

the past family type farm housing was not in great demand especially in those areas of our Nation which were heavy users of foreign farmworkers. Foreign farmworkers were either single males or traveled without their families. They were often housed in barrack type structures dormitory style. These structures were equipped with three decker bunks as sleeping accommodations and lacked family type sanitation and cooking facilities. For example, California, the Nation's largest user of foreign farm labor, in 1964 had 158,222 farm housing units for single males as opposed to 9,875 family housing units. Obviously, this type of accommodation is not suitable for a worker who is accompanied by his family.

The farmer who employs American farm labor has a unique labor problem in that he generally must provide housing for his employees. This housing is an extra item of labor costs; it has no economic value to the farmer beyond enabling him to attract employees and is only occupied for short periods of the year.

I realize that many farmers do not have adequate financial means to build family housing. The \$50 million authorized by H.R. 7984 for Federal grants in this area is an insignificant amount indeed when compared with the need for such housing.

A recent study by the State of California showed that there were 250,000 farmworkers in that State who earned less than \$2,700 a year. A great majority of these workers lived in dilapidated and deteriorated housing. In the heart of the California farm community an eight-county survey reported that 80 percent of the farmworker housing violated minimum standards of health, safety and sanitation. Sixty-five percent of such housing was deteriorated or dilapidated; 33 percent had inadequate sanitation facilities; 36 percent had no bathing facilities and 25 percent were without running water.

The lack of family housing is most acute in communities which have high seasonal, short-term labor demands. In California's Monterey, Santa Cruz, and Santa Clara Counties in the heart of that State's strawberry-producing area, there are only 183 family housing units.

The State of California estimates that in order to provide adequate housing for these farmworkers the cost would be \$4,000 per housing unit. These costs cannot be paid for by the farmworker since his low family income limits his opportunity of obtaining normal financing. The States with their already strained budgets cannot be expected to pay the entire amount.

Federal assistance such as is provided in H.R. 7984 is needed in order to better the lot of our Nation's agricultural workers. I realize, however, that low-rent housing cannot compensate for the effect of public policy which up until now has excluded American agricultural workers from such basic social legislation as minimum wage, collective bargaining and unemployment insurance. Federal grants for the construction of farm housing must only be a part of a

broader overall social economic program to better the lot of our agricultural workers.

OUR PACIFIC TRUST TERRITORY— TIME FOR REAPPRAISAL

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a timely and perceptive editorial on the political alternatives facing Pacific Island peoples has been published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. I offer the editorial as another useful item to add to the information available for discussion among the growing number of those concerned with the present and future status of non-self-governing peoples of the Western Pacific.

As the Nation charged with administering the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under a trusteeship agreement with the United Nations Security Council, the United States has an obligation to promote greater self-government among the 87,000 Micronesians who live in the former Japanese mandated islands. We are doing this with some success despite many difficulties.

Nearly 20 years have passed since we began administering the Pacific Trust Territory. It is time to take stock of our national policies and to seek a consensus on the eventual destiny for the peoples of the trust territory.

As the Star-Bulletin editorial cogently noted:

Of one thing we may be sure. Colonialism under the cloak of United Nations Trusteeship is not the final answer.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin editorial of July 22, 1965, titled "Too Poor for Independence."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin,
July 22, 1965]

TOO POOR FOR INDEPENDENCE

Pacific Island leaders, meeting in New Guinea, almost without exception indicated that they do not want to be cut adrift from their more powerful protectors: the United States, France, Britain, New Zealand, Australia.

The one exception is Nauru, rich with phosphate, which is one of the few Pacific islands with resources enough to be economically independent. But even Nauru realizes that it would still have to depend upon Australia, which administers it under United Nations trust, for defense and some services.

None of the scattered island groups under U.S. trusteeship is economically viable in today's world at anything beyond the barest subsistence level. It is unlikely that the people of those islands, having known a higher standard of living than bare subsistence, will want to revert to the primitive economies they never knew.

A colonial status under the United States, or any other power, is an anachronism not sanctioned by today's enlightened political thought—or by the U.N. Charter. And yet these small island groups are too poor to be independent. Their leaders for the most part are well aware of this. While appreciative of the internal self-government that is coming their way, they fear the consequences of being cast adrift on their own.

