

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12335

measure for adoption by the States imposing a tax measured by income.

The proposal of Mr. Cox embraces the formula for apportionment sponsored by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, approved by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, and is being submitted with a committee recommendation for approval, to the upcoming National Governor's Conference, the National Conference of Attorneys General and the National Association of Tax Administrators. The Council of State Governments is also interested in the adoption of the measure.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JUNE 8, 1964

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the majority leader concerning the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois, the program is as follows:

Monday is District day, but there are no District bills scheduled.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, as follows:

H.R. 11380, Foreign Assistance Act of 1964. This has an open rule, with 4 hours of general debate, waiving points of order.

H.R. 11376, Excise Tax Rate Extension Act of 1964.

This announcement is made, of course, subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the Members of the House that there is a possibility of announcing on Monday or Tuesday additions to this program and that these additions may include the so-called pay bill.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to say that the announcement is to be made on Monday or Tuesday as to whether or not this will be done.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman is not saying that the pay increase bill will be called up next Monday?

Mr. ALBERT. No; I am saying that an announcement will be made on Monday or Tuesday of next week as to whether it will be called up next week.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

No. 111—17

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JUNE 8

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall take only a minute or two—am I to understand that the debt ceiling increase will not be taken up next week?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman's understanding coincides with mine.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the distinguished majority leader is going to be consistent in bringing the debt ceiling increase bill in before he brings in the salary increase bill. I should not like to think that the Members of Congress are going to vote to increase their salaries or even have the opportunity to vote on it before the debt ceiling increase bill is disposed of.

Mr. ALBERT. I believe the Members of Congress are courageous and will vote their convictions regardless of when certain bills are called up.

Mr. GROSS. I believe that in order to be consistent—and this is going to increase the debt and deficit by a half billion dollars, the salary grant bill—we ought to know whether the House is going to increase the debt limit or not.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Cuba

SUPPOSED FLIGHT OF AIRCRAFT BY ANTI-CASTRO PERSONNEL FROM FLORIDA TO CUBA AND BACK WITHOUT DETECTION BY U.S. AIR DEFENSE RADAR

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks, and to include a letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in a copyrighted news story which appeared last week, a claim was made that a civilian aircraft was flown by anti-Castro personnel from Florida to

Cuba and back without detection by U.S. air defense radar.

Upon receipt of this information I related it to the House, and urged that an investigation of the circumstances surrounding this story be launched. Chairman CARL VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee was good enough to honor my request, and he urged the Secretary of Defense to look into the matter and make a full report.

You will recall that this flight was reportedly to have been made for the purpose of airdropping medical equipment for anti-Castro guerrillas inside Cuba. My concern was that U.S. air defenses had again been eluded as they had been earlier this year when a Cuban helicopter landed in Florida without being intercepted by U.S. authorities.

The results of the Defense Department investigation have just been reached, and they have been turned over to Chairman VINSON, who is to be commended for expediting this entire matter. The Defense Department has given assurances that the flight did not take place, and that the Nation's air defenses were not eluded.

This assurance should be related to the American people. It is good to know that our Armed Forces are maintaining careful vigilance in this troubled area of the Caribbean, and that every precaution is being taken to guard against impulsive acts which might originate from the Cuban situation.

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1964.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of May 28, 1964 enclosing a letter from Hon. PAUL G. ROGERS of Florida concerning an alleged undetected flight of an aircraft from Miami, Fla., to Cuba and return. At the time of receipt of your letter, the Department of Defense had already initiated a thorough investigation of this matter, which was brought to our attention as a result of news stories in the Florida press.

We have now completed two separate but coordinated investigations conducted by the North American Air Defense Command and the Defense Intelligence Agency, with the assistance of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency. As a result of these investigations one of the individuals involved in the alleged "Phantom Raid" has indicated to our investigators that the raid did not take place. Mr. Frank Florini, president of the International Anti-Communist Brigade, which allegedly conducted the raid has signed the following statement:

"To the best of my knowledge a so-called 'Operation Phantom,' a raid in Cuba on May 25, 1964, did not take place. I declare that U.S. radar defenses were not violated while leaving or entering U.S. territory."

On the basis of the investigations we conclude that:

(a) The 30th of November revolutionary movement used the alleged incident for publicity.

(b) The flight as alleged in some published reports did not take place.

12336

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 4

(c) The radar defenses of southern Florida were not evaded on May 25.
We are grateful for your interest in this matter.

Sincerely,

CYRUS VANCE.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Florida for bringing the results of this investigation to the attention of the Members of the House. I know that a lot of Members shared the gentleman's concern about the report when such report appeared in the newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, it is reassuring to know that no such flight has taken place off our shores.

DAUGHTER OF HENRY FORD TO BE ON ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF YOUNG CITIZENS FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press carried the following story today, which I believe is of significant interest to many Members of the Congress, and particularly to those Members on this side of the aisle.

The story which appeared under a Washington dateline by the Associated Press is as follows:

Miss Charlotte Ford, daughter of automaker Henry Ford II, will be on the advisory committee of the newly organized Young Citizens for Johnson, an official of the group said today.

Gene Theroux, assistant director, said Miss Ford and several other members of the advisory committee will be on hand for a news conference tomorrow kicking off the Young Citizens group's activities.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to see the daughter of the distinguished president of the Ford Motor Co. join the young people of this country in supporting the cause and impressive program of President Johnson.

