

this sentence shall not be construed as relieving an employer from keeping records relating to the compensation paid any such person."

TITLE OF ACT

SEC. 6. This Act may be cited as the "Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965".

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "THE VIETNAM CONFLICT: THE SUBSTANCE AND THE SHADOW"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and myself, a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 184), as follows:

S. RES. 184

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations sixteen thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "The Vietnam Conflict: The Substance and the Shadow."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], without losing the floor.

FREEDOM DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Communist Party is a devious organization.

Masters of opportunism, the Communist Party's leaders are at the same time clever and careful long-range planners. They are quick to take advantage of developing conditions which can be turned to the party's advantage. It is part of their philosophy to seek to capitalize on the very weaknesses of their position. And when subterfuge is called for, Communist strategians and tacticians have proved they can plan and develop the most ingenious subterfuges.

When it suits the party's purposes to move openly, no group is more brazen, or gives more outward evidence of self-assurance and confidence.

When it serves the party's objectives to move under cover, elaborate covers will be devised and used.

Dedicated as it is to the overthrow of the American Government by force and violence, dedicated as it is to the service of the Soviet Government, the Communist Party, U.S.A., finds itself held in deserved contempt by the great mass of the American people. This is not a new situation. There has never been a time when anything close to a majority of Americans would support the Communist Party as such.

The Communist Party and its supporters therefore have found themselves in political bankruptcy when they tried to operate politically under the Communist label; so they have made it part of their political strategy to set up stooge

political parties behind which they operate.

Such organizations have included the Workers' Party, the Progressive Party, the American Labor Party, the People's Party, and more recently the so-called Freedom Democratic Party of Mississippi.

This so-called Freedom Democratic Party which is neither free nor democratic, held a statewide convention in Jackson, Miss., on Sunday, January 2, 1966, in the Masonic Temple on Lynch Street. After the meeting the press was given a statement about plans of this so-called party to enter candidates for congressional seats in the elections to be held this summer.

Spokesmen for the so-called Freedom Democratic Party carefully avoided any mention and secreted from the press any mention of two men who attended the statewide convention and participated in discussions, and who, behind the scenes, have wielded great power in shaping the so-called Freedom Party's policies and directing its activities.

One of these men is Carl Braden, who has a long record of subversive activities. In 1954, in Jefferson County, Ky., court proceedings, Carl Braden and his wife, Ann Braden, were identified by a former Communist as active members of the Communist Party in Louisville, Ky.

When questioned by the House Committee on Un-American Activities on July 30, 1958, as to whether he was a member of the Communist Party, Carl Braden refused to answer. In 1955, he was convicted by a Kentucky jury of sedition. This conviction was set aside by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1956, on a technicality. Both he and his wife were identified as members of the Communist Party in sworn testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on October 28, 1957.

This is the same Carl Braden who has served as field representative for the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., which has been cited as subversive by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. In March 1960, at a meeting sponsored by the SCEF in Orlando, Fla., Braden distributed Communist literature and was among those openly urging clemency for Morton Sobel, a convicted Communist spy. Braden served a Federal prison sentence for contempt of Congress. He was released in February 1962.

During the 20 years of its existence in New Orleans, the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc.—formerly known as the Southern Conference for Human Welfare—has so discredited itself that it has been forced to move to Louisville, Ky., which it will do on February 1, 1966. State Senator Jesse Knowles, chairman of the Louisiana Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities, has declared that "the constant pressure kept on the group since 1963, has been the outstanding factor to the out-of-State move."

James A. Dombrowski, executive director of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., has announced that he will retire on February 1, 1966, and that the work of the executive director will be taken over by Carl and Anne

Braden, of Louisville. Mrs. Braden will continue to be the editor of the Southern Patriot, official organ of the SCEF.

In the course of its proceedings in Jackson, Miss., to which I referred earlier, the so-called Freedom Democratic Party, had as its guest Benjamin Smith, a New Orleans lawyer, and a member of the board of directors of the Southern Conference Educational Fund. Smith was introduced by Lawrence Guyot, nominal chairman of the so-called Freedom Party.

The Communist Daily Worker of October 20, 1954, showed Benjamin Smith as a signer of a petition to President Eisenhower, calling for amnesty for Communists convicted for violating the Smith—anti-Communist—Act. On April 6, 1956, Benjamin E. Smith appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and under oath denied Communist Party membership. In testimony before this subcommittee in 1954, Hunter Pitts O'Dell, a Communist organizer, had identified Benjamin E. Smith as "our attorney."