It is against this background that the proposal to incorporate the Pacific Islands in the State of Hawaii emerges as one practical, if complex, way out. Senator Fong has

placed the idea before Congress and a study of the possibilities, if nothing else, may be forthcoming.

Of one thing we may be sure, colonialism under the cloak of United Nations trusteeship is not the final answer.

PUERTO RICO CELEBRATES 13TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF ITS COMMONWEALTH

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on Sunday, July 25, Puerto Ricans celebrated the 13th anniversary of the establishment of the island's Commonwealth. It was a day of rejoicing, made notable by addresses of the Governor, the Honorable Roberto Sanchez Vilella, of Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, and others.

Because the establishment of the Commonwealth—an inaccurate translation really of the political status of Puerto Rico, a literal translation of its Spanish nomenclature being "associated free state"—has been so successful and has set such a fine example of what can be accomplished in eliminating colonialism in consonance with the wishes and needs of the people affected, I think it desirable that the two principal addresses—those of Governor Vilella and Secretary of the Interior Udall—be inserted in the Record, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech Delivered by Gov. ROBERTO SANCHEZ VILELLA ON THE 13TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO, JULY 25, 1965

Honorable representative of the President of the United States, distinguished guests of honor, honorable visitors, members of the three branches of government, friends, and fellow citizens, today we commemorate once again the greatest act of political creativity which our people have accomplished. Exactly 3 years ago, on a similar occasion, two historic letters were made public. Former Gov. Muñoz Marín wrote to the late President John F. Kennedy that our people should again be consulted on their political relations with the United States of America. The late President was in total agreement with this aspiration. On that same occasion, we were honored to have among us the man who is now President of the Nation, Lyndon B. Johnson, said that the exchange of letters constitutes "a historic reaffirmation of our belief in the self-determination of peoples, when exercised with the acceptance of the responsibilities of freedom."

As a result of that exchange and that belief, a commission was created—composed of American citizens from Puerto Rico and from the continent, and with representation from all sectors of opinion—to study all the aspects of our relations with the United States of America. The commission is making this study because we are proud of our present relationship with the United States, and because we want to improve it. It is also making this study because we want finally to liberate the energies of our people from the narrow dilemma of political status. We will succeed.

I am confident that the work of the commission and the subsequent acts of our people and of Congress will result in the reaffirmation of our will, expressed time and again in the ballots, the will to associate with the United States on the basis of a compact of political equality. But regardless of the deliberations and studies made by the

UDARLEJO 25

commission, the Commonwealth now is a way of life which is beyond the determination of any Congress or any commission. It is, and it has been for 13 years, our way of life.

LET US TAKE AN INTROSPECTIVE LOOK

We have no doubts about the meaning of Commonwealth status for our people. We know what it is; we "live" what it is. It has never been defined better than in the few words pronounced here 2 years ago by its main architect and exponent, Luis Muñoz Marín said then: "Commonwealth is not a theory that is described and proposed to me; Commonwealth is what I am living in my body and in my spirit every day of my life; it is what I am living and feeling in my work, in my hope, in the development of the future of my children; Commonwealth is this and nothing less than this."

In the past, we have heard on similar occasions many voices congratulating us on this breakthrough from narrow nationalism and on our contribution to the constitutional life and thought of the hemisphere. But today let us alter the direction from which we have traditionally regarded our creation on days such as this. While our relationship with the United States is being studied, let us, for the first time in 13 years, look introspectively at our Commonwealth.

Let us ask ourselves what use have we made of the powers obtained 13 years ago. Let us reply to ourselves how this constitutional system—an essential part of our creation, a system called beautiful and formidable even by the greatest opponents of association as a solution to our political status—serves our people. Let us see how we are developing democracy in our self-government and how this process will continue in the future.

