and facilities for schooling our children, for healing the sick, for administering our public affairs, and for giving Americans opportunities to work and play in pleasant surroundings.

To you who graduate today and prepare to join in the business and public life of your communities, the challenges will be many and great.

I don't mean to suggest that these challenges will all be grim. This is a wonderful age of science and invention and exploration.

When I was in your age bracket—let's say 35 years ago—life was much more simple. Montebello was a booming oil town of about 2,000 inhabitants. East Los Angeles, from Eastern Avenue to Montebello, was a wide expanse of dairy pastures and garden crop lands.

We had no television sets. The radio was a quaint and rare box. The model-T Ford burned up the dirt roads at 30 miles an hour.

That was about the year 1927. The first coast-to-coast network radio broadcast was made in that year—a play-by-play account of the Rose Bowl football game at Pasadena. And a young flyer named Lindbergh earned the Congressional Medal of Honor and the plaudits of millions for flying across the Atlantic in a monoplane at an average speed of 170 miles an hour.

Now a young astronaut gains fame by orbiting the earth in a capsule at the fantastic speed of 17,500 miles per hour. Before this decade is run out, brave young men will be exploring the valleys of the moon and preparing for journeys to other celestial bodies.

It has been my privilege, as a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, to play a part in the decisions which spurred some of the most important technological developments in the last 15 years—the establishment of civilian control of atomic energy, the development of the H-bomb, the creation of a nuclear Navy, the promotion of atomic energy as a new source of peacetime electric power, and the beginnings of the development of nuclear rockets for propulsion in outer space.

From my many contacts with scientists, engineers, and technicians, I realize that the disciplines of industrial and professional life today are stern—far more demanding than in my youth. Our young people need more and better education and training to make the most of their opportunities, to fit themselves into the exacting jobs of an age of science and technology. The jobs are more exacting, but the rewards are correspondingly larger.

To those of you who will go from here to institutions of higher learning, I say: Excellent. Study hard, sharpen your intelligence, deepen your knowledge, broaden your understanding, equip yourselves for superior performance.

To those of you who will go from here to business or industry or other pursuits, I say: Continue your education in every way that you can.

In a fundamental sense, all life is an educational process. "Live and learn" is an old saying. But what I want to convey is the importance of education as a means of keeping abreast of events in our complicated world. It is important to be well-read, to be well informed on public affairs, to be, if possible, an active participant as well as an informed observer. Your community needs your leadership.

Technology explodes in new knowledge every day. There has been nothing like it before. The tempo of life is quicker, the world shrunk by fast transport and communication. To know how others work and live, what they strive for, where they are going, is part of our continuing education. To assess public and political affairs with insight and understanding, so that the demagog can be discounted and the statesman supported, is part of our continuing education.

There are those who assault our eyes and ears with words—printed and spoken—seeking our allegiance for purposes of their own, purposes misguided or sinister. Whether they be wedded to an alien philosophy of communism or to a homespun variety of fascism, they are not in the mainstream of America, they are not riding the wave of the future.

Bolsheviks, Birchites, and beatniks have this in common—that they live in the byways and the dark corners of our national life.

They create their own phantom worlds and evil spirits. The beatniks yearn for nonconformity, and they seek it outside the ordinary world. The Birchites yearn for the simple life, and they seek it in the distant past. The Bolsheviks yearn for a dictatorship, and they seek it by the faraway Soviet example. As you travel the mainstreams and the broad highways of American life, you will do well to avoid these detours and blind alleys. I do not counsel conformity for conformity's sake. I advocate the nonconformity that comes with intelligent and independent thought, not the nonconformity of the eccentric or the regimented radical.

Intelligent and independent thought does not come from book learning alone. It comes from practice—from using our intelligence, from applying our knowledge, from testing our ideas by exchange with others. There is no substitute for good sense and good judgment. There is no easy way to acquire good sense and good judgment.

My plea is that you avoid complacency and mental laziness. Don't swallow everything you read in the newspapers and magazines and hear broadcast on the air. Inquire, examine, check, challenge. Easy acceptance of the popular notion of the day induces narrow conformity, invites prejudiced opinion in place of fact and truth and sound basic values.

Education and freedom go hand in hand. Democracy flourishes when its people are literate and well informed. But our democracy needs more: It needs superior performance in a contest with the Communist system.

Thus there are two aspects to our educational concern: Quantity and quality. On the quantitative side, educational attainment must be spread broadly among the people. On the qualitative side, we must develop to the full the talents of those with special abilities, to insure national survival, and progress and world leadership.

Quantitatively, our level of educational attainment is improving steadily. Take literacy—the ability to read and write—as the baseline. When I was a boy, 1 in 10 Americans was illiterate. Today the illiteracy ratio is something like 1 in 45, hardly more than 2 percent of the population.

In 1940 about 24 percent of the adult population (25 years or older) had finished high school. In 1959 the figure was 43 percent.

In 1940 the median years of school completed was 8.4; in 1950 it was 9.3, and in 1959 it was 11. Incidentally, the women rank higher than the men. They have a half year more of schooling.

As you can see, the educational trend is steadily upward. The same applies with respect to college education, though the advance is less striking. For example, college graduates were 5 percent of the adult population in 1940. This increased to 8 percent in 1959. Here the men did better than the women, largely because of the GI bill for veterans.

In any case, you ladies and gentlemen are in the educational vanguard. You are in the best educated segment of American society. From your ranks will come tomorrow's leaders. America's future is in your hands.

These are times, as Tom Paine once said, which try men's souls. There are dark, dangerous waters to navigate, rocks and reefs, shifting sands. I speak of the dangers but somehow I feel cheerful of the outcome.

To you I say: Have faith in yourselves and your country. Rejoice that you live in these wonderful and exciting years. Discharge wisely and well your responsibilities to yourselves, your families, your communities, your country, and the world, and your lives will be rich in satisfaction beyond any material reward.

In closing, I will quote a few words of unmatched eloquence from a speech by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It was delivered in October 1936, commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Statue of Liberty.

When a monument is erected to President Roosevelt, certainly these words will be inscribed thereon:

"Even in times as troubled and uncertain as these, I still hold to the faith that a better civilization than any we have known is in store for America and by our example, perhaps, for the world. Here destiny seems to have taken a long look. Into this continental reservoir there has been poured untold and untapped wealth of human resources. Out of that reservoir, out of the melting pot, the rich promise which the New World held out to those who came to it from many lands is finding fulfillment.

"The richness of the promise has not run out. If we keep the faith of our day as those who came before us kept the faith of theirs, then you and I can smile with confidence into the future."

God bless you.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 2, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mankind, whose love no manmade barriers can shut out, we thank Thee that there is no other right that can veto our right to Thee.

As this day at the beginning of another week we ascend the world's great altar stairs, sloping through darkness up to Thee, we come, not with a philosophy of prayer, but in the practice of this greatest of all powers which, as with golden chains, ties our human race around the throne of the eternal.

To turn to Thee even for a brief pause in the midst of draining days is to be reminded that for each of us is coming a day when we shall look back at the finished span of our life, with its ardent ambitions, its hot, strenuous endeavors, its noise, and its rush and dust, and see that it is emptiness and shadows except when here and there we have turned aside to be thoughtful of others, and unselfish in our outreach as we set our hearts on little, unremembered acts of kindness and of love.

