingarn's article will interest adults as well as youngsters and will also give foreign readers understanding of the zeal, dedication, and concern for fellow men that makes the Public Health Service exemplify the finest traditions of our Government and of our people. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

MEET OUR MEDICAL FBI: THEY ARE THE SLEUTHS FROM ATLANTA WHO FIGHT EPIDEMICS FROM COAST TO COAST

(By Natalie Davis Spingarn)

There were over 100 cases of infectious hepatitis—inflammation of the liver—in Clearfield County, Pa. Most of the sick were children and young adults. They lay abed feeling awful—tired, weak, fevered, achey. They suffered loss of appetite, nausea, vomiting, and sore stomach. Some passed brown urine and whitish or grayish stools. Some itched uncomfortably all over. All had yellowed skin or jaundice.

To make matters worse, local health authorities didn't know whether the disease was being spread from person to person or whether it was caused by a common source and, if so, what the source was.

Some epidemic diseases—like diphtheria outbreaks—may be fairly simple to find and deal with. But when a mysterious epidemic breaks out or an obscure disease baffles local health people, our national "disease detectives," headquartered at Atlanta, get a quick emergency call.

What the FBI is to crime, the Communicable Disease Center of Atlanta, Ga., is to epidemics. The Center, which is part of the U.S. Public Health Service, helps track down and stamp out outbreaks of disease wherever they erupt. Its importance may be measured by the fact that 1 out of every 4 deaths among people under 35 years of age in our country is due to a communicable disease. Each year about a million and a half cases of notifiable diseases are recorded, but perhaps five times that many are not.

The job of the 1,500 men and women at the Communicable Disease Center is not so much to treat disease—though they sometimes do—as to help the States (and other parts of the world, too) fight disease. In battling an epidemic, for example, CDC tries to find its pattern—which groups in the community it is striking, for example. From these clues, the CDC recommends ways to stop it.

When the cause of the epidemic is obscure, the Center's experts function as real "private eyes" as they look for the culprits in medical whodunits—or whatdunits.

When the hepatitis epidemic struck Clearfield County, for example, the Communicable Disease Center's Epidemic Intelligence Center got an emergency call. The Center, in turn, contacted one of their "disease detectives," Dr. James Mosely, who was especially knowledgeable about hepatitis, to determine what was causing the yellow faces in Pennsylvania.

Just 48 hours after the S O S from Atlanta, Dr. Mosely and his wife, Ann, arrived in Clearfield, which was to be their home for 3 months.

It was late March. The hepatitis epidemic was taking its toll in a town of 3,000 in which the disease was concentrated. There were no clues as to what had caused the hepatitis which made these young people look and feel so miserable. But Dr. Mosely was trained to find out and he set out swiftly to do so.

His first stop was the county health department offices in Clearfield. Here he met the clerk, five nurses and the county health officer he would be working with most closely. They were pleased to see him; the doctor who was county health officer had responsibility for the health of a dozen towns and for his own family, some of whom were sick with hepatitis.

To begin with, Dr. Mosely decided on interviews and complete questionnaires for everybody in families in which someone was sick. At the same time, he ordered gamma globulin shots for all people who had been in contact with sick patients who had not already had such shots. In that way, he hoped to curb the epidemic while trying to find out what caused it.

Early that afternoon Dr. Mosely visited the school nurse, the first person in town to suspect an epidemic.

"I first decided this was an epidemic of some kind early this month," she told the doctor. "You see, I'm in charge of the health of the youngsters not only at this school but at all five schools in town." A good many youngsters had come to her office with fevers, chills, and upset stomachs. At first she had thought it was gripe or a virus. But then her own son had become ill.

"I sent him home and put him to bed. Four or five days later his skin had turned yellow, and the whites of his eyes had a sort

of yellow tinge. In my office, I heard about others who had the same symptoms. I called the county health department. We've got an epidemic of yellow jaundice on our hands, I told them. All the local doctors had been phoning to tell them the same thing. So they called the State health officials, who, I gather, called you."

She drew out a map she had made of the town. At the site of each house where there was a patient sick with hepatitis she had made a cross with a red pencil.

To Dr. Mosely, this was a first clue. On the eastern side of town, the crosses were thick; there were only scattered crosses elsewhere. This meant the disease was centered in one part of town. It was unlikely, he felt, that the source of the epidemic was something the whole town was eating or drinking.

Two weeks later, Dr. Mosely studied a larger, more complex version of the map the school nurse had given him. The red crosses at the site of each hepatitis case had been changed to black pins, and there were 129 of them stuck in the map—mostly still on the east side of town. But there were some pins scattered in the west and even outside of town.

During the preceding 2 weeks, Dr. Mosely had been to see everyone in town who was in any way associated with the epidemic—doctors, patients, nurses, the superintendent of schools. He had gathered all the information he needed.

"The fact that there have been no new cases reported for 3 whole days settles one thing in my mind," Dr. Mosely reported. "The sick people got hepatitis from a common source—from one thing or place—probably not from each other." When an epidemic of hepatitis is spread from person to person, through close contact, the epidemic lasts about 6 months. That's because the disease has an incubation period of about a month. In other words it takes a month for a person to get sick after he's been exposed. So the disease is spread out over a longer period than when everyone is exposed to the germs simultaneously.

In addition to the time factor, there were other clues. There was the age factor: the disease had chosen as its victims mostly high-school youngsters and young adults. When germs are spread from person to person, most of the victims are young children who catch things easily. And there was also the geographic factor: the people who were sick outside of town were all children who came there to school and grownups who came to work. But most cases were actually in town and on the east side, as the nurse's map told the doctor his first day on the job.

All clues, therefore, pointed to the epidemic coming from one source. To find that source, however, was a complicated problem.

The water supply had been considered at first. But the town had only one large reservoir for drinking water. When it was tested, it showed no trace of contamination. What's more, if the reservoir water had caused the epidemic, it would have been more scattered. As for food, there had been no common place where all the sick people had eaten. Most people ate at home, not in restaurants. Milk and canned foods were also investigated. But the sick people drank milk from all three dairies in town, not just one. And they had eaten no one canned or bottled food.

The source of the epidemic, Dr. Mosely concluded, had to be a common gathering, such as the district wrestling meet which attracted the right age group, or the monthly basketball games. But not enough sick people had attended any of these functions.

It suddenly occurred to Dr. Mosely that the sick people were at the age for going to the movies—and there was just one movie house in town.

At this point, things began to move fast. Dr. Mosely called the sanitary engineer who was responsible for the local water system. The engineer and his assistant accompanied the doctor to the theater. When Dr. Mosely sighted a water fountain, he asked the manager where the plumbing for it was. If there was a cross connection, a place where the fresh water and sewage pipes crossed, they might really be on their way to finding whatfunit. There was.

Back in the office, Dr. Mosely asked the district engineer for an approved map of the sanitary and water supply systems. He studied it a few minutes, then let out a low whistle.

