

"Harry Truman called the 80th Congress a 'do nothing' Congress. I call the 89th Congress a 'do anything' Congress."—Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon.



REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE NEWSLETTER

312 CONGRESSIONAL HOTEL • WASHINGTON 3, D. C.

Number 39

89th Congress, First Session

October 11, 1965

Some Forty Scheduled

Ike Dinners Expected to Raise \$1 Million

Newsletter Editorial

Happy Birthday, Ike!

"If I should be the next President of our country, it will be my aim to so conduct that office that, at the end of my service, each of you can honestly say these words: 'He has been fair, he has been my friend, he has not coerced us with laws, nor divided us by class, but has fostered mutual respect, understanding and goodwill. He has led us forward along the broad middle way toward prosperity without war for ourselves and our children.'"

WITH THOSE WORDS, Dwight D. Eisenhower, General of the Army, spelled out in 1952 his hopes and aspirations for the Presidency which he sought at that time.

Today, 13 years later, we can look back on General Eisenhower's two terms in the White House and say without hesitation that he lived up to his promise.

To fully understand the achievements of the eight Eisenhower years, it's only necessary to look back to January, 1953, when he came into office as the first Republican President in 20 years.

On the international scene, the "cold war" was at its height; American and Communist forces were locked in combat in Korea; the Red Chinese were threatening an invasion of Formosa; Iranian oil was a bubbling dispute in the Middle East,

(Continued on Page 4)



REPUBLICANS WILL gather at fund-raising dinners in some 40 cities this week to celebrate former President Eisenhower's 75th birthday and raise up to \$1 million for the Party.

Most of the "Happy Birthday, Ike" dinners will be held on October 14, the General's birthday. Funds from the celebrations will be used to put State and local GOP organizations on a sound financial basis and help underwrite next year's Congressional campaigns.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Republican National Finance Committee chairman, has eliminated some of the "expensive frills" which normally go with such dinners. For example, there will be no nationwide closed circuit television hook-up between the various cities in which the dinners are held.


HOWEVER, GENERAL Clay said there will be a 15-minute film, narrated by Movie Actor James Stewart, which will feature highlights of General Eisenhower's career. The film, which will be shown at all the dinners, will close with a personal message from the General, filmed at his Gettysburg farm.

The dinners are under the direction of Co-Chairmen George Champion, Chairman of the Board of Chase Manhattan Bank, and Harold Boeschstein, Chairman of the Board of Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation. The chairmen have lined up an impressive list of dinner speakers.

Last year's GOP Presidential nominee, Barry Goldwater, and Republican National Chairman Ray C. Bliss will appear together at a dinner in Los Angeles. Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon will speak in Chicago.

One of the featured dinners will be the celebration held at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D. C., and attended by many GOP Congressmen and Senators. The featured speaker will be Sen. George Murphy of California.

(Continued on Page 4)



REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

NEWSLETTER

CONGRESSIONAL HOTEL • WASHINGTON 3, D. C.

Number 39
89th Congress, First Session
October 11, 1965

The Newsletter is published each week while Congress is in session by the Public Relations Division of the National Republican Congressional Committee, 312 Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C. 20003.

Committee Chairman
Rep. Bob Wilson of California

Executive Director
Jack Mills

Public Relations Director
Paul A. Theis

Contributing Editors

Jack R. Anderson	Thomas L. Lias
James R. Galbraith	Edwin D. Neff

Permission to use material in this publication is granted, with or without credit to the Committee. Subscription price \$25 annually. Second Class postage paid at Washington, D. C. When changing your address, please send both old and new addresses, allowing four weeks for changeover.

Who Said That?

"I HAVE NEVER sought nor do I seek now the support of any labor bosses dictating to free men anywhere, anytime," declared the Texas congressman.

To make sure nobody missed his point, 10 days later he declaimed, "Although I have been a friend of the workingman, these big labor rack-

Editorial Comment

eteers have voted to destroy me and other forthright congressmen who had the courage to vote for the Taft-Hartley bill."

