

1963

alive for many, many years beyond, so many years, that from our vantage point in the future, we shall be able to look back upon this decade with the perspective that only passing time can bring.

From our watchtower of the future, what do you think we shall see? Will the 1960's be the decade of the nuclear bomb? Of Castroism? Of a split between Russia and China? Of American firmness in foreign policy? Of automation? Of equal rights for all races? Of the Jackie Kennedy hairdo? Of what?

We certainly shall see all of these. But I predict we shall see something more—something, I think, that will outshine them all. What will stand out in the 1960's will be a renaissance, a new era, for the mentally ill and mentally retarded of America. I believe the revolution we are beginning to see will loom like a beacon throughout future history. I believe the 1960's will go down as years of progress in man's fight against mental illness and mental retardation.

Today, I want to concentrate on the mentally ill, although the story of the mentally retarded is just as dramatic, with mentally retarded men and women just now learning to live full lives, learning to work, learning to support themselves, men and women who, not so long ago, would be wasting away in America's back bedrooms.

In the field of mental illness, just look at the evidence around us.

The fact that there is a Committee on the Mentally Handicapped of the President's Committee; the fact that there is a Mental Health Subcommittee of your own Minnesota Governor's Committee; the fact that there are similar subcommittees being formed by growing numbers of Governors' committees all over America; the fact that President's committee annual meetings and regional meetings regularly feature discussions of the problems of employment of the mentally restored; the fact that Governors' committees, like this one, give serious consideration to the problem, all these facts, and many more, add up to a new concern, a growing awareness of the problems and prospects of the mentally ill today. Further, all the facts I have cited are new ones. Think back a mere 10 years ago. Could I have said the same things then? Was there a Mental Health Subcommittee in Minnesota?

Look beyond this room and the interests we represent. Look to other aspects of the renaissance of the 1960's.

The President of the United States only last month issued a historic document, the first Presidential message ever devoted exclusively to the mental health and mental retardation problems of our Nation.

One Senator summed up the President's message this way: "Here the President was speaking for an overlooked and discarded fragment of mankind, that has no lobbyist, no voice, no power, no votes even. The President asked not for some little gesture of relief, but meeting the issue broadside, he asked that we seek to conquer it completely with a 'wholly new national approach.'"

I am sure you are familiar with the President's message. A major part of his "wholly new national approach" is to create a network of comprehensive community mental health centers where the mentally ill can receive a variety of services, without having to leave home—diagnosis, cure, rehabilitation. Through this approach, the President said, it should be possible within another 10 or 20 years to reduce the number of mental patients under custodial care by 50 percent or more.

"If we apply our medical knowledge and social insights fully," the President said, "all but a small portion of the mentally ill can eventually achieve a wholesome and constructive social adjustment."

And, I might add, that includes job adjustment, too.

The National Association for Mental Health recently issued figures reinforcing the President's views. Said the association: 7 out of every 10 mental patients can recover partially or totally, if only they can be treated in a first-rate hospital. Further, the chances of getting out of the hospital have gone up dramatically. Back in 1952, you had a 50-50 chance to be discharged within 6 months; today, you have an 80-20 chance.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has an equally hopeful view of the fight against mental illness. Today, says VRA, some 6,600 mental patients are being rehabilitated each year. If the trend continues in the future at the same rate it has in the past, by 1970 about 13,600 will be rehabilitated, more than double today's number. That's not all. If VRA engages in an intensified program of rehabilitation of the mentally ill, the 1970 total will be much higher, between 16,000 and 20,000.

The Veterans' Administration, too, has been reporting a hopeful outlook for the mentally ill. Each year, in about the same number of hospital beds, the VA has been treating more and more mental patients 37,000 in 1957; close to 50,000 today. In the future, the numbers will continue to grow. The key here is turnover. Not only are more patients coming into the hospital, thus whittling down waiting lists; but more patients are coming out. Men who, in an earlier time, would be destined to spend all their lives in the hospital are being restored to their communities. A 66 percent turnover rate in 1955; an 80 percent turnover rate today. A higher percent in the future. Turnover means hope. It means recovery.

There's another noteworthy VA development. Recently, VA approached seriously disabled Korean war veterans, those rated as 100 percent disabled, to attempt to encourage them to take vocational rehabilitation training. Included were 160 with serious mental illnesses, rated as totally disabled. Today, 8 out of every 10 either are still in training or have been rehabilitated. Only 2 out of 10 didn't make the grade. A miracle? Perhaps; but such miracles are happening all over the country.