He had considered the water supply as a possible epidemic source at the very beginning, but dropped the idea when he learned the whole town drank from one reservoir and most of the sickness was on one side of town. Now he saw that in the hills above the town were two springs he had never heard of, and from these springs ran a fresh water supply pipe no one had told him about—right into the east side of town where the epidemic centered and where the movie theater was.

Up above and parallel to the town was a pretty little stream near an underground spring which fed the pipeline to town. The municipal water system was privately owned and the previous summer the owner had gotten complaints from his customers on the other side of the hill that they didn't have enough water pressure in their faucets. So he simply ran a pipe from the little stream into the main pipeline. If a surface stream is used for water supply, it should be chlorinated. But no one had been up to check on the spring for 5 years; it was no wonder that the spring house, which should have been watertight, was broken down and leaking.

What's more, the man who owned the water system also owned a summer cabin right below another spring which was supposed to be cut off and opened only in emergencies such as fire. But he needed more water for his cabin. So he had opened the cutoff.

The water from this spring, then, was also running into the main pipeline. And up the dirt road were houses which emptied their septic or sewage tanks right across an open field into the spring. In January a man who lived in one of those houses had come down sick with hepatitis. A girl who lived in another house had gotten it in February. So their sickness had spread through the spring, through the wrongly opened cutoff, to the whole eastern side of town.

As a result of this revelation, the pipeline was overhauled and brought up to proper health standards, and the source of the disease eliminated.

There are many other dramatic instances of the quick work done by the Center's disease detectives.

A team from the Communicable Disease Center and Baylor University, for example, rushed off to British Guiana shortly before Christmas last year to fight a polio epidemic. By setting up mass immunization clinics and assisting in essential vaccine administration, the group scored a double success. Not only did they stamp out the epidemic, but they also did much to counter anti-American propaganda in British Guiana.

And a year ago last summer, CDC's investigators went to St. Petersburg, Fla., to aid the local and State health authorities in controlling an epidemic of encephalitis in the Tampa Bay area. Scientists suspected a mosquito known as *Culex nigripalpus*, which was common in this area. After exhaustive tests, it was found that this mosquito was indeed carrying the virus of St. Louis encephalitis. This made possible a mosquito control program, specifically di-

rected toward the control of this particular species and eradication of the disease.

Again, a mysterious ailment struck down 43 young school children in a small southern town. *Psittacosis* was suspected because the children's classrooms each contained a pair of parakeets. But the blood samples which were taken during the investigation by a team of Communicable Disease Center investigators, proved the disease to be histoplasmosis, a lung fungus disease which resemble tuberculosis, and which is transmitted by pores which form in dust. Here, too, tracking down the cause of disease was the essential first step to its treatment and cure.

The Communicable Disease Center is an arm of the Public Health Service, which is a vast enterprise geared to keep disease from happening and from spreading if it does appear. Its workers strive to keep as many people as possible in as good health as possible, for as long as possible.

Through such agencies as the Communicable Disease Center, and its fast-moving, fast-thinking detectives, the Public Health Service is able to offer services that individual doctors cannot. Contagious diseases can spread like brush fires unless there are skilled people on guard to find them, then stamp them out. Your medical FBI is your family's partner in a vast health enterprise whose mission is simply stated—to advance the health of all of us.

The Lady Is for Burning: The Seven Deadly Sins of Madam Nhu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article, appearing in the last issue of the *National Review*, is written by our former colleague, Clare Boothe Luce.

The article on Madam Nhu is one of the most interesting pieces on the lady to appear in our press. Mrs. Luce has done considerable research into the questions she discusses. She has courage enough to state her views and she has intelligence enough to back them up with reason and logic. She also unveils some of our own hypocrisy and the better-than-thou attitude of some in high places:

THE LADY IS FOR BURNING: THE SEVEN DEADLY SINS OF MADAM NHU

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

Madam Ngo Dinh Nhu, the First Lady of Vietnam, who recently left our shores, is beautiful, dynamic, courageous, intelligent. And even her worst enemies do not doubt her piety or virtue. A militant Catholic, mother of four, she is a devoted and fiercely loyal (if not subservient) wife. But what makes Madam Nhu important is the great political power she wields in her country. For a moment, however brief, in history, some part of America's prestige if not security, seems to lie in the pale pink palm of her exquisite little hand.

South Vietnam, although an underpopulated country (14 million), is the latest spot in America's 17-year-old struggle to contain communism. The United States is spending better than a million dollars a day there to help the Vietnamese fight a guerrilla war.

If this war is lost Asiatic communism, in the end, must gain all of Indochina.

The purpose of Madam Nhu's visit to the United States was to convince her American hearers that her country is winning that war, but will probably lose it if she and her family are undermined and thrown to the left-wing wolves. What seems to be happening to the government in Vietnam is remarkably like what happened to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and Madam Chiang in China when the Department of State pulled the rug out from under them, and Mao Tse-tung took over China.

Madam Nhu's tour drew large crowds. But it proved somewhat less than triumphal. She was booed and hissed in her passings. And her TV interlocutors and lecture audiences (already prejudiced against her by U.S. press dispatches from far off Saigon) threw the heaviest barrage of loaded, discourteous, even insulting questions at her that have ever been addressed to a distinguished foreign figure—and an ally. By comparison, Khrushchev on his American visits had been treated like a public hero.

What is the case against this fragile little creature who has been so scornfully dubbed "the Dragon Lady"? Why was she treated as though she were a vicious enemy of our country? Why did President Kennedy slam the White House door in her pretty face, while he ordered the brass handles polished to the nines for Communist Tito's visit? Why has he ordered that shipments of surplus milk to the children of her country—our allies—be curtailed while he presses hard for shipments of wheat to Khrushchev, who still threatens to bury us?

What are the sins of Madam Nhu? Upon examination, they seem to be seven:

1. Madam Nhu and her family represent, according to their American critics in Saigon, a principle which is utterly abhorrent to all true lovers of democracy: the principle of family rule, or nepotism.

Madam Nhu's only official positions are those of deputy in the National Assembly and chief of South Vietnam's women's movements. But her husband, Ngo Dinh Nhu, controls intelligence and the secret police, and is personal adviser and political theoretician to his brother, President Ngo Dinh Diem. Her other brother-in-law is Ngo Dinh Thuc, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Hue.

To be sure, President Kennedy appointed his brother, Robert, Attorney General (even though Bobby had never tried a case.) And this powerful post put Bobby in control of our secret police—the FBI. Mr. Kennedy also engineered the election of his 31-year-old brother, Teddy, to the Senate. He made his brother-in-law, Sargent Shriver, Director of the multimillion-dollar Peace Corps program (and perhaps hopes to make him governor of Illinois). Another brother-in-law, Stephen Smith, has handled White House patronage and other sensitive affairs of the party—in the interests of the Kennedys. The President has, of course, found ornamental government missions for his sisters and other relatives.

Still, in America, that's democracy. But not in Vietnam. Not, anyway, on our money.

2. American newspapermen in Saigon view Madam Nhu as a political demagog who controls all the election machinery in her own district. They say she stole her last election as deputy by promising "to do more" for her constituents than any other candidate, because she was related to the President. The proof that her election was undemocratic, they claim, is that she got over 90 percent of the vote—and delivered on her promise: her constituents do get more than other Vietnamese voters and taxpayers.