Furthermore, said the congressman, referring to himself in the customary third-person form, he "voted for the Taft-Hartley anticommunist law because he believes that no group of men—big labor or big business—should possess the power to wreck our national welfare and economy."

He would, he vowed, "never vote to repeal this law."

There were, he proclaimed two days later, only two great issues before Texas and the nation: "One is whether we should bow our necks to labor dictatorship through the repeal or softening of the anticommunist Taft-Hartley bill; the other is the question of foreign policy."

If he did not break the letter of his vow, he has certainly pulverized his intent never to bow, for 16 years later he announced, "I will propose to Con-

gress changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, including Section 14-B."

The congressman had in the meantime become President and the "change" in Section 14-B he proposed was its liquidation. Section 14-B is that provision of the law that confirms the right of the voters of each state to decide whether or not they want compulsory unionism.

Lyndon Baines Johnson has come a long way since those days when he asked and got the support of Texas voters for his defense of the Taft-Hartley Act. He has come so far that his Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz can now get up before the convention of the International Ladies Garment Workers and inform them that part of his job is to press for the repeal of the right-to-work law.

Lyndon Johnson has come a long way since the days when he proclaimed his readiness to defend the freedom of choice of the individual. He has come so far that his labor secretary can attempt to justify a federal seizure of the states' right to decide for themselves on right-to-work by the following curious statement:

"It is time to put an end to fruitless and acrimonious political controversy by adopting the rule of uniformity."

If this is to be the rationalization for future steps toward the Great Society, it bodes ill for America. The "acrimonious political controversy" that we are urged to put an end to is the muscle and fiber, the very soul, of democracy. "The rule of uniformity" that we are urged to adopt has been found only in totalitarian societies in which diversity is forbidden.

It may be said—in fact it has been said and repeatedly—that in 1948 Lyndon Johnson was trying to represent Texans and that today he is trying to represent all the people. This is true and it is also true that this may cause a change in the relative importance he attaches to the issues.

BUT DOES THIS change the basic question of right and wrong in these issues? Can a law be perfectly just for Texans and completely unjust for other Americans? Does the change justify promising eternally to support a law in order to win one election and promising to destroy the same law to win a later election? Does the higher elevation of the White House so change the viewpoint of Lyndon B. Johnson that his convictions there can be the exact reverse of his convictions in Congress?

These questions about the theory of political relativity have been troubling us, as they have been troubling most Texans. We would be obliged to our former senator if he would explain it for us.

—Dallas Morning News.

What's Really Happening in the Dominican Republic?

Editor's Note: Because of confusing accounts of what's taking place in the Dominican Republic, the Newsletter believes the following report by Bell-McClure Syndicated Columnist Edgar Mowrer should help clear the air. Mowrer suggests a second Cuba may be in the making in the Caribbean.

WHAT IS GOING ON in the Dominican Republic?

It begins to look as though Senator Fulbright, the New York Times and the "be-sweet-to-Communists" are winning over President Johnson and former Assistant Secretary of State Mann.

For the expulsion from that country by American armed force of "reactionary" Gen. Wessin y Wessin, while collaborators like Col. Francisco Caamano Deno remain on the spot and fugitive Communists are flocking back from Cuba and other places whither they fled, is a sinister development.

And what of Juan Bosch himself? "Liberal" correspondents insist that Bosch has no weakness for Communism, he is just so democratic that he believes Communists have the same right as all others to pursue their political aims. Paul Bethel of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, Inc., unquestionably one of the best informed Americans on Caribbean matters, says that, before the April 24 uprising, Bosch met in Puerto Rico with two leaders of an organization calling itself June Fourteenth (J/14) and agreed to "cooperate" with them. J/14 is, according to Bethel, "by far the most militant and powerful" of the Communist groups with the Caamano rebel forces.

THIS IS PRECISELY what happened. This cooperation did not disturb the "liberal" U. S. correspondents, many of whom have never understood the techniques whereby a tiny minority can infiltrate into and gradually take over a "spontaneous liberation movement" and then eliminate the innocents who allowed them to creep into the seats of power.

