

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 3

FEBRUARY 10, 1966, TO FEBRUARY 26, 1966

(PAGES 2817 TO 4180)

The Communists of two and three decades ago pointed to the growing and—to them—extremist activities of big capital. According to the Communists, capitalism, then in its "last stages," was evolving into fascism and imperialism. In the same spirit, Robert Welch analyzed, in mid-1965, the development of the forces against which he has allegedly allied his society:

"(1) The Communist conspiratorial apparatus is now closing in, with every conceivable pressure and deception, on all remaining resistance to the establishment of its police state over our country; (2) the only existing force that has any possible chance of preventing the completion of these Communist plans is the John Birch Society; (3) we have no chance of stopping and reversing the long patient progress of this conspiracy except—exactly as stated in the Blue Book 6 years ago—by measures which are fantastic enough to be realistic in proportion to the danger."

Fantastic measures—some of them admitted by Welch to be "mean and dirty"—have become the trademark of Birch Society activity. And the wheels now are spinning. The active search for new members, after an initial policy of quiet recruitment, has been pushed with increasingly high pressure since 1963. All during which time the Birchers have worked to clean up their public image while Welch engaged in some hard-headed planning for future political influence.

MEMBERSHIP

The membership "explosion" that has vastly increased Birch membership rolls since the 1964 national political conventions was the result of many factors. Most of them were related to the Presidential elections campaign in which Birchers and other such extremists were active, welcomed, defended and, to a certain extent, triumphant. At the Republican convention, the Birch Society covered itself with a kind of respectability. Birchers misused the campaign as a vehicle to spread their own political propaganda and to recruit new members.

Many Americans were swept into the Birch ranks on the emotional tide of the campaign period. Many others joined after election day, when the frustration of defeat made them ripe for recruitment and when the Birch Society's postelection appeal to this group was summed up in the simple slogan: "Now Will You Join the John Birch Society?"

From August through December, 1964, the Society set new membership records and early in 1965, the growth was described by a jubilant Welch as having been of "geometric" proportions.

In 1965 membership growth continued, even though other factors were at work. For example:

Many who joined during the exciting days of the 1964 campaign found the Society demanded too much of their time, energy, and dedication. They either drifted away or were dropped from membership by the society itself, for like the Communists, the Birch Society does not tolerate "dead wood" for long.

Some of the 1964 recruits—especially Goldwater enthusiasts frustrated by the defeat of their champion—found the society too radical for their basically conservative viewpoints. They walked away along with still others who found it too "moderate" or too "educational."

Those who remained faithful to Welch's leadership as 1965 turned to 1966 were, for the most part, the zealous, the dedicated, and the indoctrinated—eager to carry out the monthly instructions sent to them by Welch from the society's headquarters in Massachusetts.

THE CALIFORNIA REPORTS

The Birch Society continues to distribute (in packets designed for the indoctrination of prospective members) the report of a 1963 investigation by the California Senate Fact-finding Subcommittee on Un-American Ac-

tivities. It found the organization to be neither secret, subversive nor antisemitic. Apparently because of the wide circulation of this 1963 report by the Birch Society, a second report was issued by the same committee in 1965. For understandable reasons, it has been ignored by the Birch Society.

The more recent report found that Robert Welch's organization "has attracted a lumatic fringe that is now assuming serious proportions" and has been "beset by an influx of emotionally unstable people, some of whom have been prosecuted in the courts for their hoodlum tactics in disrupting meetings, and heckling speakers with whom they disagree."

The committee's 1965 report concluded:

"We are more critical of the society now than we were then for the reason that it has, in our opinion, merited such criticism by reason of its activities exemplified by the irresponsible articles by a member of its national council, the republication of 'The Politician,' the inexcusable actions of its minority of irresponsible members, and a dangerous increase of antisemitism among a minority of its membership."

The members of the Birch Society are believers in the "conspiracy theory" of history and in absolute political truth which they alone claim to possess. It is through the conspiracy theory of recent American history that fear is aroused—fear, the essential ingredient of extremist strength. The operating premise of the John Birch Society, like that of the Communists, is that over all of our lives and over all the events of our time, there rules a powerful and protected establishment, perpetuated by a secret conspiracy of vast dimensions. To the Birchers it is communism—by which they mean the establishment of the last 30 years, including the American Government, whether controlled by Republicans or Democrats, whether directed by liberals or conservatives.

To each extreme, whether of the far left or the far right—to each "out" the other is "in."

The John Birch Society has grown in direct proportion to the growth which its founder sees in the power and influence of "the enemy." Welch has said his organization's chances of success in saving the country increased from 1 in 10 in 1958 to 1 in 4 today. Yet, paradoxically, he and his society claim that in the same period, "Communist influence and control" in the United States increased from 20 to 40 percent in 1958 to 60 to 80 percent today.

THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, several days ago I protested the reduction in funds for the special milk program. Since then I have received a flood of telegrams, letters, and calls urging me to support both the school lunch and special milk programs. I intend to do so. The reduction in funds requested by the Budget Bureau ignores the facts that such a cut would harm the dairy industry, would harm the schoolchildren now receiving the benefits of these programs, and would make necessary a means test as a qualification for receiving milk or food under the programs. As Senator JOSEPH TYNINGS pointed out so well a few days ago, that if we thought a means test for receiving medical care benefits for the aged was demeaning and an insult, this would be even more true for children in school.

I cannot ask that all the letters I have received be put in the RECORD. But I do

ask unanimous consent that a representative sampling be printed in the RECORD at this point reflecting the views of Minnesotans.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
St. Paul, Minn., February 7, 1966.
The Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: During the last number of weeks we have received two telegrams and a letter from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, copies of which are enclosed.

Because of the many benefits that are provided to our schoolchildren under these programs and because of their contribution to the education, welfare and health of the participants, I feel the lowering of payments to the schools will have a great detrimental effect on the school lunch and special milk programs in our State.

There is also a discriminatory feature in the cutback of funds as outlined in the second telegram that I feel worthy of mention. I would be concerned about the administrative arrangements for programs in Minnesota public schools in which special emphasis and direction were placed upon providing milk for needy children and children in schools without a food service program that would be above and beyond the efforts now being made by local school boards in taking care of these needs.

In view of the significant appropriation of money for recently developed and new programs, it is difficult for me to understand why programs such as school lunch and special milk which have proven to be so worthwhile in the schools of our State and the Nation and for which the needs are definitely known be curtailed in their appropriations.

Because of the substantially worthwhile contributions of these two programs and the increased participation in them by schoolchildren, I urge you to do everything possible to reinstate the funds to their present level and increase them accordingly each year to provide for the improvement and expansion of these excellent programs.

Sincerely,

DUANE J. MATTHEWS,
Commissioner of Education.

"CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 27, 1966.

"C. E. HOLT,
School Lunch Section, Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn.:

"For your information the President's budget for 1967 requests total of \$183 million for school lunch with breakdown as follows:

"Cash payments, \$129,415,000; section 11 special assistance, \$6,500,000; section 6, \$45 million; administration, \$2,085,000.

"Request of \$21 million for special milk program to be redirected to provide milk for needy children and children in schools without a food service. We will give you further details as quickly as they are available.

"DENNIS M. DOYLE,
Food Distribution, USDA, Chicago."

"CHICAGO, ILL.

"CARL HOLT,
Director, School Lunch Section, State Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn.:

"In accordance with instructions from the Bureau of the Budget to hold expenditures under the special milk program to \$1 billion inclusive of administrative costs for this fiscal year you are hereby advised that the current deduction of 5 percent will be increased to 10 percent beginning with claims for the month of February. Schools and child care institutions should be notified as promptly as possible. As provided in section

215.7(e) of the special milk regulations no deductions will be made in reimbursements to needy schools.

"DENNIS M. DOYLE,
Director, Midwest Area, U.S. Department of Agriculture."

"U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE, FOOD DISTRIBUTION,
Chicago, Ill., December 28, 1965.

"Mr. C. E. HOLT,
Director, School Lunch Section, State Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn.
"DEAR MR. HOLT: This will supplement my wire of December 23 on the special milk program fund situation for the remainder of the fiscal year.

"As you know, Congress appropriated \$103 million for the special milk program this year. Based on preliminary estimates of expenditures for the year, however, we would need at least \$102 million obligating authority in fiscal year 1966 if the present 5-percent reduction is continued through the full year. In order to hold expenditures to \$100 million as instructed by the Bureau of the Budget, it has become necessary to reduce obligations for the last half of the year by \$2 million.

"Because the school year generally begins in September, about 40 percent of program obligations occur from February 1 to the end of the fiscal year. This, in order to reduce obligations by \$2 million during the remaining 40 percent of the year, an additional 5-percent reduction in claims is necessary beginning with the claims for the month of February.

"No restoration of funds which may be saved by the percentage reduction method will be made after the end of the fiscal year.

"Although the wording of section 215.7(e) of the special milk program regulations, effective December 1, 1965, is not spelled out as thoroughly as it was in the former section 215.8(e) of the prior regulations, the intent is the same. No percentage reduction of reimbursement shall be applied to any part of claims submitted by needy schools approved for special assistance under the special milk program.