The Communist Worker of December 8, 1965, identified Benjamin E. Smith as "legal counsel for the Mississippi Freedom Party." On January 22, 1962, Benjamin E. Smith registered with the U.S. Department of Justice as representing the Communist government of Cuba. Benjamin Smith also is listed as a member of the executive committee of the National Lawyers Guild, which has been cited as "a legal bulwark of the Communist Party" by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. At one time he was treasurer of the Southern Conference Educational Fund. I have heretofore discussed the record of this man Benjamin Smith in more detail on the floor of the Senate, just as I have previously discussed, at greater length, the Communist ties of the so-called Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party.

Lawrence Guyot, who held a press conference as chairman of the so-called Freedom Democratic Party, did not reveal to the press either the presence or the influence of Carl Braden and Benjamin Smith; neither did he reveal that the convention accepted a suggestion from Guyot that an invitation to speak to the so-called Freedom Democratic Party be extended to Herbert Aptheker, a notorious Communist. This is the same Aptheker who recently violated State Department security regulations by making a trip to Communist-controlled Hanoi as part of a conspiracy to discredit U.S. policy with respect to Vietnam.

For some time Herbert Aptheker has been the editor of Political Affairs, theoretical organ of the Communist Party, U.S.A. In proceedings before the Subversive Activities Control Board in 1956, the CPUSA used Mr. Aptheker as its expert witness. He has been a prolific writer of Communist publications and an instructor in Communist training schools.

His daughter, Bettina Aptheker, recently made a public statement that she now is, and has been, a member of the Communist Party. Aptheker also has been active in organizing the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs, cited as Communist fronts

by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

According to the New York Times of July 31, 1965, the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party urged its followers not to honor the draft in Mississippi. This is the "line" followed by various so-called pacifist organizations which are either Communist infiltrated or Communist controlled.

The Communist Worker of May 2, 1965, featured the activities of the so-called Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, and the Worker has continued to give that group and its activities frequent and favorable public mention.

I do not want to labor the point, Mr. President, and so I shall say no more at this time. But assuredly I shall have more to say later about the so-called Freedom Party and its activities.

I thank the Senator.

GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE— NOT SIMPLY OF THE PEOPLE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my friend and colleague from Illinois, the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], has today announced the renewal of his attack on the Supreme Court's decisions enforcing the rights to the equal citizenship of Americans before their State legislatures. Apparently the successor effort to the foreign aid rider campaign and the Baseball Week resolution is to be a well-financed, expertly directed public relations campaign under the aegis of the well-known public relations firm of Whitaker & Baxter and its front organization called the Committee for Government of the People.

This is indeed an appropriate title for such an organization and appears to be revealing of their basic attitudes in this matter. Apparently, there are still those who believe that government of the people is endurable, so long as it is not government by the people and for the people. All governments are governments of the people but it is the basic American doctrine that they are also, in Lincoln's phrase, governments by the people and for the people. I believe in Lincoln's doctrine as enunciated at Gettysburg. By their omissions, I infer that the sponsors of my colleague's amendment do not.

Senators may be interested in an analysis of this new campaign to reverse the Court and restore rotten boroughism written by the able Washington reporter, Charles Nicodemus, which appeared in the Chicago Daily News of January 8. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

DIRKSEN PLANNING NEW REMAP BATTLE (By Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON.—In a dramatic new turn to the battle over State legislative apportionment, grandiloquent EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, will within 2 weeks take his bid for a constitutional amendment directly to the American people.

Having failed 2 years running to coax up the extraordinary Senate majority needed to overturn the U.S. Supreme Court's historic

one-man, one-vote decision, the Senate minority leader is about to try a new approach.

An expensive national campaign of education and ballyhoo is being readied in the hope that homefront pressure can force the needed additional handful of Senators to switch to DIRKSEN's cause.

Kickoff of the campaign—heretofore secret—is expected in mid-January, after the reconvening of Congress and the state of the Union message have receded from the headlines.

Opponents of DIRKSEN's proposed amendment—in the dark, so far, on details of the upcoming effort—can be counted on to crank up an equally gusty countercampaign.

All this should make the legislative remapping issue—thus far confined primarily to the courts and the Congress—a hot topic on a par with the national debate stirred by proposals such as medicare.

These prospects are spiced by the expectation that a high-powered, high-priced public relations and political consulting firm, long-practiced in stirring national controversy, will play a central role in DIRKSEN's campaign.

DIRKSEN fell only seven votes short last summer in his second try at rounding up the requisite two-thirds Senate majority needed for passage of a constitutional amendment.