So may the circle of our concern be stretched out until it is as wide as all humanity.

We ask it in the name of the One who came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 29, 1962, was dispensed with.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS—MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

On Saturday, June 30, 1962, the Secretary received a message from the House of Representatives announcing its agreement to the conference report on the bill (S. 3161) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

Subsequently, on the same day, the Secretary received the enrolled bill, which had been signed by the Speaker, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 30, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3161) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 1, 1962, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1834. An act to further amend the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, by providing for an increase in the authorization funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia; by extending the time in which grants may be made; and for other purposes; and

S. 3161. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3062) to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage under certain conditions.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 201) to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1658) to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendment, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. BENNETT of Michigan, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. YOUNGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8982) authorizing the Dow Chemical Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Heath Crossing, Tex.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 9883. An act to authorize the San Benito International Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Los Indios, Tex.; and

H.R. 12061. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12154) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 8031. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to give the Federal Communications Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus;

H.R. 8045. An act to change the name of the Hydrographic Office to U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office;

H.R. 8982. An act authorizing the Dow Chemical Co., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Heath Crossing, Tex.;

H.R. 9883. An act to authorize the San Benito International Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Los Indios, Tex., and to authorize the Starr-Camargo Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H.R. 11221. An act to amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 252), to increase the basic allowance for quarters of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12061. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING THE MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves of the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Frank E. Smith, of Greenwood, Miss., to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. KEATING (for Mr. MAGNUSON), from the Committee on Commerce:

Rear Adm. Donald McG. Morrison, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard with the rank of vice admiral.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the executive calendar will be stated.

DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William H. Orrick, Jr., of California, to be Deputy Under Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AMBASSADORS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles Edward Rhetts, of Indiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The next nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William M. Rountree, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Sudan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Leonard Unger, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ELIGIBILITY OF BANKS IN AMERICAN SAMOA FOR INSURANCE UNDER FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make any bank organized under the laws of American Samoa eligible to apply for insurance under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR LOANS FOR HOUSING OF ELDERLY FAMILIES AND PERSONS

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide additional authorization under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 of appropriations for loans for the provision of housing for elderly families and persons (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON TARIFF CLASSIFICATION STUDY

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a second supplemental report on tariff classification study, dated June 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SUPPLY MANAGEMENT OF HIGH-VALUE REPAIRABLE AVIATION ASSEMBLIES AND EQUIPMENT WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the supply management of high-value repairable aviation assemblies and equipment within the Department of the Navy, dated June 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

USE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC SPACE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BY ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of General Services, in connection with the construction and maintenance of a Federal office building, to use the public space under and over 10th Street SW., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Commerce:

"RESOLUTION 419

"Resolution relative to respectfully requesting the U.S. Congress to enact legislation excluding the territory of Guam from the provisions of the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933, as amended

"Whereas the provisions of the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended, title 46, U.S.C.A., and the provisions of the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933, as amended, 46 U.S.C.A., do apply to the territory of Guam, particularly as the same relate to the transportation of goods and persons; and

"Whereas as a result of the applicability of these U.S. statutes to Guam, cargoes like fish or fish products may not be brought into the United States, including, if the same were transported aboard a foreign-flag vessel, and such statutes prohibit the transportation of passengers between ports or places in the United States, either directly or by way of a foreign port in foreign vessel, thereby restricting tremendously the amount of shipping available for purposes of trade between Guam and other parts of the United States; and

"Whereas the net effect of the application of these laws, in the case of Guam, is to prevent foreign vessels from transporting passengers and property between Guam and any port in Hawaii or in the continental United States, meaning that only U.S. documented vessels may engage in trade between Guam and any other "domestic area," as for example, foreign vessels sailing from San Francisco to the Far East cannot stop in Guam to unload passengers or cargo collected in San Francisco, Hawaii, or any other U.S. port; and

"Whereas the effect of such laws as they apply is to seriously hamper trade between Guam and other places, thereby rendering our program of tourism and trade, particularly inoperative, fatuitous, and nugatory; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Sixth Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam respectfully request and memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would exclude the territory of Guam from the provisions of the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933, as amended; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs., to the chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to the Governor of Guam.

"Duly adopted on the 12th day of June 1962.

"F. T. RAMIREZ,
"Acting Speaker.
"R. J. BORDALLO,
"Acting Legislative Secretary."

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Champlain Council 441, Knights of Columbus, Richmond Hill, N.Y., signed by Thomas E. Butler, recorder, favoring legislative action to correct the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court banning prayer in New York public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H.R. 7727. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to accept fellowships, scholarships, or grants (Rept. No. 1675).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of May 1962. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

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

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, MAY AND APRIL 1962, AND PAY, APRIL AND MARCH 1962

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I, p. 2)

Information in monthly personnel reports for May 1962 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized.

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In May numbered—	In April numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In April was—	In March was—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Total [1]	2,461,534	2,453,952	+7,582	$1,154,495	$1,214,556	—$60,061
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,395,582	1,391,240	+4,342	639,802	671,918	—32,116
Department of Defense	1,065,952	1,062,712	+3,240	514,693	542,638	—27,945
Inside the United States	2,295,639	2,288,673	+6,966			
Outside the United States	165,895	165,279	+616			
Industrial employment	571,147	569,117	+2,030			
Foreign nationals	171,171	170,700	+471	26,073	25,299	+774

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1962, and comparison with April 1962, and pay for April 1962, and comparison with March 1962*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	May	April	Increase	Decrease	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	98,554	95,497	3,057		$42,235	$43,377		$1,142
Commerce	29,802	29,493	309		16,945	17,929		984
Health, Education, and Welfare	74,733	74,901		168	35,675	36,551		876
Interior	58,508	56,725	1,783		28,885	29,754		869
Justice	31,169	31,051	118		18,565	19,636		1,071
Labor	8,412	8,363	49		4,581	4,648		67
Post Office	583,658	581,663	1,995		243,253	258,209		14,956
State [1] [2]	39,757	39,682	75		18,258	19,241		983
Treasury	83,990	87,449		3,459	45,375	46,660		1,285
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	452	449	3		245	264		19
Bureau of the Budget	456	457		1	368	376		8
Council of Economic Advisers	47	50		3	36	40		4
Executive Mansion and Grounds	74	73	1		39	37	$2	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	22	20	2		16	16		
National Security Council	45	41	4		30	33		3
Office of Emergency Planning	496	488	8		377	387		10
President's Commission on Campaign Costs	6	11		5	6	6		
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	56	32	24		$20	$21		$1
American Battle Monuments Commission	439	423	16		80	82		2
Atomic Energy Commission	6,807	6,795	12		4,623	4,806		183
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	599	599			365	381		16
Civil Aeronautics Board	806	804	2		557	580		23
Civil Service Commission	3,981	3,935	46		2,247	2,324		77
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			5	5		
Commission on Civil Rights	82	74	8		40	35	$5	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	1	1		1	1		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	262	259	3		164	182		18
Farm Credit Administration	238	239		1	160	167		7
Federal Aviation Agency	43,854	43,728	126		27,066	28,396		1,330
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,399	1,382	17		870	916		46
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,248	1,246	2		744	784		40
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,152	1,140	12		693	746		53
Federal Maritime Commission	158	155	3		110	114		4
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	379	361	18		290	305		15
Federal Power Commission	911	906	5		589	615		26
Federal Trade Commission	1,061	1,046	15		670	700		30
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	64	64			46	46		
General Accounting Office	4,624	4,643		19	2,734	2,883		149
General Services Administration	31,029	30,901	128		13,974	14,640		666
Government Printing Office	6,906	6,906			3,775	3,992		217
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,060	12,912	148		7,481	7,711		230
Indian Claims Commission	20	20			19	19		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,378	2,383		5	1,485	1,558		73
James Madison Memorial Commission	1	1			1	1		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	21,785	21,458	327		14,838	14,544	294	
National Capital Housing Authority	430	431		1	176	185		9
National Capital Planning Commission	55	52	3		34	37		3
National Capital Transportation Agency	75	81		6	55	58		3
National Gallery of Art	324	322	2		125	130		5
National Labor Relations Board	1,870	1,863	7		1,186	1,246		60
National Mediation Board	117	152		35	106	133		27
National Science Foundation	846	849		3	486	540		54
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	14	27		13	19	22		3
Panama Canal	14,495	14,591		96	4,705	6,725		2,020
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	47	42	5		28	21	7	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,061	2,076		15	1,057	1,120		63
Renegotiation Board	189	190		1	150	154		4
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	166	157	9		117	95	22	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,274	1,257	17		788	810		22
Selective Service System	6,865	6,854	11		2,030	2,127		97
Small Business Administration	3,097	3,076	21		1,778	1,827		49
Smithsonian Institution	1,258	1,227	31		569	558	11	
Soldiers' Home	1,028	1,034		6	330	342		12
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	58	58			43	43		
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	27			22	23		1
Tariff Commission	271	270	1		182	195		13
Tax Court of the United States	148	148			110	109	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,614	18,489	125		10,812	10,828		16
Texas Water Study Commission	18	18			9	19		10