WHAT LEADERSHIP MEANS

Our Government and party system is a real democracy. It has a solid base: We are responsible to the people, not as an idea or an abstraction, but to 2½ million human beings each one as important as the other. We have chosen this system of parties and elections as the means of expression of popular opinion. But the popular will cannot be unanimous. When voting, the voter does not mean to say that he is in absolute agreement with all of the platform or all of the notions of his party. The mandate is consensus, not unanimity. The parties, the Government itself, is and should be a reflection of that reality. So that this system may produce the greatest benefit for our people, we must maintain an harmonious relation of consensus among the three branches of Government and among all parties, a relation of common direction, of common purpose. We have to fulfill the people's mandate.

The exercise of power is necessary to achieve the common purpose, to fulfill that mandate. It is necessary and healthy that there be strong leadership; leadership that marks the route clearly, leadership that offers alternatives and gives the reasons for the selected course of action, the leadership of reason. It is necessary and healthy that such authority be exercised by the executive. It should be used to the maximum and continuously, without evasion and without encumbrances. But it is the authority of the law, the authority of the institutions, and the authority that our people delegated to their executive in the Constitution. Absolute power does not educate in democracy. Limited power does. We have to account to the people for the exercise of that authority which is in reality and in the last instance, exclusively their own.

Our people will produce excellent leaders from among themselves. But we must seek excellence in normality. We must become accustomed to normality in the nature of men and in the functioning of institutions. We must search for and promote excellence

in normality, because the gigantic stature of Luis Muñoz Marín will not be repeated in our history.

The exercise of constitutional authority must be accompanied by the exercise of political power. But to engage in politics does not mean politicking. Political power is an instrument whereas moral principles are goals. If the cost of exercising political power is the surrender of basic principles that one sustains, it is too high a price, and it is a price which people never demand.

LET US GO TO THE PEOPLE

The people of Puerto Rico, our people understand this far more and far better than has ever been recognized. In our recent history, economic and social progress took precedence over political development; and political development was confused with the question of our status, or relationship with another country. It is one of the tasks of this new era to equate our political development with our economic and social development. It is a task of this new era to continue purifying our democracy.

The collective wisdom of the people is always greater than that of the leaders that represent them, or that of political organizations. People have prevailed over hundreds of political machines, men, and structures through the centuries, and they always reject those that depend on mere politicking. The intraparty dialog or the search for a consensus in our country cannot be founded on the basis of norms imposed by certain structures or groups. The enormous majority of our people reject the assumption that he who differs is an enemy. They already know that there is always more than one alternative, and that they are really the only final judge.

We must go directly to the people. The ballot will always prove their wisdom. The people entrust their government with the solution, not the evasion of their difficult problems. And all of us in Government are required to assume the responsibility of solving them. In recent years, some did not assume their responsibility to do their jobs, because the colossal figure of a great leader could respond for them before the electorate. Times have changed. We are widening the base of our Government and each one must assume his corresponding task. Our people are going to ask to each one of us, every 4 years: How many difficult problems did you add me to solve? What did you do to help me?

IDEAL FUNCTIONING OF OUR THREE BRANCHES

So that we can answer to their satisfaction, I want to leave with you today some thoughts on the ideal functioning of our system of self-government.

The executive branch must determine priorities among the collective needs, and it must remain continuously sensitive to the human relations of which they are evidence. It must remain always alert to the new and old problems of the country in order to propose solutions. It must prevent at all costs complacency, bureaucratization and self-deception. We must devote to this task the highest degree of imagination and initiative. The people are going to judge the extent to which the Executive initiates and directs, with dedication and capability, the solution of their collective problems.

The legislative branch must in turn vigorously represent its respective constituents in establishing a clear consensus, and it must firmly demonstrate its self-respect. It must give the most profound and careful study to the problems of the country, with a clear vision of our common purpose. It must at all costs avoid superficiality, politicking and the pettiness of conflicts of interest. We must provide it with the means to devote the greatest possible time to its work and to attract to its ranks the best of human quality. The people are going to

judge the extent to which it collaborates, with vision and depth, in the successful solution of their collective problems.