There are other developments, equally hopeful, in just about every community in our land. Drug therapies, "reaching" mental patients when all other forms of treatment seem useless—"day" hospitals and "night" hospitals, so that patients can either live at home and receive treatment during the day, or work during the day and receive treatment at night—"halfway" houses and day-care centers, staging areas, you might call them, to community living—even the new "walk-in" psychiatric service recently instituted in a couple of cities, where troubled people can drop in any time. Ten years ago, who ever heard of any of these?

We have it within our means to make obsolete the forbidding gray structure on the edge of town, the "institution," that houses all too many of the mentally ill and that can't begin to give them the kind of treatment that would restore them to society. We have the means, now, of operating a new day, a hopeful day, for the mentally ill.

The mentally ill are being rehabilitated, in greater and greater numbers. They are returning home. Men and women who, a mere decade ago, would have nothing to look forward to other than lifelong hospitalization are coming home again. This is the miracle of the sixties. This is the miracle that will live long in history.

This miracle, this renaissance, this dawn of a new day, brings us up against the burning question of the sixties. What about the mentally ill who return home? Will they be able to find employment? Will businesses and industries come to accept them? Will the doors be open? The men and women

are being mentally restored, but what about society? Is society in need of being mentally restored, as well? Could society stand a shot-in-the-arm of some sort of wonder drug called "human understanding?" What about the raised eyebrows, the whispers, the shakes of the head? Are society's attitudes toward the mentally restored as healthy as they should be?

I have the uneasy feeling that although rehabilitation and treatment may be suitable for the decade of the sixties, our public attitudes are lagging behind, and fit more readily in the gaslight days of the horse and buggy. Hence the vast importance of the work you are doing, the work the President's committee is doing, the work of all the mental health associations in the Nation, the work of all others who are attempting to change public attitudes.

I do not think I am exaggerating current day backward attitudes.

Two psychologists in New England recently conducted a 3-year study of attitudes of 200 employers in the Boston area. About three-fourths of the employers interviewed said yes, they would be willing to hire ex-mental patients. Hopeful, isn't it? But listen:

Despite what they said, only 27 out of the total of 200 actually did hire the mentally restored during the 3-year period. One in ten. What about the other nine? A need for attitude change. Definitely.

A psychologist, now on the staff of the National Association for Mental Health, once conducted a study of more than 1,000 manufacturing concerns throughout the United States. According to his study, more than 60 percent of the employers had attitudes ranging from lukewarm at best to icecold at worst, not at all conducive to job prospects for the mentally restored. You could count the warmly enthusiastic with one hand.

Still another study by Dorly Wang, noted researcher in public attitudes, uncovered something else about employers. She found that the average employer had this mental picture of the mentally restored: tense, rather than relaxed; hard to get along with, rather than easygoing; emotional rather than calm; dependent rather than self-reliant.

That certainly doesn't paint a picture of an ideal employee, does it? Of course it's a false picture, not related to fact; yet, how many jobs has this stereotype prevented the mentally restored from filling?

I am a psychiatrist and not a physicist. But I have studied enough physics in school to know that when an irresistible force meets an immovable object, look out. You get an explosion. Think for a moment what we are faced with:

On the one hand, growing numbers of patients leaving hospitals after treatment for mental illness, prepared to live in the community, full of hope, ready for work, anxious to leave the whole episode of their mental illness behind them and start anew, the kind of fresh start any man ought to be entitled to.

On the other hand, backward attitudes toward the mentally restored; the refusal to recognize there can be such a thing as mental restoration, as recovery from mental illness; sharp suspicion that once you are mentally ill, you always are mentally ill, no matter what; closed doors; even, at times, an unwillingness to shake the hand of an expatient.

There you have the situation: More and more mental patients being made ready for work, but being unable to find work because of public attitudes. A dilemma? Perhaps. But there are bright spots on the horizon. Let me give you some.

The Ida S. Latz Foundation in Los Angeles has just made available a sizable grant for the preparation of a book, the likes of which does not exist anywhere today—"A Guide

to Job Placement of the Mentally Restored." The author is former children's editor and mental health writer of the New York Times, Mrs. Dorothy Barclay Thompson.