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1962, and comparison with April 1962, and pay for April 1962, and comparison with March 1962*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	May	April	Increase	Decrease	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	81	77	4		63	55	8	
U.S. Information Agency	11,034	10,968	66		4,365	4,649		284
Veterans' Administration	176,524	176,956		432	17,694	75,930		4,236
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,096	1,104		8	218	210	8	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,395,582	1,391,240	8,619	4,277	639,802	671,918	358	32,474
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			4,342				32,116	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,785	1,780	5		1,304	1,379		75
Department of the Army [3]	391,456	389,753	1,703		181,667	190,844		9,177
Department of the Navy [3]	346,307	346,912		605	176,935	189,392		12,457
Department of the Air Force	307,818	307,482	336		146,431	153,874		7,443
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,076	2,065	11		953	1,005		52
Defense Communications Agency	138	128	10		79	80		1
Defense Intelligence Agency	200	188	12		112	109	3	
Defense Supply Agency [3]	14,877	13,120	1,757		6,350	5,054	1,296	
Office of Civil Defense	1,159	1,144	15		780	822		42
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	39	1		30	31		1
Interdepartmental activities	39	43		4	24	21	3	
International military activities	57	58		1	28	27	1	
Total, Department of Defense	1,065,952	1,062,712	3,850	610	514,693	542,638	1,303	29,248
Net change, Department of Defense			3,240				27,945	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [4]	2,461,534	2,453,952	12,469	4,887	1,154,495	1,214,556	1,661	61,722
Net change, including Department of Defense			7,582				60,061	

[1] May figure includes 15,484 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 15,399 in April, and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The May figure includes 3,796 of these trust fund employees and the April figure includes 3,833.

[2] May figure includes 608 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 560 in April and their pay.

[3] In May 1,558 employees and their functions were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 1,349 from the Department of the Army, and 209 from the Department of the Navy.

[4] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1962, and comparison with April 1962*

Department or agency	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	97,406	94,386	3,020	
Commerce	29,189	28,886	303	
Health, Education, and Welfare	74,223	74,392		169
Interior	57,991	56,213	1,778	
Justice	30,835	30,717	118	
Labor	8,315	8,280	35	
Post Office	582,242	580,237	2,005	
State [1 2]	10,206	10,154	52	
Treasury	83,374	86,832		3,458
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	452	449	3	
Bureau of the Budget	456	457		1
Council of Economic Advisers	47	50		3
Executive Mansion and Grounds	74	73	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	22	20	2	
National Security Council	45	41	4	
Office of Emergency Planning	496	488	8	
President's Commission on Campaign Costs	6	11		5
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	56	32	24	
American Battle Monuments Commission	10	10		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,774	6,763	11	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	599	599		
Civil Aeronautics Board	805	803	2	
Civil Service Commission	3,977	3,932	45	
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	82	74	8	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	1	1	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	262	259	3	
Farm Credit Administration	238	239		1
Federal Aviation Agency	42,864	42,741	123	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,396	1,379	17	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,246	1,244	2	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,152	1,140	12	
Federal Maritime Commission	158	155	3	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	379	361	18	
Federal Power Commission	911	906	5	
Federal Trade Commission	1,061	1,046	15	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	60	60		
General Accounting Office	4,553	4,572		19
General Services Administration	31,024	30,896	128	
Government Printing Office	6,906	6,906		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,886	12,737	149	
Indian Claims Commission	20	20		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,378	2,383		5
James Madison Memorial Commission	1	1		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	21,773	21,446	327	
National Capital Housing Authority	430	431		1
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Capital Planning Commission	55	52	3	
National Capital Transportation Agency	75	81		6
National Gallery of Art	324	322	2	
National Labor Relations Board	1,837	1,829	8	
National Mediation Board	117	152		35
National Science Foundation	836	839		3
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	14	27		13
Panama Canal	168	168		
President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity	47	42	5	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,061	2,076		15
Renegotiation Board	189	190		1
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	166	157	9	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,274	1,257	17	
Selective Service System	6,708	6,697	11	
Small Business Administration	3,053	3,031	22	
Smithsonian Institution	1,246	1,216	30	
Soldiers' Home	1,028	1,034		6
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	58	58		
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	27		
Tariff Commission	271	270	1	
Tax Court of the United States	148	148		
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,608	18,482	126	
Texas Water Study Commission	18	18		
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	81	77	4	
U.S. Information Agency	2,992	2,995		3
Veterans' Administration	175,498	175,940		442
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,334,299	1,330,025	8,460	4,186
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			4,274	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,739	1,734	5	
Department of the Army [3]	339,044	337,602	1,442	
Department of the Navy [3]	322,694	323,376		682
Department of the Air Force	279,303	279,177	126	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,076	2,065	11	
Defense Communications Agency	131	121	10	
Defense Intelligence Agency	200	188	12	
Defense Supply Agency [3]	14,877	13,120	1,757	
Office of Civil Defense	1,159	1,144	15	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	39	1	
Interdepartmental Activities	38	42		4
International Military Activities	39	40		1
Total, Department of Defense	961,340	958,648	3,379	687
Net increase, Department of Defense			2,692	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,295,639	2,288,673	11,839	4,873
Net increase, including Department of Defense			6,966	

[1] May figure includes 2,581 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,493 in April.

[2] May figure includes 542 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 501 in April.