"We hope the overall impact of this section will not adversely affect program operations.

"Sincerely yours,
"DENNIS M. DOYLE,
Director, Midwest Area."

MENTOR PUBLIC SCHOOL,
Mentor, Minn., January 31, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: After much exposure to all the title programs, the poverty program, and colossal waste that will take place there; to know that the Federal Government is trying to give away money for endless "dreamed up" jobs for youth at \$1.25 per hour (we know, because we had to dream them up and furnish names of students); then to know vast amounts of foreign aid moneys are given away with no strings attached—and to read about the plans for school lunch in foreign countries at our expense, we superintendents have trouble with our temperatures when we read the enclosed news item.

We have had to deduct 5 percent on each of our monthly lunch reports on the Federal milk program—which seems silly. Recently I received a letter from the State department of education stating that beginning with the February report 10 percent must be deducted. Every time I do this I think how picaunish the Government can be about established and proven programs and how unbelievably loose they can be on such programs as foreign aid.

In light of some of the things mentioned above, isn't it rather ridiculous that the

Federal Government should play the lunch program aids so closely? We should be getting more commodities—meat in particular. This year we have received considerably less.

I have always gone along with the Democratic Party but I am beginning to cool quite a bit. Let Congress and/or the executive branch cut the school lunch program and it will be the biggest political mistake they ever made. This is one place where the money is not wasted on administrative costs. One party might blame the other, but the Democrats are in and must assume the responsibility. It really makes one perturbed to think that a cut in lunch aids was even considered—say nothing about bringing it about.

You will be smart if you work to increase lunch program aids to schools—not to decrease them. Cutting aids would be the biggest joke of the century.

Sincerely yours,
E. P. NEUBAUER,
Superintendent.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters here in the United States well fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,
MURIEL ROSS.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a cook in one of our lunch-rooms, in Bloomington. I can see how much good our hot lunch does for our boys and girls. Please see what you can do, so our school lunch, and milk money will not be cut.

Sincerely,
ETTA MUNCHE.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
HON. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk programs.

Sincerely,
MRS. LEONA JONES.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
HON. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters well-fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,
MRS. GRACE LARSON.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
February 4, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
HON. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you because of the proposed cut in funds for school lunch and special milk programs. I am hoping you and others will give this much consideration before it is brought up before our lawmakers. If this cut is made, as proposed by President Johnson, it will mean the prices of lunch and milk will have to be raised. If the price of lunches are raised there will be less participating in our lunch program.

I am in hopes the proposed budget will be reconsidered by all persons who have the power to do so.

Very sincerely,
MRS. FLORENCE RYMAN.

WAUBUN, MINN.,
February 2, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MONDALE: We are very much concerned with the proposed cut in the budget for the support of the school lunch program. Should a reduction take place in the amount of our reimbursement and also a reduction in commodities we receive, it would seriously impair our program.

At the present time we are operating our school lunch program at a loss because we charge our students only 20 cents. If it became necessary for us to raise the price, many of our families would be unable to afford lunches for their children.

The board of education and myself feel that the support of the lunch program is a very worthwhile program and we would certainly not like to see a reduction in the support of it. In fact, if anything, an increase would be most helpful. This is a program that benefits all children and certainly is a very practical and humane way of making the very best use of any surplus agricultural products.

Sincerely yours,
HOMER M. BJORNSON,
Superintendent.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 29, 1966.

MR. WALTER MONDALE,
Minnesota Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Twin City Chapter of the Minnesota School Food Service Association met on Monday, January 24, at Richfield.

This was the same day it was announced that the 1967 Federal budget recommended a cutback from \$89 to \$37 million for the school milk program. Also a reduction in the school lunch subsidy was announced.

The 500 members of this chapter from the school districts of St. Paul, Minneapolis, West St. Paul, Richfield, Bloomington, Robbinsdale, Edina-Morningside, Columbia Heights, and White Bear Lake urges you to work for the restoration of these funds so that the

school milk program and the school lunch program can continue to meet the needs of our schoolchildren.

We trust that you and your colleagues will be able to execute economies in other areas rather than at the expense of the school food services.

Thank you sincerely,

MAYME MOORE,
Secretary, Twin City School Food
Service Association.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
and

HON. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIRS: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk program.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ALFRED NYBO.

STILLWATER, MINN.,
January 24, 1966.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding the milk fund and school lunch programs—either all students should benefit or none. Where can the line be drawn? Only the rich and poor will be able to survive the Great Society.

We surely do not want the inspection costs added to the prices we already pay for meats and poultry.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. VERNON HOPHAN.