Perhaps you're wondering how a guidebook, aimed at professional placement and rehabilitation specialists, could possibly change employer attitudes. The answer is this:

If, through the guidebook, professional placement techniques can be improved; if, through proper placement, the mentally restored obtain employment where they stand a better than average chance to succeed, then, every such person becomes not just one more successful employee, but something more, a sort of ambassador-at-large for all the mentally restored everywhere. If Mr. A can do it, the reasoning goes, so can Mr. B, and Mr. C.

The first placement is always the most crucial. It is the "icebreaker." It paves the way for others. The guidebook, by bettering the chances for that all-important first placement, actually can help to batter down the doors of prejudice.

Another weapon in the President's committee arsenal is a soon to be published flier for employers considering hiring the mentally restored. This will give an employer the A-B-C's of mental illness and mental health, and enhance his understanding of the mentally restored person he is contemplating taking on.

Still another weapon is a modest single page monthly President's Committee Newsletter, a clearinghouse of workable, imaginative local community programs aimed at broadening opportunities for the mentally restored and mentally retarded. The newsletter started a year ago with a circulation of 1,000; circulation has gone up 10 times to 10,000.

Still other weapons are open discussions of the job problems of the mentally restored at President's Committee meetings and Governors' committee meetings, such as this. At the annual meeting in Washington, for example, on May 9 and 10, a featured attraction will be a panel on employment of the mentally restored, chaired by Phillip Ryan, executive director of the National Association for Mental Health.

There's a new weapon, just being formed, at the suggestion of an ad hoc committee of the President's Committee, the Civil Service Commission and the National Association for Mental Health have joined forces to hammer out a vast program of education and orientation for all supervisors in the Federal service. As the Civil Service Commission sees it, persons on the hiring line—"grassroots" supervisors—must be convinced in their own minds and hearts of the capabilities of the mentally restored, if ex-mental patients ever are to be granted equal opportunity. By convincing supervisors, the Commission reasons, opportunities for qualified mentally restored persons in the Federal service should grow appreciably. Purpose of the orientation program, then, is to convince those who hire that mental illness is certainly no ending point to a man's ability.

I have given you but a few scattered examples of the massive attack on prejudice and misunderstanding that is just now being mounted in America. Many, many organizations and agencies are allied in this all-out battle. The President's Committee—the National Association for Mental Health—the National Institute for Mental Health, the American Psychiatric Association, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the U.S. Employment Service, the American Medical Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, the AFL-CIO, the mass media of America, the clergy of all faiths, women's organizations—the list is long and impressive.

But the battle will not be an easy one. The roots of prejudice against mental ill-

ness run deep. They do not give way easily. Too often, the defense weapon is a "Yes, but—" An agreement for the sake of agreement, yet the doubts remain in the heart.

The ultimate success of the all-out battle does not rest with the headquarters of the organizations I have listed. It does not rest with the "they" of the shopworn phrase, "they ought to do something about it." It rests with all of us, in every city and State in the Union. We have to kindle our own enthusiasms first, we have to convince ourselves that the mentally restored are richly deserving of equal opportunity, before we can go out and convince others. Once we are steamed up, we can go out and conquer worlds. And melt prejudice.

The stakes are high. Men and women are coming out of mental hospitals after having spent decades there. The most effective therapy in a mental hospital is the dream: "after I get out of here, I'm going to—" Going to what? Work? Yes? That "yes" is up to us.

So we are caught up in a new day, a renaissance, an exciting era of hope for the mentally ill. A good part of the realization of that new day rests in our hands, yours and mine. For employment is tied up in the resurgence of hope. Employment: our part in the miracle.

If we carry out our part well, and if we live long enough, we shall some day pause to look back upon these exciting times of the sixties, and we shall see the full measure of the revolution going on about us.

Then we shall see plainly the depth and breadth of our role in this ongoing revolution. And then we shall have the greatest of all rewards: the knowledge that we, with our own hands, have helped create a miracle. May we all reap the satisfaction.