[3] In May 1,558 employees and their functions were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 1,349 from the Department of the Army, and 209 from the Department of the Navy.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1962, and comparison with April 1962*

Department or agency	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,148	1,111	37	
Commerce	613	607	6	
Health, Education, and Welfare	510	509	1	
Interior	517	512	5	
Justice	334	334		
Labor	97	83	14	
Post Office	1,416	1,426		10
State [1] [2]	29,551	29,528	23	
Treasury	616	617		1
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	429	413	16	
Atomic Energy Commission	33	32	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	1		
Civil Service Commission	4	3	1	
Federal Aviation Agency	990	987	3	
Federal Communications Commission	3	3		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	4	4		
General Accounting Office	71	71		
General Services Administration	5	5		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	174	175		1
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	12	12		
National Labor Relations Board	33	34		1
National Science Foundation	10	10		
Panama Canal	14,327	14,423		96
Selective Service System	157	157		
Independent agencies—Continued				
Small Business Administration	44	45		1
Smithsonian Institution	12	11	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	6	7		1
U.S. Information Agency	8,042	7,973	69	
Veterans' Administration	1,026	1,016	10	
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,096	1,104		8
Total, excluding Department of Defense	61,283	61,215	187	119
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			68	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	46	46		
Department of the Army	52,412	52,151	261	
Department of the Navy	23,613	23,536	77	
Department of the Air Force	28,515	28,305	210	
Defense Communications Agency	7	7		
Interdepartmental activities	1	1		
International Military Activities	18	18		
Total, Department of Defense	104,612	104,064	548	
Net increase, Department of Defense			548	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	165,895	165,279	735	119
Net increase, including Department of Defense			616	

[1] May figure includes 12,903 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 12,906 in April. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The May figure includes 3,796 of these trust fund employees and the April figure includes 3,833.

[2] May figure includes 66 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 59 in April.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1962, and comparison with April 1962*

Department or agency	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,778	3,933		155
Commerce	5,697	5,537	160	
Interior	8,338	8,296	42	
Post Office	255	259		4
Treasury	5,175	5,175		
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	250	249	1	
Federal Aviation Agency	1,898	1,897	1	
General Services Administration	1,808	1,778	30	
Government Printing Office	6,906	6,906		
National Aeronautics and SpaceAdministration	21,785	21,458	327	
Panama Canal	7,379	7,464		85
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	129	124	5	
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,637	15,538	99	
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,096	1,104		8
Total, excluding Department of Defense	80,131	79,718	665	252
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			413	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States [1]	[2] 142,300	[3] 141,711	589	
Outside the United States	[2] 4,550	[3] 4,455	95	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States [1]	202,054	202,390		336
Outside the United States	454	456		2
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	138,618	138,902		284
Outside the United States	1,482	1,485		3
Defense Supply Agency: Inside the United States [1]	1,558		1,558	
Total, Department of Defense	491,016	489,399	2,242	625
Net increase, Department of Defense			1,617	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	571,147	569,117	2,907	877
Net increase, including Department of Defense			2,030	

[1] In May 1,558 employees and their functions were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 1,349 from the Department of the Army, and 209 from the Department of the Navy.

[2] Subject to revision.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of May 1962 and comparison with April 1962*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force		National Aeronautics and Space Administration	
	May	April	May	April	May	April	May	April	May	April
Australia	1	1							1	1
Canada	34	36					34	36		
Crete	49	49					49	49		
England	3,576	3,377			88	87	3,488	3,290		
France	22,354	22,294	18,692	18,497	11	10	3,651	3,787		
Germany	80,925	80,992	67,927	68,011	85	84	12,913	12,897		
Greece	270	273					270	273		
Greenland	134	147					134	147		
Japan	54,361	54,082	19,174	18,913	15,268	[1] 15,284	19,919	19,885		
Korea	6,221	6,188	6,221	6,188						
Morocco	2,598	2,629			768	780	1,830	1,849		
Netherlands	52	53					52	53		
Saudi Arabia		2						2		
Trinidad	596	577			596	577				
Total	171,171	170,700	112,014	111,609	16,816	16,822	42,340	42,268	1	1

[1] Revised on basis on later information.

STATEMENT BY HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of May totaling 2,461,534. This was a net increase of 7,582 compared with employment reported in the preceding month of April.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months, in fiscal year 1962, which began July 1, 1961, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
1961—July	2,435,804	16,700	
August	2,445,078	9,274	
September	2,427,216		17,862
October	2,429,691	2,475	
November	2,437,709	8,018	
December	2,430,998		6,711
1962—January	2,428,691		2,307
February	2,436,725	8,034	
March	2,441,800	5,075	
April	2,453,952	12,152	
May	2,461,534	7,582	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of May was 1,395,582, an increase of 4,342 compared with the April total of 1,391,240. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in May was 1,065,952, an increase of 3,240 as compared with 1,062,712 in April.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were Agriculture Department with 3,057, Post Office Department with 1,995, and Interior Department with 1,783. The largest decrease was reported by Treasury Department with 3,459. Agriculture, Interior, and Treasury Department changes were largely seasonal.

In Department of Defense larger increases in civilian employment were reported by Defense Supply Agency with 1,757 and Department of the Army with 1,703. The largest decrease was reported by Department of the Navy with 605.

Inside the United States civilian employment increased 6,966 and outside the United States civilian employment increased 616. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in May totaled 571,147, an increase of 2,030.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,461,534 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 171,171 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during May who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in April was 170,700. A breakdown of this employment for May follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force	NASA
Australia	1				1
Canada	34			34	
Crete	49			49	
England	3,576		88	3,488	
France	22,354	18,692	11	3,651	
Germany	80,925	67,927	85	12,913	
Greece	270			270	
Greenland	134			134	
Japan	54,361	19,174	15,268	19,919	
Korea	6,221	6,221			
Morocco	2,598		768	1,830	
Netherlands	52			52	
Trinidad	596		596		
Total	171,171	112,014	16,816	42,340	1

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 3495. A bill for the relief of Toufic Renno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3496. A bill for the relief of Peter Denes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 3497. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the consideration of construction permit and station license applications where certain interests of Members of Congress are involved; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to establish a Commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

NONSECTARIAN PRAYERS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. THURMOND) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 81) expressing the sense of Congress on the use of nonsectarian prayers in public schools as a part of their activities, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. ROBERTSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

CONSIDERATION BY UNITED NATIONS ASSEMBLY OF PERSECUTED UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC AND ORTHODOX CHURCHES

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 82) favoring consideration at the next United Nations Assembly of persecuted Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox churches, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the western part of Ukraine fell under Soviet Russian domination after World War II and was incorporated into the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic according to the agreements entered into at Teheran and Yalta; and

Whereas the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Ukraine are members of the United Nations whose General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on the 10th of December 1948, declaring that everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; and

Whereas the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics unequivocally guarantees freedom of religion for all its citizens; and

Whereas the 20th, 21st, and 22d Congresses of the Communist Party of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have declared that "Stalinist" and antiparty methods of coercion are to be denounced and abandoned; and

Whereas the Russian Orthodox Church has become a member of the World Council of Churches, which vehemently supports the toleration of all faiths; and

Whereas the Metropolitan Joseph Slipy of Lwiv, head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, has served 17 years in prison, and he, with many members of the clergy, are still imprisoned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is hereby requested to make such efforts, through the United States delegation to the United Nations, as may be necessary to place the condition of the persecuted Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox Churches on the agenda of the next United Nations Assembly for its consideration.