It does not disturb Bill Fulbright, who stated on the Senate floor, as though it were the most natural thing in the world, that "all reform movements attract Communist support." So they do.

But in Santo Domingo there



Pletcher—Sioux City Journal

A big enough sombrero to hide a large hammer and sickle

was, according to Sen. Tom Dodd among others, more than just "Communist support" of a "reform movement." Dodd thinks that, in judging whether the presence of such support constitutes a Communist danger, there are six compelling reasons for deciding that in the Dominican Republic it has a danger indeed.

Yet the American Administration, after acting energetically and receiving the full support of the five-member OAS Special Investigating Committee, then, under pressure from softies on the spot and in Washington, retreated leaving Colonel Caamano, whose soldiers fired on Americans, in virtual possession of the field. At the same time, it violently expelled Wessin y Wessin, who had prevented an immediate rebel take-over. This in direct violation of the Institutional Act supposed to govern the actions of the provisional

government, which states that "no Dominican will be expelled from the country."

Since that time, Hector Garcia Godoy, apparently with the approval of Washington and the American military on the spot, has not only allowed thousands of agitators to leave the rebel enclave and slip into the back woods, but is handing out job after job in his provisional government to known Communists.

The latter now smell complete victory. According to correspondent Jules Dubois, a veteran Latin American expert and the first American reporter to arrive in Santo Domingo after the insurrection, "the Communists have emerged from the four-month civil war numerically stronger, much better organized, licking their chops with the fruits of victory still on their lips, better trained in the art of sabotage and guerrilla warfare and their parties made LAWFUL by a decree-law issued by Provisional President Hector Garcia Godoy." Dubois calls it "a Dominican Bay of Pigs."

PRESUMABLY, A Communist take-over is not yet inevitable. So long as American troops remain in the Dominican Republic, they can prevent any such catastrophe. President Johnson is formally committed to permitting no second Cuba on our doorstep. But if such a Cuba emerges slowly, almost imperceptibly, while U.S. troops withdraw and "liberals" participate in the noble "reform movement," it may suddenly confront LBJ with the stark fact of its existence. This would force him either to launch an invasion to overthrow it or—more likely—to accept it as "inevitable."

Such a Communist Dominican Republic would demonstrate once more the rightness of Edmund Burke's dictum that the only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.

Ike Lived Up to His Promises

and the Communists were getting a toe-hold in Guatemala, the first in this hemisphere.

Domestically, the country was divided over charges and countercharges of Communism in government; evidences of corruption in high places continued to surface; and the threat of inflation hung like a Damocles sword over our economy.

In the short span of eight years, under Ike's leadership, the fighting in Korea was halted; a defense line was drawn in the Formosa Straits which resulted in a *de facto* cease fire in that area; the Iranian issue was resolved in favor of the West, and the Communist government which had taken over Guatemala was ousted by one favorable to the United States.

Economically, the Eisenhower policies resulted in record employment and production, fatter pay envelopes, a stable cost-of-living index, and an expansion of Social Security, health and highway programs. The President's middle-of-the-road philosophy was in tune with the country and his own party was

united behind him.

Perhaps the best way to sum up Eisenhower's achievements is to note that his leadership restored to the country a sense of decency, honesty and sanity internally and respect, prestige and goodwill internationally. He instilled in the Nation a sense of morality and fair play, enabling the great issues of the day to be debated rationally and calmly—which is, after all, the first step toward finding solutions. By the force of his personality, he lifted America back into a position of esteem and leadership in the world as a peace-loving nation and defender of freedom.

As General Eisenhower observes his 75th birthday next Thursday, we believe he can look back over his years of public service with great satisfaction. For one thing, although he's not likely to claim it, he has a long line of established credit to draw on from the American people. The debt owed Dwight D. Eisenhower, in short, will be hard to repay.