House Resolution 121

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution unanimously agreed to by the Missouri House of Representatives, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 121

Whereas the forests of this State constitute one of our most valuable and productive resources; and

Whereas much of the progress in the development and utilization of this important resource in recent years has resulted directly from the capital gains treatment of timber under the Internal Revenue Code of the United States; and

Whereas the substantial elimination of capital gains treatment for the owners of forest lands, in the manner now before the Congress of the United States, would seriously hamper the continued development of Missouri's timber industry; and

Whereas the jobs of thousands of our citizens who depend directly or indirectly on our timber industry would be jeopardized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 72d Missouri General Assembly, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully petitioned and requested to consider the possible effects upon the economy and progress of a great segment of the State of Missouri in enacting any legislation af-

fecting the tax treatment of timber; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house send suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the Members in the Congress of the United States from Missouri.

Bill file
A Foreign Academy: To Match the
Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the distinguished and objective American columnist, Roscoe Drummond, has a most interesting and persuasive column in this morning's issue of the Washington Post dealing with the issues raised by the testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the need for a Freedom Academy.

I ask unanimous consent that the Drummond commentary be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD. It provides additional reasons why having done too little for too long to try to win the cold war we do not prolong our ineptitude by failing to develop an effective mechanism now so that at long last we can begin winning victories in the nonmilitary aspects of the contest now being waged between communism and freedom.

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

A FOREIGN ACADEMY: TO MATCH THE COMMUNISTS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Following the public hearings, the Senate and House Foreign Relations Committees will soon report to Congress their findings on an administration proposal to create a National Academy of Foreign Affairs. They can reach one of three conclusions:

That the proposed National Academy, designed to make training, education, and research a more effective instrument of foreign policy, is just right and ought to be enacted.

That while the National Academy is a long-delayed step in the right direction, it does not go far enough and ought to include the broader concepts of the Freedom Academy, which already has wide bipartisan backing in Congress.

That there is no need for anything, that both projects—the National Academy and the Freedom Academy—in any combination are unnecessary, that everything is just dandy.

Of these three conclusions the least defensible, the most harmful, would be a decision to do nothing.

The one thing we cannot afford is to look back at the reverses we have experienced in the struggle against communism since the end of World War II and pretend that everything has been going well.

But if we admit that things have not been going well—the Communist bloc has moved its periphery to Cuba—and still decide that we have been doing the best we can, such a decision can only mean that we are unwilling to mobilize our full resources to win.

This is why it would be a grave mistake for either the Senate or House committee to fail to take one step if it is not ready to take two steps.

1963

The National Academy is a welcome and useful first step.

Many, who feel we have marked time too long in matching the resources of Communists in nonviolent conflict and political warfare, would like to see the Government take a much larger first step by combining the concepts of the National Academy and the Freedom Academy.

Not one of the many witnesses who have appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in behalf of the Freedom Academy has voiced any opposition to the National Academy. All have spoken in support of it and have simply proposed measures to strengthen its work.

They want to see an academy which will train both Government and private citizens in the techniques needed to counter communism in the nonmilitary field—since our citizens' interests take them abroad much of the time. They want to see an academy equipped to train non-Americans as the Soviet Union and Cuba to our great anxiety are currently training non-Cubans in Havana.

"If we were to confine this training to a small elite," said William R. Kintner, deputy director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, "we would leave untapped the immense potential of resourcefulness and ingenuity throughout the Government service as well as our business and private organizations. Only by drawing upon all its human resources can America marshal the ability to solve pressing problems of national survival."

I think the sponsors of the Freedom Academy have the better argument. But there is no good argument in favor of doing nothing.

Ponzi Did It First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Austen Lake wrote a painfully blunt but very thought-provoking column in the Boston Record American of Thursday, February 14, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

PONZI DID IT FIRST

(By Austen Lake)

There is a strange similarity between the audacious swindles of Charles Ponzi in 1920 and the wildcat, owe-as-we-go program whereby the New Frontier is pawning our tomorrows to pay for our todays.

Maybe the reader is old enough to remember the runty, balding, fortyish, Latin-esque man named Ponzi, an ex-fruit peddler and stock clerk who had sudden delusions of grandeur and opened a cave-of-the-winds office on School Street late in 1919.

If you don't recall Ponzi, ask your dad. He'll tell you how the dapper little gyp named his firm the Securities Exchange Co., then put ads in the Boston daily papers reading, "I have a new investment system which guarantees 50-percent profit on your money every 45 days." Just that and nothing more.