The judicial branch must firmly express its independent criteria, and assume the responsibility for its effective operation as well as the efficient administration of its functions. It must foster mutual respect among its components and an harmonious relation with those that represent the people's will. It must at all costs avoid idleness, politicization and disorder. It must be provided with all that is necessary to inspire maximum respect and dignity. And will itself be judged on the extent to which it can guarantee, day by day, to our citizens the sacred rights of the law.

In the relationship among the branches, in spite of the functional separation which constitutional order obliges us to maintain, there must exist a close and harmonious collaboration of spirit. There must be all the agreement permitted us within the limits set by the people in their Constitution. There must exist communication without intervention.

THE FUNCTION OF POLITICAL PARTIES

The picture of our self-government would not be complete were we to omit mention of the function of political parties. On this subject, it is sufficient to repeat the prophetic and illuminating words of Luis Muñoz Marín. Long before becoming Governor, he gave us the rule to follow when he said:

"The best public administration can only be achieved if it acts on the basis of a clear idea of the relations in a democracy between politics and public administration."

"We all know what the ideal function of minority parties is: a mission to criticize all that they honestly feel should be criticized and corrected; and to cooperate in all that they honestly feel deserves promotion and support."

"The Government and the majority party, both being expressions of the people, must have a common purpose: the establishment and development of the program of public action approved by the people in the elections. But the political party and the Government have different things to do, as a result of their common origin in the people, and as instruments of their common objectives for the people."

"The political party is created to propose and discuss solutions before the people and to facilitate the exercise of voting rights. Beyond that, the political party cannot intervene determinatively without risking, in the long or the short run, good public administration."

"This is due to the fact that behind the political party is the people; that the interest of the people must always be dominant over the interest of the political party as such, and that in the interest of the people is the best possible public administration."

THIS IS OUR GOVERNMENT

That is the illuminating word. Here is our reality. We have begun since last January 2, the healthy process of differentiation in action. The function of the three branches of the Government and the parties, is seen now without the presence of a charismatic leader. We see in action the total dimension of our constitutional system. It is our system of self-government, and it deserves to be so under any political status. It is a democratic government. It means that there is a popular mandate, and that we are responsible only to the people. I have described the role which I think corresponds to each of us who works in Government. Our respective oaths give us that responsibility, and we assume the duty to fulfill it. Our people, on the other hand, will assume their own duty.

I am determined to serve honorably to fulfill my duty. I shall never do my own will, but that of my fellow citizens. Our demo-

cratic system provides that the people shall judge every 4 years. And judge they will. The people of Puerto Rico will respond to the confidence that I have deposited in them, and they will give me their confidence for as long as necessary, until we fulfill our final purpose: greatness for Puerto Rico.

The institution, the system, that will serve us as the means to this goal, is the one we are honoring today. It is the commonwealth. It is our constitution. Let this day serve to repeat with love, the phrase that is the essence of self-determination and freedom. Let this day serve to reiterate with dedication the phrase that expresses the obligation of each one of us, of every Puerto Rican. Let us say, with pride: "This is our government."

Thank you.

**ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
STEWART L. UDALL AT COMMONWEALTH DAY
CELEBRANCE, SAN JUAN, P.R., JULY 26, 1965**

I am delighted to be here in Puerto Rico to join in the observance of Commonwealth Day. This is a great day in the history of United States and Puerto Rico and the hemisphere, an occasion for true celebration.

I am here to bring to you the warm personal greetings of the President of the United States. As you know, he has been long associated with Puerto Rico and he is glad of his participation in the historical events which led up to the establishment of the Commonwealth. He is proud of the splendid economic and social evolution which has been taking place within Puerto Rico, and he is excited at the prospect of the really magnificent achievements and contributions which the people of Puerto Rico now have the opportunity to make in the world.

It seems to me appropriate in a sort of reverse sense that the President happened to choose me as his Commonwealth Day proxy. The Secretary of the Interior can be called a symbol of the growth and development of the United States Puerto Rican relationship. Puerto Rican matters are no longer referred to the Interior Department. This is one time I am enthusiastic over seeing my empire shrink.

It was in keeping with history that President Kennedy made this change in 1961, ordering that matters involving Puerto Rican status be referred to the Office of the White House. On that occasion he stressed the "unique position of the Commonwealth." It is this uniqueness which I think most fascinates us all, and sums up our joint delight in the Puerto Rican story.