Continued from Page 1

Salute to Ike Dinners

Among other speakers scheduled thus far are Rep. Bob Wilson of California, Chairman of



the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, who will speak at Ketchikan, Alaska, October 13, Juneau,

Taft October 14, Fairbanks, October 15, and Anchorage, October 16. Former Congressman Robert A. Taft, Jr., of Ohio, will speak at dinners at San Jose and Santa Clara, Calif., October 23. Sen. Roman Hruska of Nebraska has accepted an invitation to speak at the Tulare, Calif., dinner October 16.

At other dinners scheduled for October 14, Gov. Robert Smylie of Idaho will speak at Chesire, Conn.; Gov. John Love of Colorado at Westport, Conn.

Charles Percy, 1964 Republi-

can candidate for Governor of Illinois, will speak at Atlanta, Ga. He will be introduced by Rep. Howard H. Callaway of Georgia. Sen. Everett Dirksen of Illinois, Republican Leader in the Senate, will be the principal speaker at the dinner at Indianapolis. He will be introduced by Rep. Charles Halleck of Indiana.



Murphy

Rep. Rogers C. B. Morton of Maryland will speak at Great Bend, Kans.; Gov. John Chafee of Rhode Island at Kansas City, Kans.; House Republican Leader Gerald Ford of Michigan at Omaha.

Gov. John Volpe of Massachusetts will be introduced as the principal speaker at Buffalo, N. Y., by former Vice Presidential Nominee William E. Miller. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Republican Fi-

nance Committee Chairman, will introduce New York City's principal speaker, Gov. George Romney of Michigan. Reps. Leslie C. Arends of Illinois and Clark MacGregor of Minnesota also will appear on a panel presentation at the New York dinner.

Rep. Melvin R. Laird of Wisconsin will speak at Asheville, N. C.; Rep. Bob Dole of Kansas at Durham, N.C.; Sen. Thruston Morton of Kentucky at Cleveland; Sen. Thomas H. Kuchel of California at Toledo; Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York at Portland, Ore.; and Rep. Silvio Conte of Massachusetts at Newport, R. I.



Sen. Morton

At dinners scheduled on days other than October 14, Gov. Romney will speak at Baltimore October 13; General Clay at Midland, Mich., October 12; Richard Nixon at Minneapolis, October 21, and Sen. Peter Dominick of Colorado at Enid, Okla., October 26.

The America We Lost

Where is America heading? Dr. Mario A. Pei, who came to this country from Italy in 1908 as an immigrant and is now an associate professor of romance philology at Columbia University in New York, tries to answer that question in the following article. Originally published in the Saturday Evening Post of May 31, 1952, the article created considerable stir at the time. Its message is still timely today. Excerpts are reprinted below.

WHEN I FIRST came to America, forty-four years ago, I learned a new meaning of the word "Liberty" — freedom from government.

I did not learn a new meaning for "democracy." The European country from which I came, Italy, was at that time as "democratic" as America. It was a constitutional monarchy, with a parliament, free and frequent elections, lots of political parties and plenty of freedom of religion, speech, press and assembly.

But my native country was government-ridden. A vast bureaucracy held it in its countless tentacles. . . . You could not take a step without government intervention.

Many industries and businesses were government-owned and government-run—railroads, telegraphs, salt and tobacco among them. No agreement, however trivial, was legal unless written on government-stamped paper. No business could be started or run without the official sanction of a hundred bureaucrats.

Young people did not dream of going into business for themselves; they dreamed of a modest but safe government job, where they would have tenure, security and a pitiful pension at the end of their plodding careers. There was grinding taxation to support the many government functions and the innumerable public servants. Everybody hated the government — not just the party in power, but the government itself. . . . Yet, I repeat, the country was democratically run, with all the trappings of a many-

party system and all the freedoms of which we in America boast today.

America in those days made you open your lungs wide and inhale great gulps of freedom-laden air, for here was one additional freedom — freedom from government.