SEC. 2. The President is further requested to take all such steps, through the Secretary of State and the United States delegation to the United Nations, as may be possible to encourage that Archbishop Joseph Slipy, Metropolitan of Lwiv and head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine, and all other prelates of the Orthodox, Protestant, Jewish, Moslem and other faiths, be released from prison and granted their freedom.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION PERMIT AND STATION LICENSE APPLICATIONS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Federal Communications Commission has in the past justified the award of a lucrative television channel in part on the ground that stockholders of the company were Members of Congress.

This was held to give the applicant an edge in the civic participation criterion—one of the yardsticks used by the FCC in deciding contested cases.

I sharply disapprove of this criterion. Members of Congress have great authority over the FCC. They enact its basic law, provide the annual appropriations, and, in the case of Senators, confirm the appointment of the Commissioners.

Specifically favoring an application because it has a Congressman participating could turn into a form of payola. We in Congress benefit from the practice. It's up to us to end it.

The FCC itself, dependent as it is on Congress, cannot be expected to reverse a policy so favorable to Senators and Congressmen, unless Congress acts. Silence by Congress on this subject means that the special advantage to Congressmen in the award of lucrative broadcast franchises will continue.

Six of the seven members now on the FCC were also on it when the favoritism to Congressmen was stated. There has been no indication from them that this policy has been disavowed. The new member, Chairman Newton Minow, has not expressed an opinion.

I do not expect the Commission to reverse this decision on its own. Rather it is my view that Congress has a clear, immediate responsibility to state a firm policy against giving favorable weight to ownership or pecuniary interest by a

Member of Congress in a broadcasting firm.

My bill does not prohibit Members of Congress from ownership or participation in television or radio stations. But it does prevent such ownership from favorably influencing the FCC.

I introduced a similar amendment in 1960, at which time the chairman of the Communications Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee indicated on the floor that hearings would be held if the bill were introduced again.

My present action is in response to that understanding.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill to amend the Communications Act, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3497) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the consideration of construction permit and station license applications where certain interests of Members of Congress are involved, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 308(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 308(b)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In considering the application made by any person for any construction permit or station license, or any modification or renewal thereof, the Commission may not consider as a factor favoring the granting of that application the fact that such applicant is a Member of Congress or the fact that any Member of Congress has any direct or indirect pecuniary interest in the applicant."

NONSECTARIAN PRAYERS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, there is an old maxim to the effect that history repeats itself. About 140 years ago one of our greatest statesmen and political philosophers was claiming that Congress was creating formidable deficits through wasteful spending and that the Supreme Court was at the same time undermining our established form of government. In a letter from Monticello dated December 25, 1820, Thomas Jefferson wrote to his friend, Thomas Ritchie:

If there be anything amiss, therefore, in the present state of our affairs, as the formidable deficit lately unfolded to us indicates, I ascribe it to the inattention of Congress to their duties, to their unwise dissipation and waste of the public contributions. They seemed, some little while ago, to be at a loss for objects whereon to throw away the supposed fathomless funds of the Treasury. I had feared the result, because I saw among them some of my old fellow laborers, of tried and known principles, yet often in their minorities. I am aware that in one of their most ruinous vagaries, the people were themselves betrayed into the same frenzy with their representatives. The deficit produced, and a heavy tax to supply it, will, I trust, bring both to their sober senses.

But it is not from this branch of government we have most to fear. Taxes and short elections will keep them right. The judiciary of the United States is the subtle corps of sappers and miners constantly working underground to undermine the foundations of our confederated fabric. They are construing our Constitution from a coordination of a general and special government to a general and supreme one alone. This will lay all things at their feet, and they are too well versed in English law to forget the maxim, "boni judicis est amplaire jurisdictionem." We shall see if they are bold enough to take the daring stride their five lawyers have lately taken. If they do, then, with the editor of our book, in his address to the public, I will say, that "against this every man should raise his voice," and more, should uplift his arm.

In line with the admonition of Thomas Jefferson that every man should raise his voice when he feels that our Supreme Court has exceeded its constitutional authority, on behalf of myself, and Senators TALMADGE, STENNIS, and THURMOND, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution disclaiming the action last month of the Supreme Court in the New York school prayer case of Engle against Vitale and ask that the resolution be permitted to lie on the table for the next week to permit Senators to become cosponsors who wish to reaffirm publicly that we are, as our Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag states, "one Nation under God."

Mr. President, in support of the concurrent resolution, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the resolution, a brief statement in support of its adoption, a copy of the opinions of the members of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, a copy of the brief of intervenors—respondents in the U.S. Supreme Court, and a copy of a timely and stirring sermon which I was permitted to hear on yesterday at the Metropolitan Baptist Church by its pastor, Dr. R. B. Culbreth, who took as his text the 12th verse of the 33d Psalm: Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution and the material requested will be printed in the RECORD; and the concurrent resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 81) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas from the first permanent white settlements in North America at Jamestown and Plymouth Rock we have recognized the existence of God and our dependence on Him; and

Whereas the greatest single threat to our political and religious freedom is posed by nations who deny the existence of God; and

Whereas the atheists in our Nation are making a concerted drive to eliminate the recognition of God in our Government as completely as He has been eliminated in Russia, and have recently included in that program the demand to eliminate from public schools, not only the voluntary recitation of a prayer, but all hymns, all religious paintings, and all celebrations connected with Christmas and Easter; and

Whereas there never has been a greater need to inculcate in the minds and hearts of the youth of our Nation a reverence for God and faith in His omnipotence; and

Whereas with that in view the board of regents of the State of New York prepared for voluntary use in the public schools of that State a nonsecular form of civic prayer which merely recognized the existence of God and our dependence on Him; and

Whereas in the case of *Engle* v. *Vitale,* the Supreme Court of the United States on June 25, 1962, declared the use of that voluntary prayer to be unconstitutional; and

Whereas the clear implication of that Court action is the outlawing of public recognition of God by any government agency, Federal or State, including a prohibition against employment of chaplains in both branches of the Congress and for all branches of our Armed Services; and

Whereas the Congress desires to go on record as reaffirming that we are one nation under God and are desirous of passing on to generations yet unborn that rich heritage; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the designation by a public school authority of a nonsectarian prayer for use, as a part of the activities of a public school, does not constitute an establishment of religion or an infringement of the doctrine of separation of church and state in violation of the Constitution of the United States, if participation in the offering of that prayer by individual students is not made compulsory.

The material presented by Mr. ROBERTSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

I have submitted a concurrent resolution expressing the disapproval of the Congress of the recent Supreme Court decision in the New York school prayer case. That decision, in my opinion, was contrary both to the law and the evidence.

The facts were that the State board of regents, which in Virginia we call the State board of education, suggested for voluntary use for public schools in that State a 22-word prayer, which merely acknowledged God and asked His blessings "upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country." The use of the prayer was at the discretion of local school boards, and all pupils who did not care to participate could ask to be excused. The Supreme Court held that the 14th amendment extended the 1st amendment, to all the States and that the prayer in question violated the 1st amendment. The first amendment says that the Congress shall make no law with respect to the establishment of religion or prohibit the free exercise thereof. Of course, the 22-word prayer established no state church and the freedom to participate did not bring the prayer within the prohibition against the free practice of religion. So the decision was contrary to the evidence.