The uniqueness covers many fronts. To start with, Puerto Rico is, of course, dramatically different in many elementary ways from the United States—site, climate, resources. Add to that the cultural and historical differences in such areas as political experience, language, wealth, population. To the enormous credit of the United States, it has historically responded to those differences by differences in treatment—uniqueness of relationship. Even from the beginning of our political association, it has been characterized by a combination of elements, some resembling integration, some completely different. I do not here have the time or need to specify the aspects of the long relationship. The heart of it, the cause of our mutual pride, the practical genius of it, is this: the Americans and the Puerto Ricans have been able to work out arrangements between them which are appropriate to the peculiar circumstances of Puerto Rico and which are at the same time a benefit to the United States.

Uniqueness is usually intriguing, just because it is unique. But the charm in the Puerto Rican story goes much deeper, into real meaning for many areas of our troubled lives. I mentioned earlier that the United States reacted gracefully and generously to the differences it confronted in 1898 in Puerto Rico, differences it had had no experience

with before in all its wide territories. But just as decisive was the Puerto Rican reaction to the reaction. With a slow start and a tremendous rate of speed in recent years, Puerto Rico has achieved remarkable gains economically, in diversification and industrialization and sound growth in prosperity. This is in the face of devastating natural odds, and with current direct American financial help less per capita than that going to some independent foreign countries.

In other areas the success of the Puerto Rican talent for self-help is less tangible but even more heartening. The development of political responsibility is a dramatic story, both on the part of the Government and of the people. The island's bold attacks on problems of deplorable housing, illiteracy, scanty land area, poverty (Shriver didn't invent the poverty program) have all made tremendously impressive gains, and there are many others of this kind. The Puerto Rican achievements in the last generation or so are a sort of evolving success story in an area where most stories are gloomy and disheartening. The less developed areas are now generally doing worse, economically at least, than a few short years ago. The world, and all of us, need encouragement and it is good indeed to see the wonderful progress that Puerto Rico is continuing to make in the different areas of life.

The first Commonwealth Day, 13 years ago, is a proud day for us for many reasons. One of the most important is its recognition of a close relationship in equal association, a compact relationship, tailored to the particular individualisms of the United States and Puerto Rico in relation to each other. Both the Americans and the Puerto Ricans showed themselves possessed of a political creativity and vision. The Commonwealth established at that point in time was thoroughly unique. It certainly differed sharply from the traditional varieties of American status: statehood, colony, incorporated territory. It didn't resemble very closely any other entity in the world—the nearest relative was probably some stage in British dominion development, but the differences there were still acute.

The Americans, then, and the Puerto Ricans both had the bravery to venture beyond the textbook relationships to work out something more appropriate to their own personalities and abilities. This in itself is to us one of the great significances of Commonwealth Day. For some dire reason, creativity in political affairs of the world has been moving much more slowly than our desperate need occasions, and the Commonwealth is a brilliant exception.

Commonwealth, the free association between the United States and Puerto Rico, has as we all know grown and proved itself in many ways and to many persons since July 26, 1952. That illustrates the underlying nature of Commonwealth. It is a growing, evolving, dynamic creature. The nature of life is change, but Commonwealth has the grace to be able to adapt to it without losing its hold on the stable lasting values.

The most stirring aspect of this festive occasion is to me the possibilities now open to the Puerto Ricans for many important different kinds of achievements. The fact of Puerto Rican success can be in itself a meaningful incentive to other peoples, particularly the underdeveloped, to help themselves to economic improvement and political stability. The world badly needs this kind of example, and it can respond to this kind of success story. In this connection, the Commonwealth status can point the way to weaker areas for dignified and beneficial association with other areas. Once the less developed nations lose their fears and over-sensitiveness, we can hope that they will evaluate the many kinds of beneficial relationships open to them.

It is also most interesting to see the energy with which Puerto Rico is tackling its problems and extending its lines. Some of these

areas are of special importance to the United States. Puerto Rico is aptly suited for certain kinds of activities, including particular assistance programs and regional development activities to help build up Caribbean economic and political health. The possibilities in areas like this are exciting indeed.