NEPOTISM EAST AND WEST

Now, to be sure, a thing like that can happen here—it happened just a year ago, right in Massachusetts. And now Senator Ted

Kennedy is delivering a \$50 million electronic research center to his constituents who are also hopeful on the score of profitable railroad and airline mergers.

Still, in America, that's democracy. But not in Vietnam. Not, anyway, on our money.

3. Madam Nhu's American critics feel she is a religious bigot. She not only insists on practicing what her Christian church teaches, but she tries to have the law of her country reflect Christian morals on sex. She has put through laws against concubinage, prostitution, and adultery. She has made divorce unattainable, except by Government permission. Her country is greatly underpopulated and is suffering thousands of war casualties: she has banned contraceptives. She has, the press reports, some mad idea that she can preserve the ancient, chaste, Vietnamese pattern of courtship. She has fought against the entrance of Hollywood films of sex and violence, and foreign pornographic literature. And—could you ask for better proof of her bigotry—she frowns on the twist and bikinis.

It is even rumored among Americans in the "twist-easies" which have sprung up in Saigon on protest against this Asiatic blue-stocking that she disapproves of Liz Taylor films, on the totally undemocratic grounds that young Vietnamese girls have not yet learned to envy and admire our American goddess' habit of breaking up homes and living publicly with others' husbands.

Now, Vietnam may be Madam Nhu's country, but democracy has just got to make room for things like that. That's what the American taxpayer is shelling out a million dollars a day to defend in Vietnam. (Or is it?)

4. The U.S. press corps in Saigon seem to agree to a man that Madam Nhu has too much political power for a woman—especially one with no official position. Time says she not only has her husband's ear, but she openly orders around cabinet ministers and generals, sees to it that her favorites get jobs in government, and at all times around the clock, she is up to her neck in political wangling.

Being a mere 5 feet tall in her 3-inch heels, she has still not had an eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation with Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. But that gallant gentleman has drawn himself up to his full 6 feet 3 inches and is waiting for her return to slug it out with her.

To be sure, we have had our Eleanor Roosevelt, a President's wife who for 25 years exerted more influence over the domestic and foreign politics of her country than any woman who wasn't a crowned ruler. Indeed, she was once known to have ordered up a whole squad of planes during the war to pay a visit to some favorite soldier friends in the Pacific. And, like Madam Nhu, she also helped to select candidates for office who reflected her views. Again like Madam Nhu, she often took a beating from pressmen who thought she meddled and was too ubiquitous.

BUT IN AMERICA—

But in America, that's democracy. The American press wants no such power in a woman's hands in Vietnam. Not, anyway, on our money.

Moreover, Madam Nhu is an inveterate do-gooder, and a feminist. She has tried to raise the legal status of women in her country, and interest them in taking an active part in politics and in the defense of their country. For example, Madam Nhu has taught Vietnamese women to shoot—the condition, that they must stand by unarmed when a village is attacked by Communist guerrillas, but ready to pick up the gun of a fallen, or absconding, Vietnamese man.

Madam Nhu, it seems, offends both Western and Asiatic male sensibilities, not only because she herself is not the geisha type, the concubine type of the clinging vine type, but because she seems to want the 7 million women of her new-born, embattled nation to

behave like the kind of women who went out of style a hundred or more years ago—the pioneer women of America. It seems she has heard about our foremothers who helped their men conquer the oceans and the continent, and who were as quick on the draw as their menfolk when scalping parties suddenly put in an appearance. She seems to have heard somewhere of Molly Pitcher, Annie Oakley, and Joan of Arc. (Boy, is this lady for burning.)

To be sure, in America, we have ourselves in recent months turned a thought or two to the question of giving a break to American women.

The Commission headed by the late Mrs. Roosevelt on the Status of Women, has just turned in its report to the President. It shows that while 24 million American women work for wages, they are not paid equal wages for equal work. It shows that there are only 234 women among the States' 7,700 legislators; 11 Congresswomen out of 435, and 2 women Senators out of a hundred. Only two women have held Cabinet rank in all American history. In releasing the report, President Kennedy urged that more women participate at all levels in public life. In America, we want progress for our women. But not for women of Vietnam. Not, anyway, on our money.

5. The family rule of the Ngo Dinhhs, according to their American critics, does not have the full support of the people of South Vietnam. Although there is no Gallup poll in Vietnam, it seems that there is a newspaper in Saigon which lays on to Madam Nhu, her husband, and President Diem quite unmercifully. This paper says the Nhush must go, and hints quite broadly that a coup d'etat or a revolution would be the most democratic way of getting rid of the lot. Why wait for elections?

This highly democratic view seems to be shared by some of the U.S. pressmen who pop in and out of Saigon en route to Hong Kong. And it is also shared by some coup-minded officials of the U.S. Embassy.

THE ELECTORATE AND THE PRESS

While this antigovernment press is not suppressed, Madam Nhu makes it plain that she doesn't like the situation. As for the Embassy, she feels that it is pretty stupid of the United States to try to throw out an anti-Communist government when all they can substitute is a military (and unreliable) dictatorship.

Madam Nhu's American critics say all this shows that she is, at heart, a tyrant and that any foreign government without the full support of all the people and the press should be kicked out.

Now, the American electorate is far from 100 percent for President Kennedy. Indeed, he got just a fraction less than 50 percent of the vote in 1960 * * * and there were even rumors he didn't get that. Nor is the press entirely for him. In fact, a lot of it is against him—and even more against his family—and quite a lot of Americans happen to agree with Madam Nhu, who thinks he is lulling the United States into a false sense of security about the Communists.

However, this is America and we don't talk about coups and overthrowing elected governments. We believe in a democracy. You should wait for elections. But in Vietnam it's different. Why not help overthrow the Diem government in order to get rid of Madam Nhu. Isn't it our money?

Two additional charges (6 and 7) remain against Madam Nhu. They are indeed serious: First, that she has pressured the Diem government into persecuting the Buddhist religion; second, that her stubborn refusal to come to terms with the Buddhists has "hopelessly" compromised the Vietnamese war effort.

How well founded are these charges? And if well founded, what will happen in Vietnam if the Nhush and President Diem are

booted out? For there can be little doubt that the big boot will have to be used, since Madam Nhu, among other things, is a fighting lady.

Not long ago Madam Nhu said that Americans are "Ivanhoses" who are perpetually in love with the underdog, but confused about who the underdog really is. She thinks the underdogs that the U.S. press corps in Vietnam and the State Department are sobbing over are the Vietcong Communist provocateurs who have inflamed some Buddhist opinion. Madam Nhu believes she herself is the real underdog in the situation. Certainly the china doll-sized stateswoman from South Vietnam has been taking enough punishment from the American press to smash her into a tiny heap of porcelain scraps. Fortunately for her, and possibly for her country, Madam Nhu is not a china doll. Backhanded by the State Department, bullied and scratched at by reporters, lectured at by her own lecture audiences, Madam Nhu travels along singing her song. Chin up, eyes flashing, long delicate hands gesticulating gracefully and forcefully, she is still pretty solid on her 3-inch heels.