His proposal, which he will now ask the Nation to help him carry, would return to the State legislatures the right to organize one of their houses on the basis of geography or political subdivisions.

The Supreme Court, in its series of controversial apportionment decisions, decreed in June 1964 that districts in both houses of a bicameral legislature must be mapped according to population only.

This knocked out the "little federal system," which uses geographic area or political subdivisions as a criterion. It had been in use in some form in more than two-thirds of the States, including Illinois.

The high cost of financing a campaign broad enough to help upset those decisions in Congress doubtless will stir charges that special interest groups, which often were influential in rural-dominated legislatures, are attempting to buy back some of the power they stand to lose under reapportionment.

Similarly, DIRKSEN's forces can be expected to allege that the inevitable countercampaign is an effort by groups opposing him—such as labor, civil rights leaders, and big-city political organizations—to guarantee their takeover of legislatures under the one-man, one-vote decision.

DIRKSEN made clear last October much of what he hoped to accomplish.

"We must organize as our opponents have organized," he said, after again maneuvering his proposal into a position where it can go onto the Senate Calendar whenever he wishes this session.

"We must take this to the grassroots, in a campaign to mobilize the immense public support that we know is there. We must concentrate on the States where we believe we have a chance of switching some votes—particularly those where there is a Senator up for reelection."

CONSULTING FIRM HELPS DIRKSEN

Active in helping, DIRKSEN's supporters plan that campaign has been the nationally known consulting firm of Whitaker & Baxter, headquartered in San Francisco.

W. & B. has had a hand in the successful campaigns of such political figures as California Gov. Earl Warren and Goodwin Knight. They have backed an occasional loser, such as Richard Nixon in his 1960 presidential bid.

They also have played a central role in California's last three electoral battles over legislative redistricting—leading successful

campaigns in 1948, 1960, and 1962 to defeat one-man, one-vote referendum proposals.

Their most renowned effort was on behalf of the American Medical Association in the late forties.

That's when President Harry Truman introduced the Nation's first plan for "socialized medicine," as the Whitaker & Baxter campaign succeeded in tabbing it.

Under W. & B. skillful director, Mr. Truman's pioneer medicine program was buried under a barrage of nationally disseminated red, white, and blue literature, along with radio and press attacks.

Since last fall, W. & B. has been providing organizational help behind the scenes for DIRKSEN and the groups that are supporting his proposal, such as the Farm Bureau, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and others.

W. & B. has also organized a number of unpublicized fund-raising dinners around the country to which well-heeled influential have been invited to hear arguments on behalf of DIRKSEN's proposal. Then the hat is passed.

The campaign kickoff will be announced in about 2 weeks, to be followed by a blizzard-like educational campaign. This will peak sometime in March.

That's when DIRKSEN, most distinguished orator in the country, will move to center stage by having Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, call up for floor consideration DIRKSEN's Senate Resolution 103.

Says DIRKSEN, of his defeats and the upcoming battle:

"This is the basic constitutional crisis of our time. I don't relent. I don't compromise. This is a matter of principle. I am duty-bound to persevere, on behalf of the country and the people."

DIRKSEN's amendment would give a State the right to set up one house of its legislation on a nonpopulation basis—but only if such a plan is first approved at a referendum, at which a strict population plan also is on the ballot.

Such a little federal plan, if ratified, would have to be reapproved in a similar competitive referendum after every 10-year census.

"This merely returns to the States the historic right of the people to decide how they wish to govern themselves—without dictation by a narrow Supreme Court majority moved by changing whims," DIRKSEN declared.

So far, DIRKSEN's leading foes—Senators PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, WILLIAM PROXMIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and JOSEPH TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland, the AFL-CIO, and civil rights groups—have heard few details of what the Dirksen forces are planning.

DIRKSEN's opponents contend they still have the votes to deny the minority leader his two-thirds margin. If any question crops up about that margin, the opponents say they will simply filibuster—as they did in 1964 to block DIRKSEN's first try.

If the Dirksen proposal foes win two-thirds endorsement by both Houses, it must still be ratified by three-quarters of the States within 7 years.

Prospects for such ratification once appeared certain. Now they are clouded. Many legislatures already have redistricted under the one-man one-vote decision. They might not be eager to ratify an amendment that could upset any resulting new balance of State power.

The National Municipal League reported that as of January 1, there were 15 State legislatures with both houses now apportioned according to one-man, one-vote standards; 24 States in which the next crop of legislators will be elected under such plans, most in November 1966; 8 States now