It all sounds like quite a love affair, this relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico, and I think that is true. It happily combines tremendous affection with a real feeling for the separateness and differences of two entities.

I have no doubt that this close and intimate relationship—this brotherhood—between the United States and Puerto Rico will continue as far as one can see into the future. It is a sign of the dynamic nature of the Puerto Rican people and of the vision of the United States that the political status of Puerto Rico is now being reexamined by a distinguished joint committee. I do not, of course, know what the specific results will be—but I am confident of one fundamental fact: I am sure that whatever the status commission recommends—whatever the future holds in terms of adaptations and changes in the form of the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico, they will always be close collaborators and intimate partners in the great human adventure—the search for peace and the spiritual and physical well-being of people.

HARTFORD'S REVITALIZATION CORPS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Revitalization Corps of Hartford, Conn., is a private agency which is seeking to answer the challenge of our times on a personal basis. Founded in 1964 by Edward T. Coll, the Revitalization Corps offers a citizen Peace Corps, through which individuals may serve their community without interrupting their careers or their studies.

The corps operates a four-pronged program of educational, recreational, humanitarian and civic activities, working to enrich the lives of culturally deprived seventh- and eighth-graders in the Hartford area. The volunteer staff, comprised of members of all races, religions and age groups, includes New York Knickerbocker Basketball Star Johnny Egan. Under the direction of its president, Mr. Coll, the organization offers programs including lectures and seminars on civic affairs, remedial tutoring, athletic tournaments, volunteer service at hospitals and charitable institutions and youth guidance and counseling to the over 500 participating youngsters.

The Revitalization Corps is carrying out its program in the American tradition of cooperative private efforts devoted to the public welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that an article concerning the Revitalization Corps from the New York Times and an editorial from the Hartford Times be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times,
July 11, 1965]

KENNEDY'S IDEALS INSPIRE PROGRAM—GROUP
IN HARTFORD IS HELPING CHILDREN MEET
CHALLENGES

(By John C. Devlin)

HARTFORD, July 10—When President Kennedy was assassinated late in 1963, one of the

63 513 689

highly sophisticated commercial weapons. Our traders must be prepared to counter with aggressive sales and market penetration techniques, good service and sound but liberal and imaginative credit arrangements. Moreover, we should not forget that a richer Korea means a richer, stronger Pacific community through trade which in turn means greater prosperity for America. We must therefore continue to encourage Korea's development and the growth of prosperity for her people. At the same time, we ought to promote increased participation by Korea in the affairs of the Pacific community.

In this regard let us continue in the forefront of those who advocate the creation of an Asian Development Bank which will encourage nations like Korea to help themselves by providing the means with which to do it. Let us continue to encourage the growing rapprochement between Korea and Japan and the high statesmanship demonstrated by the governments of both of those nations in coming to agreement on normalizing their relations. Let us also seek to multiply our own commercial and cultural ties with Korea by expanding our currently inadequate cultural exchange program, by working to increase tourism in both directions, by encouraging such ventures as the Korean Bank to be located in Los Angeles, by promoting joint scientific and cultural projects of mutual benefit which will increase the store of human knowledge in such areas as oceanography, art, and archeology. As neighbors in the Pacific community we ought to get to know each other much better than we now do. Korea and the United States have enjoyed a close international friendship for 20 years. Let us strengthen that friendship with the cement of people-to-people understanding—personal knowledge by our peoples of each others' people, culture, and land.

Few nations in history have come to so much grief so often as has Korea. Cursed by geography as a strategically located buffer state at the feet of three giants, she has known in the past century only war, intrigue, revolution, subjugation, colonization, and now tragic partition.

But today, on this 12th anniversary of the armistice, we can see that the southern half of this tiny Asian peninsula is at last beginning to glow, however faintly, with the promise of a brighter future for 30 millions of people. We cheer this progress and hope that the sparks we see will soon burst into the flame of prosperity.

A Salute to Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, 1952, the island community of Puerto Rico attained Commonwealth status.