The charge that Madam Nhu, her husband, her brothers-in-law President Ngo Dinh Diem and Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc, have "persecuted" South Vietnamese Buddhists is certainly the toughest charge she has had to meet. But meet it she did. And meet it she must, for her fellow Catholic President Kennedy does not intend to face into the 1964 election campaign defending himself against accusations from the liberal left that he has supported a government just because it is Catholic. He can better afford to lose Vietnam than to have that calumny tied to him.

THE CHARGE OF PERSECUTION

The fact is that the charge of religious persecution against the family is pretty recent. And if indeed they are persecuting Buddhists this will mark the first time in democratic history that a small religious minority has successfully persecuted an overwhelming religious majority in a democracy.

South Vietnam Catholics number 1.5 million of the 14 million population. There are approximately 5.25 million Buddhists and the remainder of the population is made up of Taoists, Confucianists, and members of other sects. Less than one-third of the Cabinet members are Catholics; only 3 of the 19 generals. But Catholics are about half of the civil service and the Assembly. The reason for this, given and accepted until a few months ago by all foreign observers in Vietnam, is that the Catholics under the French built an extensive parochial school system. Over the years this system has turned out relatively well-educated graduates with a lively interest in Western democratic government. The Buddhists have not been able to compete with these educated Catholic Vietnamese in civil service examinations. Until last May, there was no evidence of great discontent with the Diem government by the Buddhist population. On the contrary, thanks to the annual \$350 million economic and military aid, and with the help of 14,000 U.S. military "advisers," victory, last spring, seemed near for the Diem government, and the people seemed to know it.

Then, in the space of 5 months the flaming deaths of six Buddhist bonzes, or priests, led to a series of public demonstrations which brought about the present political crisis in which Madam Nhu herself is also being badly burned.

FORCED TO "LOSE FACE"

How did these deaths come about? Were the Buddhist priests dragged by force from their homes or temples by Catholics and put to the torch—as in the not so distant past in America, Negroes were torn from their homes, or jails, and lynched or burned—by white Americans? Were the bonzes butchered

as were thousands of Mao Tse-tung's recalcitrant Chinese farmers? Were they tortured, beaten, brainwashed, shot, liquidated as millions of Russians, Poles, Hungarians were by Stalin and Khrushchev?

They were not. The saffron-robed monks were living unmolested by anyone in their own pagodas, when one by one they stole forth into public squares, where they squatted in lotus pose, poured gasoline over themselves, applied the match, and committed suicide.

In America, if a Catholic priest were to burn himself to death in protest to the Government's failure to provide free bus rides for parochial schoolchildren, or if a Protestant minister were to make of himself a living torch to express his opposition to the Supreme Court decision against prayer in public schools, we would consider them religious maniacs. And our Government would take stringent measures to prevent any repetition of such acts. This is precisely the view Madam Nhu has taken of the self-immolating bonzes. They are slaves, she said, "if not to others, at least to their own folly." And the government of President Diem has used the police force to prevent further emulations of such follies. What, then, was the particular grievance which led these Buddhists to encompass their own cremation?

Last May, the Buddhists of Hue were forbidden to unfurl their flags, in honor of Buddha's 2507th birthday, above the flag of Vietnam. As in America, no flag in Vietnam may fly above the national flag. (In this land of many religions, separation of church and state is, of necessity, the law of the nation.) Refusal by Diem's government to permit the Buddhists to fly their flag above the national flag caused the leaders of the Hue pagoda to lose face.

In America, self-immolation is not thought to be a useful or particularly democratic way to protest grievances or discrimination. However, an insult which might barely cause one American to punch another, could, say in Japan, lead to *hara-kiri*. A Japanese who loses face disembowels himself with a ritual sword, often aided by a friend or a relative. In India, for hundreds of years, widows threw themselves onto the funeral pyres of their husbands; if they did not, they lost face. Although *suttee* has been outlawed for a century in India, in backward villages it is still occasionally practiced.

NIRVANA ATTAINED

The Buddhist monks in Vietnam who incinerated themselves not only regained "face" for the temple, but Nirvana or Paradise and sainthood for themselves. For at least three of the monks who were over age 70, this must have seemed a rather good deal.

(Probably no American can understand the Asiatic concept of "face." This is perhaps fortunate. In view of how much "face" the United States has lost in the Orient, we would have to burn Washington to recover it.)

In our country, protestors sign petitions, picket, hire halls or rabble-rouse. Recently our Negroes (a minority) have taken to sit-ins, sit-downs, mass demonstrations, handcuffing themselves together, until the police break them up.

While we are on the subject of discrimination, it may help us to think a little more charitably about President Diem's and Madam Nhu's alleged persecution of the Buddhists, if we remember that despite 4 years of mass Negro demonstrations in America, the President still has not found it convenient to appoint a Negro to his Cabinet, to help elect a Negro Senator, or Governor, or even a big city mayor. And yet Negroes represent 20 percent of our population, and time and again their vote decides presidential elections.

In America, it depends on what you can get away with. But not so in Vietnam. Not,

anyway, on our money. In Vietnam you have to be perfect.

Consequent to the Buddhist sacrifices, there have been, since May, a half-dozen demonstrations of Buddhists in the streets. In the attempt to keep order, the Vietnam police have encountered the same difficulties our police have encountered with unruly crowds of demonstrators in Alabama, Chicago, New York's Harlem, New Jersey. And in Vietnam as in America, some people got hurt. A bomb thrown by an unknown provocateur killed several people in Vietnam. U.S. Embassy officers expressed themselves as being "shocked and disgusted" at this occurrence and at the police suppression of the Buddhist demonstrators.

The State Department no doubt failed to inform our Embassy in Saigon that similar episodes were happening in Alabama, where four children were killed in a church bombing, and in the wake, two boys were killed by police. Nor did they send out over the Voice of America to Vietnam a very clear account of riots and police methods used to quell Negro-white rioters in other parts of the country.

And speaking of corruption in Vietnam, what about the Cosa Nostra operation in America? Ah, well, in America, democracy isn't perfect. But in Vietnam it had better be—on our money.

The last charge against Mme. Nhu and the Diem government is that their failure to be an ideal democracy which their American critics carry about in their heads—will now make it impossible to win the war against the Vietcong Communists.

Is this true, or is it false? Vietnam has been at war for almost a decade. The South Vietnam population is suffering 5,000 casualties a year. Women and men, many of them Buddhists, have gone forth day after day, year after year, to meet and repulse their Communist enemies. A few months ago victory was in sight. If the United States gives firm support to Diem now, the crisis will pass and the war may still be won. If the U.S. support is withdrawn on the grounds that the United States can no longer support the Diem government because 6 men—or 16—insist on making human torches of themselves, then South Vietnam will fall and the political vacuum left by the Ngo Dinh family will soon be filled by the "Yu-No-Hu" family: the Chinese Communists.

Is the history of the liberal press in Chungking and Havana going to repeat itself? The evidence is that it is.