Well lawzee. Wouldn't you think a bare-faced comealliya like that would bring the cops a-running? But no. All over town, the State, and the Nation men and women started to withdraw their life savings and

swarmed into School Street to shove their money through Ponzi's wicket, until his dingy office was choked with bundled currency in denominations from \$1 to \$100.

Ponzi's girl clerks just snapped rubber bands around the stuff and stashed it in barrels, baskets, and cartons like dill pickles, until Ponzi bought the Hanover Trust Co. for a convenient storage bin. How the money rolled in.

Like the deficit spending system in Washington right now, Ponzi's fiscal methods were moronically simple. Not that, at first, he made his operative ideas clear. He pretended to deal in something vaguely called "postal reply coupons" but refused to explain the mysterious flub dub, lest parvenu manipulators might copy this sure-fire plan which, at its peak, had more than 40,000 "investors" for a total of \$9 million.

Not until late in 1920 did the law crack down and reveal Ponzi as a crude swindler who had invented a "deficits forever" program, by paying early investors from the booty which subsequent suckers stuffed into his choppers.

In a miniature-skeleton form, it was the same fiscal system which the New Frontier is now using on U.S. taxpayers—by pyramiding the national debt to a new peak of \$320 billion, on the bland assumption that an ever-expanding national income will cover its ballooning debt, to achieve what it calls a "floating balance," or until the balloon goes bust.

Thus, on the old Ponzi principle that to stay perpetually solvent, all one needs do is to keep paying the running, yearly interest, the New Deal manipulators are piling today's deficits on tomorrow's debts until the interest alone runs to \$10 billion annually and growing bigger every day.

As long as the illusion lasted, Ponzi had a glorious time. He bought a massive mansion in the arch-eyed social section of Winchester, Mass. He imported his aging mother from Italy in a deluxe trans-Atlantic suite and met her on a chartered yacht with full orchestra. He bought control of five Boston banks, all of which went bust later.

Every morning a shiny limousine, driven by a liveried chauffeur, brought him neatly barbered and trimly tailored, to his School Street office where police cleared a path through crowds of huzzahing men and women and Ponzi would graciously doff his fedora and make a brief speech on how it felt to be a public benefactor.

But, by December of 1920, his bubble had burst and he was in Plymouth jail. And by January 8 of 1949 he was dead, as a pauper. Nonetheless he invented the "deficits forever" system whereby, if one parlays the annual interest on a debt, it will never come due for collection—in theory, of course.

But, imaginative as he was, Ponzi never had such an inspirational idea as to call his owe-as-you-go scheme a "minus adjustment," which is Washington fiscalese of today. But he did rediscover the fact that people have a built-in suckerism for easy money, the illusionary free punch, and a deep conviction that something can be derived from zero.

Thus though Ponzi is dead these 14 years, his spirit lives on in the annual messages from Washington's dreamworld where we've had 27 budgets deficits in 33 years, for a grand total of minus \$294 billion.

Of course, the New Frontier's hole-0 policies don't promise a 50-percent premium every 45 days. But the total annual spending of Federal, State, and local governments for 1964 is rapidly nearing half of the income of the entire U.S. work force.

So the authorities arrested Ponzi in 1920 for trying to pay off his current liabilities from anticipated revenues. But where are the authorities to grab Messrs. Dillon, Heller, and Kennedy for doing ditto in 1963? Huh! Ponzi would have made a fine White House economist if he lived today.

Dedication of New York World's Fair Press Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, 1964-65, at the dedication of the New York World's Fair Press Building, at Flushing Meadow, Long Island, on May 4, 1963.

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

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR 1964-65, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE PRESS BUILDING, FLUSHING MEADOW, SATURDAY, MAY 4, 1963

Mr. Sallinger and representatives of the fourth estate, we open today a fine building with the most modern facilities for a free press. In this building there will be no hour in which the Father will give his beloved sleep. Here day unto day uttereth speech and night unto night sheweth wisdom. The clatter of the news never ceases. This is your club as well as your workshop. We expect to drop in frequently as your guests for informal talks as well as for those inquiries which you euphemistically call interviews and press conferences. We shall be relaxed, candid and in the best sense clubbable.

Bob Considine's film of the fair, which you have seen, has taken the curse off the speaker and makes a long talk by him, especially to professionals, gratuitous, if not intolerable. A good film is more than an overture. When it is finished, there is nothing much left to the opus but amplification and reprise. Therefore I see no excuse for boring you with repetitions and shall confine my remarks to a few subjects of interest to the press.