The Government was conspicuous by its very absence. There were no men in uniform, save occasional cops and firemen, no visible bureaucrats, no stifling restrictions, no Government monopolies. It was wonderful to get used to the American system: To learn that a contract was valid if written on the side of a house; that you could move not only from the city to the country but from state to state and never be asked what your business was or whether you had anything to declare; that you could open and conduct your own business, provided it was a legitimate one, without Government interference; that you could go from one end of the year to the other and never have contact with the national Government, save for the cheery postman who delivered your mail with a speed and efficiency unknown today; that there were no national taxes, save hidden excises and import duties that you did not even know you paid.

In that horse- and- buggy America, if you made an honest dollar, you could pocket it or spend it without having to figure what portion of it you "owed" the Government or what possible deductions you could allege against that Government's

claims. You did not have to keep books and records of every bit of income and expenditure or run the risk of being called a liar and a cheat by someone in authority.

Above all, the national ideal was not the obscure security of a Government job, but the boundless opportunity that all Americans seemed to consider their birthright. Those same Americans loved their Government then. It was there to help, protect and defend them, not to restrict, befuddle and harass them. At the same time, they did not look to the Government for a livelihood or for special privileges and handouts. They were independent men in the full sense of the word.

Foreign-born citizens have been watching with alarm the gradual Europeanization of America over the past twenty years. They have seen the growth of the familiar European-style Government octopus, along with the vanishing of the American spirit of freedom and opportunity and its replacement by a breathless search for "security" that is doomed to defeat in advance in a world where nothing, not even life itself, is secure.

FAR MORE THAN the native-born, they are in a position to make comparisons. They see that America is fast becoming a nineteenth-century-model European country. They are asked to believe that this is progress. But they know from bitter experience that it just isn't so.

Rich Man's War

By Rep. Richard H. Poff (R. of Va.)

ASIDE FROM THE "Operation Head Start" program, which of the many programs authorized by Congress in the Poverty War statute has succeeded? How many poverty-stricken people do you know who have been directly or indirectly benefited by the vast sums of money which have been spent under this program?

It begins to appear from more and more unchallengeable evidence that the poor war is really a rich man's war. Here is some of the evidence:

► In the Office of Economic Opportunity, the war staff room where the Sargent (Shriver, that is) and all his generals make the plans and in its outposts scattered about the country, one out of every 19 employees is paid more than \$19,000 per year; by comparison, in the Department of Defense, the figure is one per 1,000; even the Department of Agriculture (where there are hosts of experts) boasts only one out of 500.

► In addition to the regular, full-time Civil Service employees, OEO hires so-called "consultants" on a temporary basis; these soldiers get \$100 apiece, each and every day of combat. Perhaps only coincidentally, many of these little soldiers happen to be also loyal, hard-working members of the political party in power at the national level.

► It seems that war plans can be successfully formulated only in plush vacation resorts; at one of the planning sessions, an expense item was listed for renting tuxedos and the taxpayers picked up the tab for \$63.20 for flowers.

► At one of the Job Corps camps, the boys are receiving instruction in the basic skills of carpentry and plumbing. Part of the funds of the poverty war chest at that camp were spent to hire professional construction gangs to repair the buildings where they were housed.

► One of the Job Corps camps supposedly is teaching its girl recruits the details of housekeeping; part of the war funds at this camp is being spent to hire maids so the girls won't have to make their own beds.

► Under another program, a little army of 500 was assembled this summer to learn new skills. It was discovered that they were being taught the versatile art of picking tomatoes. For this arduous and delicate chore, they were being paid \$75 per week. At the same time, real troops training for actual combat in Vietnam were being paid only slightly more than \$75 per month.

ANY FAIR-MINDED appraisal of the total poverty war picture is bound to conclude that most of the money is absorbed in the upper echelons of the bureaucracy and little trickles down to the people for whom the big shots have so many kind words of sympathy.

What Republicans Are Saying . . .