The Christian Science Monitor wrote last week: "The confusion (in American public opinion) stems from the fact that the United States does not wish to say, in so many words, that it is working for a revolution in South Vietnam. But so long as the Ngo Dinh family remains unbending, that is the fact."

If indeed, that is the fact, the administration will no doubt begin to boast along about 1965 that it has relieved tensions in Vietnam by negotiating peace with Ho Chi-minh, the Communist leader of that country. And no doubt wheat and arms will then soon be sent to him, to strengthen "the Vietnamese Tito" against Red China.

Poor Madam Nhu. The lady is sure for burning.

Some Call It Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Tom Pugh, the Peoria-Journal Star's man in

Whereas there are others to follow with the details on how contracts are let and how payments for research are made, let us briefly consider the subject in broad terms.

Ours is a capitalistic society, and we feel very strongly that the capitalistic system is responsible for our unquestioned strength. The profit motive must continue to operate, as it has so well in the past, to provide the incentive and the reward to those whose genius and labor contribute to the common good.

We are spending more and more money for research every day, but the rules are changing. The systems that are used to contract for research, or to repay research costs on independently produced items, are constantly being modified to meet new conditions, to improve them and to make them more responsive to the needs and demands of the situation.

The whole fabric of our society, the most successful yet devised by man we believe, is woven of the warp of individual and collective integrity and the woof of conflicting interests justly compromised—of checks, and balances, and safeguards.

Whereas the Communist theory is, "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs," we question who is to decide those abilities and those needs.

We know that man is imperfect—he is improvable, and capable of great sacrifice and achievement—but he should never be allowed too much uncontrolled power. As the old Romans put it "quis custodiet ipso custodiet"—"who shall guard the guards?"

In the realm of payment for research for military applications, a similar system of justly compromised conflicts of interest—of checks and balances and safeguards—needs also to apply. This system is still being perfected. It is a complicated problem, and every legitimate interest must be justly served.

I believe our present strength is ample evidence of past success. I have some personal knowledge of this since not too long ago I served in the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics as Assistant Chief for Research and Development.

As fleet commander of the 7th Fleet recently, I was a consumer of our own products, and so my evaluation of necessity had some degree of objectivity.

Now I am back on the producer side of the house, and as part of my catching up with what has gone on while I was happily employed as an operator, I have been refreshing myself on developments in the field of procurement. In so doing I came across two qualifications which I thought might add substance to my rather general remarks on this subject.

The Armed Services Procurement Regulation issued by the Department of Defense, in the revision issued on August 15 this year, has this to say about profits: " * * * low average profit rates on defense contracts overall are detrimental to the public interest. Effective national defense in a free enterprise economy requires that the best * * * capabilities be attracted to defense contracts."

Another portion of the regulation sets forth the following specific policy for research and development:

"A fundamental mission of research and development programs is to maintain scientific and technological superiority requisite to promote and advance the effectiveness of military operations. The accomplishment of this mission requires the broadest possible base of contractor and subcontractor sources including the optimum use of manpower and resources. It is essential that the best technical competence be located and fully utilized. The departments shall continually search for and develop information on sources (including small business concerns) competent to perform research and development."

Of course these aren't the only considerations. The interest of the Government must be protected—that is profits should not be too high. And the interest of the consumer must be protected—that is performance must be assured. But within those obvious limitations, our free and competitive society must be served.

As the Chief of Naval Material, I am vitally concerned with supporting the commendable philosophy embodied in those two quotations.

It is certainly an honor and a pleasure to be with you here today.

I wish you the greatest success in your endeavors here in the clinic.

What Does Vietnam Coup Mean?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, there is great concern in the United States over the coup in Vietnam, which had the approval of President Kennedy.

In yesterday's Washington Evening Star, William S. White gives us his analysis of the seriousness of the situation.

WILL THE COUP AID WAR ON REDS?

(By William S. White)

A long night of worry for the future in South Vietnam has settled in for high American policymakers. If any jubilation was initially felt here among junior officials at the destruction of the government of Ngo Dinh Diem—with which Washington had long been having trouble—nothing of that sort is anywhere discernible now.

Instead, there is a morning-after mood. In part, this is produced by genuine regret at the assassination of a man our people would, in fact, have liked to see remain in power if only he would have got rid of his erratic brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu. Ironically, American Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge had prepared a cable reporting that Mr. Diem seemed to be moving a bit more our way on the very day the insurrection was mounted.

In larger part, however, the air of concern is caused by these new fears:

1. That "super patriots" attached to the revolution of the 20 generals which deposed Mr. Diem may go on killing and thus further stain the new regime and raise questions of its capacity to govern in decency.

2. That one or two among the generals might conceivably not be so reliably anti-Communist as the great majority is, and so begin what above all else is to be feared. This is some under-the-cover negotiation with the Communist invaders of South Vietnam so long fought off by the Diem government backed by 15,000 American troops.

3. That the new provisional government of the generals, with Nguyen Ngoc Tho as provisional President, might become politically ambitious rather than solely concerned with the war against the Communists.

TWO U.S. HOPES

Mixed with all this are two strong American hopes. One is that there may now be an end to the exploitation of religious differences in Vietnam—no more talk of who is a Catholic and who is a Buddhist. Mr. Diem, himself a Christian, was endlessly accused of unduly repressive action against the Buddhists. It was this charge that brought him down. Most of the generals of his staff—Christian as well as Buddhist—became convinced that religious turmoil—no matter

who was to blame for it—was endangering the war. In this connection, some comfort is taken officially here in the fact that all three of the top Catholic generals joined in the uprising.

The second American hope is that the new regime will be in no hurry to order popular elections. Washington is not interested in seeing a political campaign, with all its in-built divisiveness to a country at war, sweep over Vietnam. The United States would be quite content to see the new outfit maintain its provisional character—with power diffused among the generals. For Mr. Diem's fate established the inherent danger of having all power concentrated in one or two pairs of hands as it was with Mr. Diem and Mr. Nhu.

WILL WAR EFFORT BE AIDED?

But all this is mere prelude to the crucial question: Will the war against the Communists now be promoted or retarded? If it is promoted all, of course, will be well. If it becomes bogged down by disunity in Saigon, twin disaster will lie ahead.

Any failure of the American military effort there would not only lay all southeast Asia open to creeping Communist aggression. It also would bankrupt a wise American strategy to halt such aggressions by limited commitments of our own forces cooperating with full commitments of local forces. The alternatives to this policy would be to submit to local aggressions or to face major war on the Korean scale—or beyond.

Moreover, a collapse in South Vietnam could quite simply, destroy the Kennedy administration. Careful and persistent inquiries have convinced me, for one, that the United States neither ordered nor directly participated in the bloody ouster of Mr. Diem. But nothing can alter the fact that Washington long had been deliberately shaking his regime—not to smash it, but in the hope of thus forcing him to make accommodations with his Buddhist-led opposition to permit the war to go full tilt. Since America has helped, if indirectly, to push him down, the administration's responsibility will be frightful if the new regime ever abandons the war on communism.