The decision was contrary to the law because the 1st amendment applied to Congress only, and there was nothing in the 14th amendment that made it apply to the States. James Madison, author of the first 10 amendments, wanted to make the first amendment, with respect to the separation of church and state, apply to the States, but was defeated in that effort. In 1875, Representative James G. Blaine, of Maine (later a distinguished Senator from that State), offered a resolution in the House to amend the Constitution to extend the first amendment to the States, and while that passed the House it was defeated in the Senate. The Blaine resolution provided, in extending the first amendment to the States, it would not prohibit prayers in the public schools. The Senate, in refusing to extend the first amend-

ment to the States, said with respect to the last section which would have exempted prayers in the schools, that there was nothing in the first amendment that prohibited prayers in the schools.

When was the 14th amendment adopted and why? It was a Civil War measure, proposed in 1866 and allegedly ratified 2 years later, although in the opinion of many, not legally. The purpose of the amendment was to implement the 13th amendment, which had granted freedom to former slaves. Desiring to give former slaves all the rights and privileges of the white citizens of the Nation, the 14th amendment provided "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." That was the sole purpose of the 14th amendment, and that is all that it did. But in 1940 the Supreme Court, in an effort to extend the 1st amendment to the States, for the first time claimed that the due process clause of the 14th amendment extended to the States the prohibitions of the 1st amendment against the establishment of a state church or the free exercise of religion. Even if we accept that as a proper interpretation of the Constitution the fact remains that the 14th amendment merely extended but added no new substance to the 1st amendment.

Incidentally, it was 14 years later that the Supreme Court decided that the 14th amendment also included a prohibition against segregated public schools and in reaching that conclusion overrode every previous Federal and State court decision on the subject.

The sum and substance of this situation is that the Supreme Court has decided that it can use the due process clause of the 14th amendment to strike down any State law that it pleases. And unless Congress intervenes that poses a threat not only to the historic position of our Nation, with respect to belief in God, but to other very essential rights of the States and the people thereof.

It has likewise overridden every recent decision of the State courts in cases brought by atheists to prohibit prayers in the public schools. New York State always has had an outstanding court and its rejection of the atheists' case was able, clear, and convincing. Equally so was the decision of the court in Maryland in a case brought there by an atheist against the Lord's Prayer. That case has been on the docket of the Supreme Court since last April and the Lord's Prayer certainly will be prohibited if the Congress and the people of the Nation who believe in God supinely accept the decision in the New York case. And, in a Florida case, which is headed for the Supreme Court, the atheists have asked not only to eliminate prayers but all hymns, all religious paintings, and all Christmas and Easter celebrations.

Therefore, I think it is highly important for the Senate to go on record as disapproving the decision of the Supreme Court in the New York school prayer case.

[10 N.Y. 2d 174]

IN THE MATTER OF STEVEN I. ENGEL ET AL., APPELLANTS, *v.* WILLIAM J. VITALE, JR., ET AL., CONSTITUTING THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF UNION FREE SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 9, NEW HYDE PARK, N.Y., RESPONDENTS—HENRY HOLLENBERG ET AL., INTERVENORS-RESPONDENTS

(Court of Appeals of New York, July 7, 1961)

Taxpayers in school district and parents of children attending the public schools brought a proceeding under the Civil Practice Act, section 1283 et seq., for an order in the nature of mandamus to compel the board of education to discontinue the saying of a prayer in the schools. The supreme court, special term, Nassau County, Bernard S. Meyer, J. (18 Misc. 2d 659, 191 N.Y.S. 2d 453), entered an order denying demand for jury trial and denying mandamus and remanding the matter to the board for further proceedings. Permission to appeal was granted by the special term pursuant to Civil Practice Act, section 1304. The Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Second Judicial Department, 11 A.D. 2d 340, 206 N.Y.S. 2d 183, affirmed by a divided court. The special term entered an order dismissing the proceeding under Civil Practice Act, section 1300. The petitioners appealed. The court of appeals held that the noncompulsory daily recitation of the regents prayer in the public schools is not violative of the constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion.

Order affirmed.

Dye and Fuld, JJ., dissented.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW (KEY NO. 84,274)

Noncompulsory recitation in public schools, following Pledge of Allegiance to Flag at start of each school day, of regents prayer worded as follows: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country" is no violative of State constitutional guarantee of free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, or Federal constitutional prohibition against laws respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting free exercise thereof. (U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 1; Const. art. 1, sec. 3.)

William J. Butler, Stanley Geller and Peter B. Schwarzkopf, New York City, for appellants.

Bertram B. Daiker and Wilford E. Neier, Port Washington, for respondents. Porter R. Chandler, New York City, Thomas J. Ford, Brooklyn, and Richard E. Nolan, New York City, for intervenors-respondents.

Charles B. Brind, Jr., John P. Jehu, Elizabeth M. Eastman, and George B. Farrington, Albany, for board of regents of the University of the State of New York, amicus curiae.

Mervin H. Riseman, Henry Edward Schultz, Arnold Forster, Paul Hartman, Theodore Leskes, Edwin J. Lukas, and Sol Rabkin, New York City, for American Jewish Committee and another, amici curiae.

Desmond, chief judge:

"In 1951 and again in 1955 the board of regents, governing body of our State public school system, recommended to all local school boards that 'at the commencement of each school day the act of allegiance to the flag might well be joined with this act of reverence to God: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country."' In 1958 the respondents, who are the board members of a public school district in Nassau County, conformed to the regents' recommendation and gave instructions to the teaching staff to adopt the practice in the district's schools. Petitioners, taxpayers in the district and parents of children attending the schools and all (except one nonbeliever) being members of various religious bodies, brought this proceeding for an order directing the board to discontinue the practice. They assert that it is unlawful because of the prohibitions of the first amendment ('no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof') and the command of section 3 of article I of our State constitution ('The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed in this state to all mankind').

"The order here appealed from contains adequate provisions to insure that no pupil need take part in or be present during the act of reverence, so any question of compulsion or free exercise is out of the case (see *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, 72 S. Ct. 679, 96 L. Ed. 954).

"What remains of appellants' argument is this: that the saying of regents prayer as a daily school exercise is a form of State-sponsored religious education and is accordingly an unconstitutional establishment of religion. If the utterance of these reverential words was religious education, then providing such education would be so far beyond the powers of a public school board as to be wholly arbitrary and unlawful, so that the courts would need no constitutional warrant for forbidding it. But it is not religious education nor is it the practice of or establishment of religion in any reasonable meaning of those phrases. Saying this simple prayer may be, according to the broadest possible dictionary definition, an act of religion, but when the Founding Fathers prohibited an establishment of religion they were referring to official adoption of, or favor to, one or more sects. They could not have meant to prohibit mere professions of belief in God for, if that were so, they themselves in many ways were violating their rule when and after they adopted it. Not only is this prayer not a violation of the first amendment (no decision of this or of the U.S. Supreme Court says or suggests that it is) but a holding that it is such a violation would be in defiance of all American history, and such a holding would destroy a part of the essential foundation of the American governmental structure.