Political Quotes

About Bureaucratic Confusion: "If this Congress proceeds in the next few months the way it has in the past nine months, we will have to establish a new agency . . . just to



Collier

coordinate the programs and bureaus, because the left bureaucratic hand does not know what the right bureaucratic hand is doing any more."—Rep. HAROLD R. COLLIER of Illinois

... About Red China and the UN: "Indications are that there may be more votes favoring the admission of Red China to the United Nations than in previous years—perhaps enough to succeed in that effort. In 1963, the vote was 57 to 41 against. A change of less than 10 votes could make the difference."—Rep. WILLIAM G. BRAY of Indiana.

About Crime: "It is imperative that there be stronger law enforcement and greater respect for the law. Placing the blame for the soaring crime rate is not the major problem. But how to put a stop to it . . . better support for the police . . . and a return to the philosophy in the courts that 'crime does not pay' would be two ways (to) check the number of crimes that are being committed."—Rep. E. ROSS ADAIR of Indiana.

About LBJ's Wars: "We've got the cold war with the Communists. We have a war on poverty, a war on crime, a war on pollution and others. But the other war you hear very little about is the war on the taxpayers."—Rep. JAMES R. GROVER of New York . . .

About the Deficit: "It is becoming increasingly obvious that our deficit next June will be at least seven or eight billion dollars. It is becoming apparent



Cederberg

that vast Federal expenditures . . . are increasing the cost of living."—Rep. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG of Michigan . . . About Equal Opportunity: "Republicans believe that the greatest rewards should go to those who work the hardest . . . we believe that everyone should have an equal place at the starting blocks. But we do not believe that the race must always end in a tie."—Rep. CHARLES RAPER JONAS of North Carolina.

POLITICAL NOTES

Although President Johnson likes to make a big splash with bill-signings, he seems to care little for those to be helped by a new law. For example, he delayed five days before signing a GI insurance bill which provided \$10,000 in death benefits. Rep. William H. Ayres (R. of Ohio), a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, points out that LBJ's delay meant families of those men killed in Vietnam during that period lost benefits provided under the bill.

ISN'T IT AMAZING how any Washington scandal always seems to wind up with a White House tie-in? Take the furor over the sugar scandal, for example. Irving Hoff, the lobbyist for the cane sugar refiners who was permitted to sit in on Congressional committee sessions when the sugar bill was being drafted, served as President Johnson's campaign manager in the West last year . . . Wild Blue Wonders: Democratic Congressmen who have ridden on the Presidential helicopter are receiving official "flight certificates" from LBJ. Commented one Democrat: "This is like belonging to a Mickey Mouse Club" . . . LBJ might try to pretend all is well with the economy, but just-released figures reveal lost man-days because of strikes are running at near-record levels. Thus far in 1965, strike idleness has amounted to 16.8 million man-days, compared with 11.2 million and 11.3 million for the same periods in 1964 and 1963. Strikes in August idled 222,000 workers, highest level since 1959. . . . Although he may receive a White House reprimand, Under Secretary of Commerce Leroy Collins last week conceded that an increase of "even a fraction of a point" in national production is of greater significance in relieving economic distress than all the arsenal of the anti-poverty program.

Remember the photo of the billboard advertising the Lyndon Johnsons' radio-TV stations in Austin published in the September 27th Newsletter? White House newsmen visiting Austin with the President last weekend reported KTBC signs had been removed from two locations along Austin roadways.

NOTING THE fluctuation of stock market prices prior to the announcement of Lockheed's award of a \$2 billion government contract, Rep. Robert Dole (R. of Kans.) has urged the Securities and Exchange Commission to look into the matter. Dole said spec-

Losing the Popularity Poles

President Johnson and the Nation's Polish community are "poles apart" on the recent transfer of Postmaster General John Gronouski to the post of ambassador to Communist Poland.

LBJ used the old Great Society ploy, the secret meeting, to placate Polish-American Congressmen who were rankled over Gronouski's demotion. Johnson told the Congressmen that the Polish ambassadorship was a highly important job and Gronouski was the best man for it.