J.F.K. on Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Post of Tuesday, November 5, 1963, entitled "J.F.K. on Price Fixing," in which President Kennedy rather clearly pointed out the probability of a Presidential veto for this most destructive legislation.

In view of the President's comments it would appear well for the Congress to devote itself to more fruitful and useful legislation which will not wind up a wreck on the rocks of a Presidential veto.

The article follows:

J.F.K. ON PRICE FIXING

The proponents of the so-called "Quality Stabilization Act," a bill which would diminish competition in retail trade through the Federal enforcement of resale-price agreements between manufacturers and retailers, derived little comfort from the re-

marks made by President Kennedy at his last press conference.

When asked about his position on the bill which is opposed by all departments of the executive branch, the President replied:

"I've never been for the quality stabilization bill. I have to look at the bill when it finally comes in the form it's in. I quite obviously can't comment on legislation before it finally comes to the desk of the White House, but the administration witnesses have spoken my view."

The President's reluctance to comment in greater detail was doubtless prompted by the fact that a number of leading members of his own party have been so foolhardy as to sponsor legislation which would infringe upon the right of the retailer to set prices at competitive levels. The bill would saddle the American consumers with an enormous burden.

With a backlog of unfinished business that runs the gamut from the budget for the current fiscal year to tax reduction and civil rights legislation, Congress should not waste precious time on a bill which so clearly violates the spirit of free enterprise and stands so small a chance of Presidential approval. Time will be saved and embarrassment avoided if the Quality Stabilization Act is allowed to die stillborn.

National Day of Fast and Prayer To Protest Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Dr. Julius G. Neumann, chairman of the board of governors of the National Information Bureau of Jewish Life, Inc., of which I am honorary president, has just concluded a one-man 3-day fast to dramatize to America the oppression, persecution, and tyranny of the Soviet Union toward Russia's 3 million Jews. An extension of Rabbi Neumann's protest is planned for Monday, November 25, when a national day of fast and prayer will be observed to protest Soviet anti-Semitism.

Having made numerous and serious efforts to bring this situation to the attention of the administration and the American people, I am pleased to insert in the Record the statement made by Rabbi Neumann at the conclusion of his dramatic protest:

NATIONAL DAY OF FAST AND PRAYER TO PROTEST SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

As pledged and in all accord with rabbinical teachings, I have concluded an individual 3-day fast. I abstained from food and drink on Monday, October 28; Thursday, October 31 and Monday, November 4 as a protest against Soviet anti-Semitism and to dramatize to all Americans the tragic plight of Russian Jewry.

For Americans of all faiths to know—that persons are being condemned to death and executed for minor economic offenses, charged with committing criminal acts if they sell matzo's, that kosher meat is not available, that Yiddish books may not be printed, and that Jewish dead may not be buried in a Jewish cemetery; to learn—that in the Soviet Union synagogues are closed,

prayer books and religious articles are unavailable; Jewish instruction banned; Yiddish theaters, books and culture prohibited; Jewish lay organizations barred; families separated and reunion thwarted; equal rights for Russian Jews openly denied, all this midst a violent anti-Jewish press campaign—to do nothing about this spiritual genocide is just as sinful as abetting such atrocities.

At times, the Soviet Government has been shown to be cognizant of world public opinion. If the crescendo of international protest mounts, there is hope that some amelioration of the oppressive treatment and tyranny meted out to Russian Jews may be obtained.

Therefore, after consultation with many religious and lay leaders of all faiths, I urge the last Monday in November to be set aside as a "National Day of Fast and Prayer" to protest vigorously the persecution of the Jewish minority by the Soviet Union.

My congregation Zichron Moshe will join me in a 1-day 24-hour fast beginning at sundown, Sunday, November 24, and continuing until sunset, Monday, November 25. On Sunday evening, a special prayer service will be held in the synagogue at 8 p.m. on behalf of the 3 million Russian Jews.

Furthermore, the National Information Bureau for Jewish Life, Inc., of which I am chairman of the board of governors, has contacted 77 community leaders in various cities in our 50 States of the Union who we expect to participate in joining this 1-day fast for November 25 and arrange for special prayer services on the preceding Sunday evening in houses of worship of all faiths in their respective cities. The bureau in New York City and the surrounding metropolitan area are reaching more than 1,250 institutions of spiritual guidance to cooperate in this public demonstration of solidarity against Soviet discrimination.

I trust that my humble one-man, 3-day fast will be transformed into a thunderous 3 million, 1-day fast which will reverberate to the very rooms of the Kremlin. Let 3 million Americans stand up and be counted as each a brother of 3 million Russian Jews.

Will We Ever Wise Up?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the Record an editorial entitled "Will We Ever Wise Up?" from the Lusk (Wyo.) Herald.

The editorial contains pertinent comment on the proposed sale of wheat to the U.S.S.R. which I believe will be of interest to Members of the House.

WILL WE EVER WISE UP?

We Americans just don't seem to be adept at playing the cold war game.

Somehow the makeup of Americans is such that we can't deal with the Russians. Our usual error is that we think the Communists of Russia are honorable. Time and again this thinking has been proven erroneous, but we keep trying. Just take a look at the recent happenings.

On the afternoon of October 9 President Kennedy said he would sell 4 million tons of wheat to the Soviets. The following morning, as a display of gratitude, the Soviets prevented a convey of U.S. troops from using the autobahn to Berlin, despite the fact

that America had in a treaty with Russia the right to use the autobahn.

While the Soviets held up the American troops President Kennedy was entertaining Gromyko, Russia's Foreign Minister, in the White House.

Then too, the wheat deal doesn't smell exactly good. In answer to our inquiry Senator MILWARD SIMPSON reports the sale of wheat to Russia is in essence about a 50-50 credit cash deal. In other words Russia is going to, if the deal goes through, pay about half of the world market price (usually between \$1.75-\$1.80). American wheat farmers will get about \$2.03 per bushel.

Can you imagine charging anything to Russia when they already owe \$11 billion to the United States?

Doctors Opposed to Medicare but Take \$2 Million in Public Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Engineers' Press on October 25, 1963 pointing out very well that West Virginia doctors, whose State and National medical associations are violently opposed to hospitalization for the aged under the social security program, are not in the least opposed to socialized State and Federal funds, of which they collected more than \$2 million last year for treating patients too poor to pay.

One physician, I assume a staunch supporter of the AMA and its position, received \$44,391 in socialized State and Federal funds for treatment of certain West Virginians.

Another doctor contrived to receive \$40,596 worth of socialized State and Federal funds to confer, according to AMA, \$49,596 worth of socialized medicine upon a number of other unfortunate West Virginians.

It strikes me that there is brazen hypocrisy abroad in the land when the American Medical Association would engage in violent opposition to "socialized medicine" and measures to responsibly meet the need of people of this country, and at the same time support other programs like Kerr-Mills, which is fully as socialized but which does not, according to recent findings of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, do the job for the vast number of people 65 and over.