"The regents prayer is an acknowledgment of our dependence upon Almighty God and a petition for the bestowal of His blessings. It includes an acknowledgment of the existence of a Supreme Being just as does the Declaration of Independence and the constitutions of each of the 50 States of the Union, including our own. In construing even a constitution some attention must be paid to the obvious intent of those who drafted it and adopted it (*Carey* v. *Morton*, 297 N.Y. 361, 79 N.E.2d 442). That the first amendment was ever intended to forbid as an establishment of religion a simple declaration of belief in God is so contrary to history as to be impossible of acceptance. No historical fact is so easy to prove by literally countless illustrations as the fact that belief and trust in a Supreme Being was from the beginning and has been continuously part of the very essence of the American plan of Government and society. The references to the Deity in the Declaration of Independence; the words of our National Anthem: 'In God is our trust'; the motto on our coins; the daily prayers in Congress; the universal practice in official oaths of calling upon God to witness the truth; the official thanksgiving proclamations beginning with those of the Continental Congress and the First Congress of the United States and continuing till the present; the provisions for chaplaincies in the Armed Forces; the directions by Congress in modern times for a National Day of Prayer and for the insertion of the words 'under God' in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag; innumerable solemn utterances by our Presidents and other leaders—all these and many more make historically unescapable the flat statement in *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 1952, 343 U.S. 306, 313, 72 S. Ct. 679, 684, supra, that: 'We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being,' which paraphrased the Supreme Court's similar assertion in 1892 in the Holy Trinity Church case (*Rector, Etc., of Holy Trinity Church* v. *United States*, 143 U.S. 457, 12 S. Ct. 511, 36 L. Ed. 226). As Justice Beldock of the appellate division wrote in this case: 'The contention that acknowledgments of and references to Almighty God are acceptable and desirable in all other phases of our public life but not in our public schools is, in my judgment, an attempt to stretch far beyond its breaking point the principle of separation of church and state and to obscure one's vision to the universally accepted tradition that

ours is a Nation founded and nurtured upon belief in God.' (11 A.D. 2d 340, 206 N.Y.S. 2d 188.)

"The universally accepted tradition referred to by Justice Beldock has been maintained without break from the days of the Founding Fathers, all of whom believed in the existence of God (see Cousins, 'In God We Trust'), to the day of the inauguration of President Kennedy. It is an indisputable and historically provable fact that belief and trust in a Creator has always been regarded as an integral and inseparable part of the fabric of our fundamental institutions. It is not a matter of majority power or minority protection. Belief in a Supreme Being is as essential and permanent a feature of the American governmental system as is freedom of worship, equality under the law, and due process of law. Like them it is an American absolute, an application of the natural law beliefs on which the Republic was founded and which in turn presuppose an Omnipotent Being.

"The motives and purposes of the regents and of the local board are noble. The success of the practice is problematical. But there is no problem of constitutionality.

"The order should be affirmed, without costs."

Froessel, judge (concurring):

"The thoughtful and thorough opinion written at special term and its review of the relevant history and the authorities, culminating in its order of March 17, 1961, renders extended discussion unnecessary.

"We are not here concerned with the statements of the board of regents or of the local school board as to their motives or purposes in the eventual promulgation of the challenged recitation.

"The narrow question presented is: Do the Federal and State Constitutions prohibit the recitation by children in our public schools of the 22 words acknowledging dependence upon Almighty God, and invoking His blessing upon them, their parents and teachers, and upon our country? To say that they do seems to me to stretch the so-called separation of church and state doctrine beyond reason.

"History and common experience teach us that the perception of a Supreme Being, commonly called God, is experienced in the lives of most human beings. Some, it is true, escape it, or think they do for a time. In any event, that perception is manifest, independent of any particular religion or church, and has become the foundation of virtually every recognized religious faith—indeed, the common denominator. One may earnestly believe in God, without being attached to any particular religion or church. Hence a rule permitting public school children, willing to do so, to acknowledge their dependence upon Him, and to invoke His blessings, can hardly be called a law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof in transgression of the first amendment, which in nowise prohibits the recognition of God, or laws respecting such recognition.

"The challenged recitation follows the Pledge of Allegiance, which itself refers to God. Schoolchildren are permitted to sing 'America,' the fourth stanza of which is indeed a prayer, invoking the protection of God, Author of Liberty. The preamble to our State constitution, which is taught in our public schools, provides: 'We the people of the State of New York, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom.' Virtually every State constitution in the United States, as well as the Declaration of Independence, contains similar references. To say that such references, and others of like nature employed in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government (see *Zorah* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, at pp. 312–313, 72 S. Ct. 679, at p. 683), unrelated to any particular religion or church, may be sanctioned by public officials everywhere but in the public school room defies understanding.

"As Mr. Justice Douglas said, in the *Zorach* case (supra, 343 U.S. at p. 313, 72 S. Ct. at p. 684), in holding that the New York City released time program does not violate the first amendment, 'We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. We guarantee the freedom to worship as one chooses. We make room for as wide a variety of beliefs or creeds as the spiritual needs of man deem necessary. We sponsor an attitude on the part of government that shows no partiality to any one group and that lets each flourish according to the zeal of its adherents and the appeal of its dogma.' Here no partiality is shown, nor are classrooms being turned over to religious instructors as in *People of State of Ill. ex rel. McCollum* v. *Board of Ed.* 333 U.S. 203, 68 S. Ct. 461, 92 L. Ed. 649. Any effort of a particular group to promote its own beliefs, doctrines, tenets, and dogma must be carried on outside the public school, and any law to the contrary would violate the first amendment. *People of State of Ill. ex. rel. McCollum* v. *Board of Ed., supra.*

"As we see it, then, the challenged recitation was rightly upheld. It is not compulsory, is clearly nonsectarian in language, and neither directly nor indirectly even suggests belief in any form of organized or established religion. It permits each child to express gratitude to God and to invoke His blessing, to be steadfast in the faith of his acceptance if he has one; it compels no one, directly or indirectly, to do anything, if that be his or his parents' wish. All remain free, and thus we do not show preference as between 'those who believe in no religion' and 'those who do believe' (*Zorach* v. *Clauson, supra*, 343 U.S. at p. 314, 72 S. Ct. at p. 684).

"The orders appealed from should be affirmed, without costs."

Burke, judge (concurring):

"I concur in the opinions of Chief Judge Desmond and Judge Froessel. The dissenting opinion not only inadvertently distorts the purposes of the first amendment, but is also self-contradictory. The first amendment, it admits, specifically forbids any kind of monism in respect to religion. The amendment, it concedes, encourages diverse religious tenets. But the opinion reads in the amendment an attempt to compel conformity in the field of education—in other words, a compulsory unification of opinion in all school boards to totally reject any religious element in education and banish it from the schools. This, of course, would force on the children a culture that is founded upon secularist dogma.

"This interpretation rests on a misunderstanding. There is no language in the amendment which gives the slightest basis for the interpolation of a Marxist concept that mandates a prescribed ethic. According to the opinion, the separation of church and state which was intended to encourage religious interests among our people would become the constitutional basis for the compulsory exclusion of any religious element and the consequent promotion and advancement of atheism. It is not mere neutrality to prevent voluntary prayer to a Creator; it is an interference by the courts, contrary to the plain language of the Constitution, on the side of those who oppose religion."

Dye, judge (dissenting):

"The question posed on this appeal is whether the recital of a school-sponsored prayer may be required as a daily procedure in a public school. This question comes about as a result of a recommendation duly adopted at a special meeting of the Board of Education of Union Free School District No. 9, New Hyde Park, N.Y., held July 8, 1958, requiring that 'the regents prayer be said daily in our schools,' pursuant to which the board gave a 'direction to the district principal that this be instituted as a daily procedure to follow the salute to the flag' (minutes, board of education, Union Free School District No. 9, of meeting July 8, 1958).