Practical television was inaugurated here in Flushing Meadow at the 1939-1940 fair. Now it is to be worldwide and eventually in color. They tell me that the images ingeniously transmitted cannot be carried in relays on the surface of the seven seas and must be bounced off stars or carried by cable on the ocean floor. These things are beyond the comprehension of laymen and yet right in the offing. Since Prometheus offended Zeus and brought fire to man, no such potent and awful instrument has been entrusted to your profession, for tomorrow there will be no more dark continents, no more Tibetan monasteries, no more remote blessed isles, no more places to hide this side of heaven where beyond these voices there is peace. It is a Pandora's box entrusted to you and you must control what flies out of it. I don't envy you the responsibility.

A fair, like Caesar's wife, must be all things to all men. To those who build with the latest materials, it explodes into fantastic shapes of stone, glass, steel, aluminum, concrete, plastics, ceramics, rubber, and whatnot. Gone is the simple colonial, Georgian line. The fact that effects are temporary encourages experiment, individuality, boldness, inhibits inhibitions and gives designers who seek a clean break with the past the opportunity to get hopelessly lost or found a new school.

To those of you who build with words, which the poet tells us are more enduring than bronze, the fair is a sort of gigantic

game of anagrams. You have the opportunity, which we hope you will embrace, to present the conventional 26 letters in endless, in exhaustible, meaningful combinations. But most of all, we ask you to practice superlatives, for this will be a superlative show. If at times you are inclined to think this pageant of our is pretty insubstantial, reflect that you too in the etymological sense are journalists, creatures of a day, ephemeral, and please have in mind that we are working toward a great permanent city park, just as you build your own Sinala to the everlasting credit of your profession.

To the scientist the fair is the epitome of the age of space, to the artist and educator the cynosure of culture, to the merchant a bird's eye view of the home and common markets. To engineers the fair presents a golden opportunity to build a permanent system of approaches, crossings and highways of the most modern, ingenious design, which will be the pride of the motor age. To the sportsman the fair will be an Olympics of progress open to all in free competition without regard to ideology and protocol. We who run the fair wear overalls, not striped pants, and we strive in strategic political years to avoid domestic as well as international politics.

Finally, the fair marks the 300th anniversary of the founding of the greatest of all our American ports of entry, where the mother of exiles lifts her lamp beside the golden door, a city which our vast hinterland has a tendency to describe as foreign, offbeat, sophisticated and headed straight for pandemonium, but also regards with plain high-minded envy.

New York on the surface is a strange, hectic, overgrown, proud, complex, and in some respects puzzling society, but it represents the success of polyglot democracy, the Tower of Babel if you will, in which we have learned to speak a common language, the magnet which draws its talent from all quarters, the seat of the United Nations, the crossroads of the world. It is easy to characterize a great metropolis as a place of confusion, ruthless competition, wrath, and tears, a world's fair as a mere circus, a gathering of multitudes as a futile gesture to unite a hopelessly divided world, and to picture hospitality as exploitation in disguise.

Whatever its reputation—and no metropolis yields to a single definition—New York is no mean city. You are the chosen instruments to give our city a good name, not to advertise and exaggerate its deficiencies. You can hardly blame the executives of the fair if they complain that often there is little mention in your prints of what we perhaps fatuously regard as minor triumphs and plenty in your columns when something goes wrong. You no doubt have high warrant for such treatment. I recall that there was little said of the 90 and 9 in the fold and much about the absentee in the wilderness, and that the prodigal son, staggering home from riotous living, got the fatted calf while his hard-working brother, who was always around, got the works. It may be that you are simply dispensing Biblical justice.

I don't take too seriously occasional smear stories about the fair. What's wrong? Is it on time? Is it overwhelmed with troubles? Our friends are not misled by such stuff, nor are the distinguished bankers on our finance committee, nor the leading business giants who are investing huge sums in their exhibits, nor the thousands who eagerly write in for information about their vacations here in 1964 and 1965. I might mention also the splendid response of so many States, the aegis of President Kennedy, the support of our three living ex-Presidents, the imprimatur of the churches. The critics, at a safe distance where they can't be intimidated, jeer at those who work. They think, they think, but Mr. Huxley, who was

quite a thinker, concluded that the great end of life is not knowledge, but action. We answer the critics by palpable and increasingly visible evidences of progress. One further remark on this subject: Very shortly we shall announce that we have no more space available. This means the fair will enter a period of scarcity. There won't be room even for a critics' Tower of Babel.