Mr. Johnson has followed the tradition of former President Kennedy in realizing the many problems of the young people of America. President Johnson is carrying on a program which provides the young people of this country a rallying point for all of their hopes and, I am sure, for progress in America.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us are proud that Miss Ford will play an important role in this Young Citizens group for President Johnson. Certainly, I hope that her example will draw many, many other young people into the political arena. It is good for the young people of this country to take an interest in the body politic. We, as Democrats, are particularly pleased that Miss Ford, like her distinguished father, has chosen to use her energy in support of President Johnson.

POLITICAL POLLSTERS: "THE MORE I'M WRONG, THE BETTER I GET"

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that today Mr. Lou Harris is saying to himself, "The more I'm wrong, the better I get."

When the Literary Digest made its famous miscalculation about the outcome of the Roosevelt-Landon race, it went out of business. But the more the Lou Harris poll guesses wrong, the more insistent his clients are in using his Democrat Party inspired propaganda. Unfortunately these clients include newspapers, magazines and television networks who insist on giving him a platform to try to sink the Republican Party, especially the popularly phrased conservative wing.

In view of his "accuracy" to date, I think Republicans should take heart in the Harris allegation that "40 percent of the GOP voters prefer Lyndon Johnson to either Goldwater or Rockefeller."

That is a typical statement to be expected from one who has spent much of his career in the employ of a Democrat Senator and the Democrat National Committee. But if his statement is on a par with his predictions in the New Hampshire, Oregon, and California primaries, then L.B.J. has cause to worry about a possible 40-percent defection of Democrats to the Republican standard bearer next November. Indeed the outcome of the Wisconsin, Indiana, and Maryland Democrat primaries are more cause for L.B.J. worry than the Harris propaganda is for GOP worry.

Attached is a story in the New York Times by Earl Mazo which bears out this contention:

CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN PRIMARY TRIPS THE POLLSTERS FOR THIRD TIME IN ROW
(By Earl Mazo)

Major opinion polls went wrong again in forecasting the winner of the California Presidential primary.

Erroneous predictions by nationally published and broadcast polls in three successive Republican primaries have caused the opinion research profession to approach the election this year with a reputation recalling 1948, when nearly all polls picked Gov. Thomas E. Dewey to defeat President Truman.

The setback is evident from mounting criticism in Congress and elsewhere, even though only a few of the Nation's 200 professional pollsters conducted surveys in the California, Oregon, and New Hampshire primaries.

Among others, Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, charged in the Senate yesterday that pollsters were getting such a reputation for failure this year that their currently unanimous victory forecasts for President Johnson could mean "the Republicans will win the greatest victory in the history of this country."

And the Senate Republican leader, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, joined the chorus by characterizing the California primary as "a computed election to end all computers."

Experienced polltakers are painfully aware that prophesying a primary result is more

difficult than calling a general election. Also, there are additional hazards this year because of the unusually volatile situation within the Republican Party.

But what counts to poll readers—laymen and politicians—is whether the professional pollster is right or wrong in naming the winner.

And only in an election itself can the public check pollster reports.

Thus, when Senator BARRY GOLDWATER won California with 53 percent of the vote, it was obvious that the pollsters who had predicted otherwise were in error.

For example, readers of Louis Harris' election eve newspaper column could judge the accuracy of its report that Governor Rockefeller was leading by 2 percent.

HARRIS PREDICTION

But the public may have to await the election in November before checking another report made by Mr. Harris:

"The plain fact is that 40 percent of these GOP voters prefer Lyndon Johnson to either Goldwater or Rockefeller."

None of the professionals who polled in California called it right, not even Samuel Lubell, whose election eve report came closer than any other that was published.

Mr. Lubell, published in the Scripps-Howard newspapers, found Governor Rockefeller to have "the edge of victory through the whole State," but he reported Senator BARRY GOLDWATER was gaining rapidly enough to be given "a fair chance of winning."

The Lubell poll accurately pointed to Governor Rockefeller's surprise victory in the Oregon primary on May 15 and Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge's write-in triumph in the New Hampshire primary on March 10.

Mr. Harris, the only other nationally syndicated opinion researcher in the three Republican primaries, failed to predict the winner of any.

Two pollsters who operate at the State and regional level also inaccurately forecast victory for Mr. Rockefeller.

They were Mervin D. Field, whose poll is published in newspapers throughout California, and Don Muchmore, polltaker for the Long Beach Independent Press Telegram.

Mr. Field explained the error in his poll in terms of its timing.

"Our final pre-election surveys have to be terminated a week or more before an election," he said. "A lot can happen in the closing days, if not the closing hours of a campaign."

Mr. Harris, who was a confidential opinion sampler for President Kennedy and now is pollster for the Los Angeles Times Syndicate, Newsweek magazine, and the Columbia Broadcasting System, insisted yesterday that his polls have been "absolutely right as of when they were taken."

But he conceded, indirectly, that his figures and findings may have become outdated when published a few days later.

Mr. Rockefeller lost to Mr. GOLDWATER in California "on Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday," Mr. Harris said. He listed a range of reasons, including "the birth of the Rockefeller baby."

Critics of pollster performance this year also have raised questions about the speed with which Mr. Harris and other experts declared Senator GOLDWATER to be the victor in California on primary night.

The Columbia network was first. Just 22 minutes after the first polls closed, Mr. Harris announced Mr. GOLDWATER had swept the primary with 53 percent of the vote.

Eyebrows were raised when Mr. Harris later revised that margin downward, finally settling on 51 percent.

Meanwhile, other networks came through with Goldwater declarations. And as the vote between the rival candidates narrowed through the night, those early announce-