Some critics have complained that since it is neither a territory nor a State, Puerto Rico enjoys the advantages of Federal services without paying taxes.

But this is far from a one-sided relationship. The more than 2 million residents of the island community have a voice, but no vote, in Congress. They have little say in determining their fate.

And they have served our Nation well in time of need. Some 60,000 Puerto Ricans—90 percent of them volunteers—were members of the Armed Forces during the Korean war.

And it is a happy relationship. In the 1960 elections in Puerto Rico, candidates favoring retention of Commonwealth status outdistanced by nearly 2 to 1 statehood advocates. Those favoring independence lagged far behind.

And so we take this occasion to salute Puerto Rico and its unique status, a status that has enabled the island to demonstrate to the world the progress and growing prosperity it has made as a workshop for democracy in Latin America.

Excise Tax Reduction Seen as Savings to Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of this body an ad which appeared today in the Cleveland Press, with which Sears, Roebuck & Co. becomes the first retailer in the United States, to my knowledge, to use the excise tax reduction for positive consumer advertising.

In this full-page ad, Sears, Roebuck & Co. started by saying:

You can count on us. Sears prices have been reduced on merchandises covered by the recent repeal of the manufacturers' Federal excise tax by Congress. You can also save 10 percent on all items that carried the retailers' Federal excise tax. You can count on Sears to pass the new Federal excise tax savings directly on to you.

The number of merchandise items is too lengthy to list in one advertisement. However, here are some of the categories on which you can expect manufacturers' Federal excise tax savings at Sears.

These creative advertisers at Sears went on to list approximately 50 categories of items in which the consumer could expect a savings to be passed on to them at the Sears stores. These items mentioned included refrigerators, electric blankets, electric irons, electric frying pans, electric waffle irons, electric door chimes, electric food choppers and grinders, electric hedge trimmers, electric lawn mowers—with less than 30-inch cut—cameras, business machines, playing cards, phonograph records, tennis equipment, golf balls, pool tables, and many other items.

The Sears advertising men went on to picture specific items of consumer interest with each model number, pre-excise-tax prices, and their post-excise-tax

prices as well as their sale prices in certain instances so that the consumer could tell at a glance exactly where and how the excise tax was being passed on.

I wish to congratulate and commend the management of Sears, Roebuck & Co. for this splendid example of creative advertising in utilizing the excise tax reduction to the greatest extent possible. In this instance, the consumer cannot be misled or confused and has no reason to mistrust the honesty of this retailer because excise taxes are being passed on. In this full-page ad, the consumer can see where and how.

It is my hope that other retailers will follow Sears' lead in clarifying this question of how and where the excise taxes are being passed on to the consumer as well as if the excise tax reduction is reflected in lower retail prices.

Far From Home and the Red Bluebeard Recalls First Wife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following articles from the July 23, 1965, edition of the New York Journal-American. The first article, "Far From Home," an editorial, concerns the action of 10 members of the U.S. Women's Strike for Peace. These misguided women signed a joint statement with a delegation of Vietnamese women deploring U.S. "military aggression" in Vietnam.

The second article, "The Red Bluebeard Recalls First Wife," by John Chamberlain, concerns the "celebration" of the 25th anniversary of the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union.

It is ironic that little of the population that was incorporated in 1940 is left in these Baltic States. The Soviet Union has pursued a policy of genocide by diffusion, scattering the Baltic inhabitants and replacing them with Soviets and Ukrainians. It was a bitter anniversary "celebration" for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The parallel needs no amplification.

The articles follow:

FAR FROM HOME

Ten members of the U.S. Women's Strike for Peace signed a joint statement in Jakarta, Indonesia, with a delegation of Vietnamese and Communist North Vietnamese women deploring U.S. "military aggression" in Vietnam.

The statement urges American women "to work with dedication to stop the war in Vietnam."

Doesn't it occur to these misguided women that something must be wrong if they are in such agreement with the Communists?

THREE DAYS—THE RED BLUEBEARD RECALLS FIRST WIFE

(By John Chamberlain)

The three Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have been "observing"

1055 510 585