ARROWHEAD COOPERATIVE MILK
PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Duluth, Minn., January 21, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We, members of Arrowhead Cooperative Milk Producers Association, want you to do your utmost to restore any moneys that are being cut from the school milk program.

This program is one of the best and should be encouraged more, as it gives "nature's best food" milk, to the group that needs it most. It also supplies it to some who may not receive it otherwise.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

ROY E. PETERSON,
Manager-Operator.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
January 26, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We are greatly disturbed over President Johnson's proposal to slash the school milk budget. We feel, as an average taxpayer, some other budget could be considered. Why do we always have to consider the needy, they receive plenty already, and it is we who pay for it; or the Cuban exiles, who else but us, is paying their transportation costs, etc.; or that highway beautification bill, is that as beneficial as a glass of milk?

Please give due thought to this proposal.

Gratefully,

Mr. and Mrs. ROGER REICHEL.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Congratulations to you as our Senator from Minnesota.

Are you a supporter of the school lunch program as your predecessor, Vice President HUMPHREY is? I sincerely hope you are as I have a request to make of you.

I have worked in the school lunch program for 20 years and am aware of the benefits

gained by our children by learning to eat a variety of different foods. The President's proposed budget included large cuts in the special milk program and the school lunch program. These cuts, if allowed to pass, would mean an increase in price to the children and may well cause some to have to go without a school lunch. My request is that you lend your support to disallow the proposed cuts and keep our school lunch program a vital part of the Nation's economy helping our future citizens grow up strong and healthy.

A friend of yours, Mr. Leroy Johnson, with General Mills, mentioned last week that he too was going to tell you how important it is to support the school lunch program.

Thank you for your consideration to this request.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. DAVID V. JOHNSON.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
January 25, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: It was with considerable concern that we read that President Johnson's budget proposed reducing the sum spent on the school milk program to 37 million for 1967—and, further, that only needy children be allowed to buy milk at reduced cost.

It is our considered judgment that these proposals are false economies to the extreme.

In St. Paul where we sell milk at 1 cent to students bringing a lunch from home, we are certain that an increase to 4 cents (our cost) would seriously reduce participation among the very students who are most in need of milk at noon from a nutritional standpoint.

In secondary schools, which is our major service in St. Paul, it is difficult presently to meet the needs of all the underprivileged because such students will go to lengths to avoid being stigmatized as such. We feel certain that such is the case in most secondary schools and only slightly less true in elementary grades.

If the suggested reduction were applied to the school lunch program, it is likely that our lunch charge in St. Paul would be increased from its present 25 cents to 30 cents. We feel that such an increase would adversely affect participation among the very students most benefited by the program.

We have worked hard—and have been greatly assisted by State and Federal aids—to increase participation in both the school milk program and the school lunch program. St. Paul has more than doubled such participation in the past 5 years. We are working to continue this progress.

We urge that you give full consideration to this suggested reduction and work for its reconsideration if you can do so in good conscience.

Cordially,

S. W. DOUCETTE,
Director, St. Paul School Cafeterias.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
February 3, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk programs.

Respectfully,

Mrs. GERALD EVANS.

WETTERGREN DAIRY,

St. Peter, Minn., February 2, 1966.

The Honorable Senator MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I read in the paper where the milk program for the schools

would be cut millions of dollars and just the needy would be the recipients. I don't know who is to do the classifying, etc., but I hope you will support the milk program on a full scale as is ANCHER NELSEN.

I believe the milk that children get in the morning is the only breakfast that most of them get.

I trust that you will check into this matter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. WETTERGREN.

P.S.—I discussed this with Russell G. Schwandt, who was our speaker at Lions yesterday at my request, and he said to contact you.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters well fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. LILLIAN MADNIG.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
February 7, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I ask that you please reconsider the cut in appropriations for school lunch and special milk programs. I hope the cut will not be approved.

Sincerely,

Mrs. FRANK MILLEREN.

THE PRICE OF BIG GOVERNMENT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] delivered a masterful address on February 22, 1966, at the banquet of the Virginia branch of the Associated General Contractors of America at Hot Springs, Va. His subject was "The Price of Big Government."

This is another outstanding address by Senator ROBERTSON, who has demonstrated time and time again his wisdom and great value to Congress and to the Nation.

As chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and as one who has had many years of experience in fiscal affairs, Senator ROBERTSON is well qualified to speak on the subject. His service and efforts in behalf of fiscal responsibility and in behalf of the free enterprise system has been of great benefit to the Nation. There is no one in the country more qualified to speak with authority and experience on this subject.

I think the entire Nation will be rewarded by having an opportunity to read this wonderful address. I ask unanimous consent that the address of Senator ROB-