The article follows:

DOCTORS OPPOSED TO MEDICARE BUT TAKE \$2 MILLION IN PUBLIC FUNDS

CHARLESTON, W. Va.—West Virginia doctors who with their counterparts in other States decry "socialized" medical care, collected more than \$2 million in State and Federal funds last year for treating patients too poor to pay.

One physician, the Charleston Gazette reported, received \$44,391 in State payments—presumably in addition to the fees he received from noncharity patients. Another doctor managed to see enough charity pa-

Whereas there are others to follow with the details on how contracts are let and how payments for research are made, let us briefly consider the subject in broad terms.

Ours is a capitalistic society, and we feel very strongly that the capitalistic system is responsible for our unquestioned strength. The profit motive must continue to operate, as it has so well in the past, to provide the incentive and the reward to those whose genius and labor contribute to the common good.

We are spending more and more money for research every day, but the rules are changing. The systems that are used to contract for research, or to repay research costs on independently produced items, are constantly being modified to meet new conditions, to improve them and to make them more responsive to the needs and demands of the situation.

The whole fabric of our society, the most successful yet devised by man we believe, is woven of the warp of individual and collective integrity and the woof of conflicting interests justly compromised—of checks, and balances, and safeguards.

Whereas the Communist theory is, "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs," we question who is to decide those abilities and those needs.

We know that man is imperfect—he is improvable, and capable of great sacrifice and achievement—but he should never be allowed too much uncontrolled power. As the old Romans put it "quis custodiet ipso custodiet"—"who shall guard the guards?"

In the realm of payment for research for military applications, a similar system of justly compromised conflicts of interest—of checks and balances and safeguards—needs also to apply. This system is still being perfected. It is a complicated problem, and every legitimate interest must be justly served.

I believe our present strength is ample evidence of past success. I have some personal knowledge of this since not too long ago I served in the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics as Assistant Chief for Research and Development.

As fleet commander of the 7th Fleet recently, I was a consumer of our own products, and so my evaluation of necessity had some degree of objectivity.

Now I am back on the producer side of the house, and as part of my catching up with what has gone on while I was happily employed as an operator, I have been refreshing myself on developments in the field of procurement. In so doing I came across two qualifications which I thought might add substance to my rather general remarks on this subject.

The Armed Services Procurement Regulation issued by the Department of Defense, in the revision issued on August 15 this year, has this to say about profits: " * * * low average profit rates on defense contracts overall are detrimental to the public interest. Effective national defense in a free enterprise economy requires that the best * * * capabilities be attracted to defense contracts."

Another portion of the regulation sets forth the following specific policy for research and development:

"A fundamental mission of research and development programs is to maintain scientific and technological superiority requisite to promote and advance the effectiveness of military operations. The accomplishment of this mission requires the broadest possible base of contractor and subcontractor sources including the optimum use of manpower and resources. It is essential that the best technical competence be located and fully utilized. The departments shall continually search for and develop information on sources (including small business concerns) competent to perform research and development."

Of course these aren't the only considerations. The interest of the Government must be protected—that is profits should not be too high. And the interest of the consumer must be protected—that is performance must be assured. But within those obvious limitations, our free and competitive society must be served.

As the Chief of Naval Material, I am vitally concerned with supporting the commendable philosophy embodied in those two quotations.

It is certainly an honor and a pleasure to be with you here today.

I wish you the greatest success in your endeavors here in the clinic.

What Does Vietnam Coup Mean?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, there is great concern in the United States over the coup in Vietnam, which had the approval of President Kennedy.

In yesterday's Washington Evening Star, William S. White gives us his analysis of the seriousness of the situation.

WILL THE COUP AID WAR ON REDS?

(By William S. White)

A long night of worry for the future in South Vietnam has settled in for high American policymakers. If any jubilation was initially felt here among junior officials at the destruction of the government of Ngo Dinh Diem—with which Washington had long been having trouble—nothing of that sort is anywhere discernible now.

Instead, there is a morning-after mood. In part, this is produced by genuine regret at the assassination of a man our people would, in fact, have liked to see remain in power if only he would have got rid of his erratic brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu. Ironically, American Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge had prepared a cable reporting that Mr. Diem seemed to be moving a bit more our way on the very day the insurrection was mounted.

In larger part, however, the air of concern is caused by these new fears:

1. That "super patriots" attached to the revolution of the 20 generals which deposed Mr. Diem may go on killing and thus further stain the new regime and raise questions of its capacity to govern in decency.

2. That one or two among the generals might conceivably not be so reliably anti-Communist as the great majority is, and so begin what above all else is to be feared. This is some under-the-cover negotiation with the Communist invaders of South Vietnam so long fought off by the Diem government backed by 15,000 American troops.

3. That the new provisional government of the generals, with Nguyen Ngoc Tho as provisional President, might become politically ambitious rather than solely concerned with the war against the Communists.

TWO U.S. HOPES

Mixed with all this are two strong American hopes. One is that there may now be an end to the exploitation of religious differences in Vietnam—no more talk of who is a Catholic and who is a Buddhist. Mr. Diem, himself a Christian, was endlessly accused of unduly repressive action against the Buddhists. It was this charge that brought him down. Most of the generals of his staff—Christian as well as Buddhist—became convinced that religious turmoil—no matter

who was to blame for it—was endangering the war. In this connection, some comfort is taken officially here in the fact that all three of the top Catholic generals joined in the uprising.

The second American hope is that the new regime will be in no hurry to order popular elections. Washington is not interested in seeing a political campaign, with all its in-built divisiveness to a country at war, sweep over Vietnam. The United States would be quite content to see the new outfit maintain its provisional character—with power diffused among the generals. For Mr. Diem's fate established the inherent danger of having all power concentrated in one or two pairs of hands as it was with Mr. Diem and Mr. Nhu.

WILL WAR EFFORT BE AIDED?

But all this is mere prelude to the crucial question: Will the war against the Communists now be promoted or retarded? If it is promoted all, of course, will be well. If it becomes bogged down by disunity in Saigon, twin disaster will lie ahead.

Any failure of the American military effort there would not only lay all southeast Asia open to creeping Communist aggression. It also would bankrupt a wise American strategy to halt such aggressions by limited commitments of our own forces cooperating with full commitments of local forces. The alternatives to this policy would be to submit to local aggressions or to face major war on the Korean scale—or beyond.

Moreover, a collapse in South Vietnam could quite simply, destroy the Kennedy administration. Careful and persistent inquiries have convinced me, for one, that the United States neither ordered nor directly participated in the bloody ouster of Mr. Diem. But nothing can alter the fact that Washington long had been deliberately shaking his regime—not to smash it, but in the hope of thus forcing him to make accommodations with his Buddhist-led opposition to permit the war to go full tilt. Since America has helped, if indirectly, to push him down, the administration's responsibility will be frightful if the new regime ever abandons the war on communism.

J.F.K. on Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Post of Tuesday, November 5, 1963, entitled "J.F.K. on Price Fixing," in which President Kennedy rather clearly pointed out the probability of a Presidential veto for this most destructive legislation.

In view of the President's comments it would appear well for the Congress to devote itself to more fruitful and useful legislation which will not wind up a wreck on the rocks of a Presidential veto.