The Polish weekly in Pittsburgh compared Johnson's action with FDR's sending former Boston Mayor James Curley to Warsaw, stressing the same theme that Johnson stated with Gronouski—that the post is important to preserve peace.

Curley reportedly told FDR: "Mr. President, if you believe that the ambassadorial post in Warsaw is so very important, doesn't it seem the right thing to do would be for you to resign your office as President and go to Warsaw yourself as ambassador to save the world."

ulators with inside information could have made profits on the jump in Lockheed's price following the announcement . . . The Capitol Hill Club salutes the Pennsylvania GOP Congressional delegation at a reception Wednesday, October 13 . . . Some California Republicans, perhaps thinking about their Governor, are nominating for headline of the year this one from the *Oakland Tribune*: "Peach Growers Face Heavy Losses Due to Brown Rot" . . . Felix Cotten, long-time Congressional correspondent for International News Service and more recently legislative analyst at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, has joined the Republican National Committee's public relations staff . . . War Notes: Don't expect American soldiers home from Vietnam by Christmas. One reason: The American PX in Saigon has already laid in a full supply of Christmas decorations.

National Thrift Week "the oldest of all national weeks," is scheduled October 17-24. Since LBJ is always anxious to issue proclamations, what do you suppose he has up his sleeve to commemorate National Thrift Week when his Administration is the highest spending in the Nation's history?

House Democrats have voted to double the money for the war on poverty. Under Lyndon Johnson, it seems poverty has become our fastest growing industry.

What Republicans Are Doing

PPOINTING OUT THAT the Administration already is spending \$4,000 to \$6,000 per man to train school dropouts in the Job Corps, Rep. John J. Duncan of Tennessee urged President Johnson to end his opposition to a GI education bill for Vietnamese veterans, now before the House Veterans Affairs Committee. Duncan said the cost of the GI bill would be only about \$1,440 per veteran, and hence the President's objections on the basis of cost are "ridiculous" . . . Rep. James C. Cleveland of New Hampshire has proposed creation of a special Congressional committee to review Federal land ownership policies. Specifically, he seeks a nine-member, bipartisan select committee of the House to investigate imbalances in Federal land ownership, the need for acquiring additional lands for Federal use and related matters.



Duncan

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED by Rep. John W. Wydler of New York would provide that the Federal Government share part of its revenues with the States for use in public schools. The bill would establish an "Educational Assistance Trust Fund" into which one per cent of Federal revenue would be deposited the first year, two per cent the second, up to five per cent the fifth year and thereafter. "This will result in Federal aid without Federal control," Wyd-

ler said . . . Sen. Jacob K. Javits of New York has proposed that the U.S. Pavillion at the World's Fair, which closes this month, be used as a Job Corps training site. Javits said it would be "a most deplorable waste of taxpayers money if the pavillion were to be demolished."

A BILL TO ABOLISH the National Labor Relations Board and establish in its place a 12-man U.S. Labor Court, similar to the U.S. Tax Court, and a part of the judicial system, has been introduced by Rep. Robert Griffin of Michigan. Griffin said the present NLRB

"seems determined to make policy and to write their own laws" . . . Rep. Robert C. McEwen of New York, an advocate of highway beautification, says roadside industries serving the travelling public should be allowed to have a limited number of off-premises advertisements. Without such advertisements, he said, many small businesses would perish, throwing hundreds out of work . . . Rep. James F. Battin of Montana has urged the secretary of agriculture to hold back marketing of Commodity Credit Corporation wheat in order to improve the cash market. Rain and snow last spring damaged the wheat crop of many farmers, who thus have less wheat to sell.



McEwen

Drawings by Steve Balogh

Does Anyone Care?

"It is often said that Lyndon Johnson wields more power than any other President, at least in a time of less than full-scale war. The striking thing is that this remarkable concentration of power apparently bothers so few people. . . . It would be a bitter outcome if this generation, legatees of free institutions, were to bequeath in turn a legacy whereby the citizen is secure in his liberty only at the whim of the Executive."—*Wall Street Journal*.