We ask you to welcome prospective visitors to the fair with open arms and to urge them to prepare for visits in 1964 and 1965. You can safely promise worldwide education, culture, science, and entertainment. It will be the high point in the lives of this generation, something to look forward to with longing, to enjoy during two golden summers, and to look back upon with found remembrance. Future historians will fix the New York Fair of 1964 and 1965 as the dividing line between the age of discovery and the age of invention, between the shrinking globe and the expanding universe. Please tell your readers and listeners to come to the fair. They will thank you as long as they live.

The fourth estate sits in lordly splendor in the reporters' gallery and, according to the sage of Ecclefechan, exercised a wide world-embracing influence. It furnishes the inspiration as well as the facts for the voice of the people, which we are told is the voice of God. We are emboldened therefore to ask you to give us more than lip service, more than coldblooded justice, more than impartial criticism. Give us a break.

Tribute to the State of Israel on Its 15th Anniversary

SPEECH
OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to pay tribute in honor of the 15th anniversary of the State of Israel.

Since its establishment, the State of Israel has made considerable development and is now the most progressive and stabilized country in the Middle East. Its population has been more than doubled by the influx of persecuted refugees from all over the world, particularly from Arab and Moslem countries.

To me, Israel is a foothold of democracy in the Middle East. A strong Israel is important to the security and welfare of the United States. Of all the countries in the Middle East, the State of Israel stands out clearly as the most dependable exponent of democracy. I sincerely believe that our American policy should always be one of close friendship with the State of Israel, which the United States helped to create.

Notwithstanding all the wonderful achievements brought about by the people of Israel, the enemies of Israel continue plotting the destruction of the only truly democratic state in the Middle East. In its struggle, Israel needs the sympathetic and wholehearted support of all right thinking Americans. We must not permit Egypt and the members of the Arab League, which hates Israel, to block the progress of the young, democratic State of Israel. When we help the State of Israel, we are not only

helping the people of Israel, but we are making an everlasting friend and ally for the United States.

There must be peace between Israel and the Arab States in the Middle East.

I wish for the State of Israel and its gallant people, a continued future of peace, prosperity, security, and liberty.

One of Uncle Sam's Bad Habits, Trying To Buy Friends, Started Many Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Jim Bishop, one of America's outstanding journalists on the subject of foreign aid.

Since the end of World War II, the United States has spent the enormous sum of at least \$100 billion in some 70 countries of the world. We have given economic and military aid to dictators who then used this aid to suppress their own people in the name of anti-Communism. We have given to dictators who have indicated by word and deed their affinity for our Communist enemies.

Since we will soon be called upon to vote on legislation authorizing the foreign assistance program for the fiscal year 1964, I believe Mr. Bishop's article is most timely; and I am pleased to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

ONE OF UNCLE SAM'S BAD HABITS, TRYING TO BUY FRIENDS, STARTED MANY YEARS AGO
(By Jim Bishop)

It is difficult to trace the origin of a bad habit. No one wants to remember how it started. However, a little research shows that the United States began to give money away in large amounts in the middle of World War I. It turned out to be a habit, once started, which could not be curbed. When we give money away, nations dislike us. When we stop, they hate us.

In the second term of Woodrow Wilson, the United States began to lend money. It coincided with the emergence of America as a first class power. The money went to friendly powers to help them win the then current war. These nations made solemn pledges to repay the money, plus interest, as soon as the war was over.

As soon as it was won, the diplomatic excuses arrived. Some, like Great Britain, made a pretense of paying the interest but not the principal. Little nations like Finland paid in full, and on time. The Germans, who had been our enemies and killed our fathers, became bankrupt and we sent a man named Owen D. Young to Germany to straighten out their finances.

He did a good job. We sent money to Germany, the nation recovered from its panic inflation, and became industrially strong. The Weimar Republic was assassinated by the National Socialists, whose leader was an Austrian named Adolf Hitler. By the time he was ready to start another war of conquest, Great Britain was pleading for more money. In fact, any nation at all friendly to us measured its loyalty to us by the size of the check we sent.

Franklin D. Roosevelt decided not to lend money outright. It amounted to the same