The article follows:

J.F.K. ON PRICE FIXING

The proponents of the so-called "Quality Stabilization Act," a bill which would diminish competition in retail trade through the Federal enforcement of resale-price agreements between manufacturers and retailers, derived little comfort from the re-

marks made by President Kennedy at his last press conference.

When asked about his position on the bill which is opposed by all departments of the executive branch, the President replied:

"I've never been for the quality stabilization bill. I have to look at the bill when it finally comes in the form it's in. I quite obviously can't comment on legislation before it finally comes to the desk of the White House, but the administration witnesses have spoken my view."

The President's reluctance to comment in greater detail was doubtless prompted by the fact that a number of leading members of his own party have been so foolhardy as to sponsor legislation which would infringe upon the right of the retailer to set prices at competitive levels. The bill would saddle the American consumers with an enormous burden.

With a backlog of unfinished business that runs the gamut from the budget for the current fiscal year to tax reduction and civil rights legislation, Congress should not waste precious time on a bill which so clearly violates the spirit of free enterprise and stands so small a chance of Presidential approval. Time will be saved and embarrassment avoided if the Quality Stabilization Act is allowed to die stillborn.

National Day of Fast and Prayer To Protest Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Dr. Julius G. Neumann, chairman of the board of governors of the National Information Bureau of Jewish Life, Inc., of which I am honorary president, has just concluded a one-man 3-day fast to dramatize to America the oppression, persecution, and tyranny of the Soviet Union toward Russia's 3 million Jews. An extension of Rabbi Neumann's protest is planned for Monday, November 25, when a national day of fast and prayer will be observed to protest Soviet anti-Semitism.

Having made numerous and serious efforts to bring this situation to the attention of the administration and the American people, I am pleased to insert in the Record the statement made by Rabbi Neumann at the conclusion of his dramatic protest:

NATIONAL DAY OF FAST AND PRAYER TO PROTEST SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

As pledged and in all accord with rabbinical teachings, I have concluded an individual 3-day fast. I abstained from food and drink on Monday, October 28; Thursday, October 31 and Monday, November 4 as a protest against Soviet anti-Semitism and to dramatize to all Americans the tragic plight of Russian Jewry.

For Americans of all faiths to know—that persons are being condemned to death and executed for minor economic offenses, charged with committing criminal acts if they sell matzo, that kosher meat is not available, that Yiddish books may not be printed, and that Jewish dead may not be buried in a Jewish cemetery; to learn—that in the Soviet Union synagogues are closed,

prayer books and religious articles are unavailable; Jewish instruction banned; Yiddish theaters, books and culture prohibited; Jewish lay organizations barred; families separated and reunion thwarted; equal rights for Russian Jews openly denied, all this amidst a violent anti-Jewish press campaign—to do nothing about this spiritual genocide is just as sinful as abetting such atrocities.

At times, the Soviet Government has been shown to be cognizant of world public opinion. If the crescendo of international protest mounts, there is hope that some amelioration of the oppressive treatment and tyranny meted out to Russian Jews may be obtained.

Therefore, after consultation with many religious and lay leaders of all faiths, I urge the last Monday in November to be set aside as a "National Day of Fast and Prayer" to protest vigorously the persecution of the Jewish minority by the Soviet Union.

My congregation Zichron Moshe will join me in a 1-day 24-hour fast beginning at sundown, Sunday, November 24, and continuing until sunset, Monday, November 25. On Sunday evening, a special prayer service will be held in the synagogue at 8 p.m. on behalf of the 3 million Russian Jews.

Furthermore, the National Information Bureau for Jewish Life, Inc., of which I am chairman of the board of governors, has contacted 77 community leaders in various cities in our 50 States of the Union who we expect to participate in joining this 1-day fast for November 25 and arrange for special prayer services on the preceding Sunday evening in houses of worship of all faiths in their respective cities. The bureau in New York City and the surrounding metropolitan area are reaching more than 1,250 institutions of spiritual guidance to cooperate in this public demonstration of solidarity against Soviet discrimination.

I trust that my humble one-man, 3-day fast will be transformed into a thunderous 3 million, 1-day fast which will reverberate to the very rooms of the Kremlin. Let 3 million Americans stand up and be counted as each a brother of 3 million Russian Jews.

Will We Ever Wise Up?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the Record an editorial entitled "Will We Ever Wise Up?" from the Lusk (Wyo.) Herald.

The editorial contains pertinent comment on the proposed sale of wheat to the U.S.S.R. which I believe will be of interest to Members of the House.

WILL WE EVER WISE UP?

We Americans just don't seem to be adept at playing the cold war game.

Somehow the makeup of Americans is such that we can't deal with the Russians. Our usual error is that we think the Communists of Russia are honorable. Time and again this thinking has been proven erroneous, but we keep trying. Just take a look at the recent happenings.

On the afternoon of October 9 President Kennedy said he would sell 4 million tons of wheat to the Soviets. The following morning, as a display of gratitude, the Soviets prevented a convey of U.S. troops from using the autobahn to Berlin, despite the fact

that America had in a treaty with Russia the right to use the autobahn.

While the Soviets held up the American troops President Kennedy was entertaining Gromyko, Russia's Foreign Minister, in the White House.

Then too, the wheat deal doesn't smell exactly good. In answer to our inquiry Senator Milward Simpson reports the sale of wheat to Russia is in essence about a 50-50 credit cash deal. In other words Russia is going to, if the deal goes through, pay about half of the world market price (usually between \$1.75-\$1.80). American wheat farmers will get about \$2.03 per bushel.

Can you imagine charging anything to Russia when they already owe \$11 billion to the United States?

Doctors Opposed to Medicare but Take \$2 Million in Public Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Engineers' Press on October 25, 1963 pointing out very well that West Virginia doctors, whose State and National medical associations are violently opposed to hospitalization for the aged under the social security program, are not in the least opposed to socialized State and Federal funds, of which they collected more than \$2 million last year for treating patients too poor to pay.

One physician, I assume a staunch supporter of the AMA and its position, received \$44,391 in socialized State and Federal funds for treatment of certain West Virginians.

Another doctor contrived to receive \$40,596 worth of socialized State and Federal funds to confer, according to AMA, \$49,596 worth of socialized medicine upon a number of other unfortunate West Virginians.

It strikes me that there is brazen hypocrisy abroad in the land when the American Medical Association would engage in violent opposition to "socialized medicine" and measures to responsibly meet the need of people of this country, and at the same time support other programs like Kerr-Mills, which is fully as socialized but which does not, according to recent findings of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, do the job for the vast number of people 65 and over.

The article follows:

DOCTORS OPPOSED TO MEDICARE BUT TAKE \$2 MILLION IN PUBLIC FUNDS

CHARLESTON, W. Va.—West Virginia doctors who with their counterparts in other States decry "socialized" medical care, collected more than \$2 million in State and Federal funds last year for treating patients too poor to pay.

One physician, the Charleston Gazette reported, received \$44,391 in State payments—presumably in addition to the fees he received from noncharity patients. Another doctor managed to see enough charity pa-