"The regents prayer is worded as follows: 'Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country.' It derives from the 'Regents Statement on Moral and Spiritual Training in the Schools,' issued by the New York State Board of Regents, as duly adopted at a meeting held on November 30, 1951. This statement was reaffirmed and supplemented by 'The Regents Recommendations for School Programs on America's Moral and Spiritual Heritage,' unanimously adopted March 25, 1955. The recommendations requoted the opening sentence of the 1951 statement, viz.: 'Belief in and dependence upon Almighty God was the very cornerstone upon which our Founding Fathers builded,' and went on to express the conviction that 'such fundamental belief and dependence is the best security against the dangers of these difficult days and the adoption of their recommendations the best way of insuring that this Government and our way of life shall not perish from the earth.'

"The regents recommended that school programs be instituted, stressing the moral and spiritual heritage of America. It was in response to this recommendation that the respondent board promulgated the above order.

"In the schools in the respondents' district, it is the practice to say the prayer immediately after the salute to the flag, as a required daily procedure. It is led by the teacher or by a student selected by the teacher, with other students joining therein. While it does not appear whether any students leave the classroom during such recital, no penalty attaches for nonparticipation, since the board announced that, as a matter of policy, no child was to be required or encouraged to join in said prayer against his or her wishes.

"The petitioners with one exception—a nonbeliever—are all members of various religious faiths and, as taxpayers and parents of children attending public schools within the district, have challenged the saying of the prayer and have demanded its discontinuance on the ground that it amounts to an abridgement of religious freedom guaranteed by the 1st and 14th amendments to the Federal Constitution and section 3 of article I and section 4 of article XI of the New York State Constitution which, in essence, is to say that it constitutes a breach in Jefferson's metaphorical wall separating church and state.

"No one doubts for a moment that we are a religious people. It can be safely said that under no other government—past or present—have the people enjoyed such an untrammeled freedom to worship as they please and to indulge such freedom in more different ways and according to more diverse tenets and beliefs than do the people of the United States. The number of sects and religious groups are almost countless, due, no doubt, to the varied origins of our heterogenous population who have come here seeking, among other things, an asylum from religious persecution and a freedom to gain salvation in their own chosen way. The recognition of the need for the spiritual comfort and solace derived from religious practices was a first concern of the Founding Fathers who gave it expression in the simple and plainly worded phrase: 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' (U.S. Constitution, 1st amendment.) Our State constitution reiterates the same thought as 'The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed in this

State to all mankind.' (New York Constitution, art. I, sec. 3.)

"The natural consequence of these fundamental principles is not only to allow but to guarantee to all citizens an absolute freedom in the exercise of religious belief or no belief. By the same token, our State is free to function without interference by or dictation from an organized church. This mutual forbearance in spirit and in practice has eliminated divisiveness in a most sensitive area, created mutual respect for both church and state and has unified our people in a way that no other force could do.

"The development of the precise meaning of the establishment and freedom clauses of the first amendment has had a long and interesting history which needs no narration here. Very recently the U.S. Supreme Court has dealt with it in a series of historical decisions which, though varying in details, make it clear that the establishment and freedom clauses of the first amendment constitute a complete and unequivocal separation of church and State, a wall which must be kept high and impregnable, for in modern times it means at least this: 'Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or nonattendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a State nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa.' *Everson* v. *Board of Ed.*, 330 U.S. 1, 15–16, 67 S. Ct. 504, 511, 91 L. Ed. 711. A year later, in *People of State of Ill. ex rel. McCollum* v. *Board of Ed.*, 333 U.S. 203, 210, 68 S. Ct. 461, 464, 92 L. Ed. 649, involving a released time program in Illinois public schools, the U.S. Supreme Court found that the program, which in substance permitted outside teachers sponsored by religious organizations to give instruction in religion to schoolchildren, in the school building, during the school hours, as a substitute for the secular teaching provided in accordance with the compulsory education law, was 'beyond all question a utilization of the tax-established and tax-supported public school system to aid religious groups to spread their faith.' This, as Mr. Justice Black took pains to point out (333 U.S. at pp. 211–212, 68 S. Ct. at p. 465), did not 'manifest a governmental hostility to religion or religious teachings. A manifestation of such hostility would be at war with our national tradition as embodied in the first amendment's guaranty of the free exercise of religion,' and the key to its meaning 'rests upon the premise that both religion and Government can best work to achieve their lofty aims if each is left free from the other within its respective sphere.' It is interesting to note that in McCollum the four dissenting Justices in Everson concurred. Mr. Justice Frankfurter, while recognizing (333 U.S. at p. 213, 68 S. Ct. at p. 466) the existence of a clash in views as to what the wall separates, nonetheless made it very clear that the 1st and 14th amendments 'have a secular reach far more penetrating in the conduct of Government than merely to forbid an established church.'

"The New York released time program was tested and approved in *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, 72 S. Ct. 679, 96 L. Ed. 954. This permitted release of public school students during class hours for religious instruction off the school grounds, provided that written parental approval was first obtained. All costs were paid by the interested religious organizations. Some have read Zorach as a retreat from McCollum, but a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court did not think so. In sustaining the program, the Court removed any possible doubt that the principle of complete and unequivocal separation enunciated in McCollum was being reaffirmed since the prohibition is absolute (343 U.S. at p. 312, 72 S. Ct. at p. 683). As the Court expressed it, 'We follow the McCollum case' (343 U.S. at p. 315, 72 S. Ct. at p. 684). In deciding the merits as they did, the U.S. Supreme Court took the view that New York was 'adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs * * * [in the] best of our traditions,' for to hold otherwise, in its opinion, 'would be to find in the Constitution a requirement that the Government show a callous indifference to religious groups. * * * The Government must be neutral when it comes to competition between sects. It may not thrust any sect on any person. It may not make a religious observance compulsory. It may not coerce anyone to attend church, to observe a religious holiday, or to take religious instruction. But it can close its doors or suspend its operations as to those who want to repair to their religious sanctuary for worship or instruction. No more than that is undertaken here' (343 U.S. at p. 314, 72 S. Ct. at p. 684).

"It is also interesting to note that in *McGowan* v. *State of Maryland* (366 U.S. 420, 81 S. Ct. 1101, 6 L. Ed. 2d 393) Mr. Justice Douglas took occasion to sharpen what he had previously said in Zorach about our being a religious people by writing:

" 'But those who fashioned the Constitution decided that if and when God is to be served, His service will not be motivated by coercive measures of government. * * * [The first amendment] means, as I understand it, that if a religious leaven is to be worked into the affairs of our people, it is to be done by individuals and groups, not by the Government. * * * The idea, as I understand it, was to limit the power of government to act in religious matters ([West Virginia State] *Board of Education* v. *Barnette* (319 U.S. 624, 63 S. Ct. 1178, 87 L. Ed. 1628), supra: *People of State of Illinois ex rel. McCollum* v. *Board of Education* (333 U.S. 203, 68 S. Ct. 461, 92 L. Ed. 649), not to limit the freedom of religious men to act religiously nor to restrict the freedom of atheists or agnostics.

" 'The first amendment commands government to have no interest in theology or ritual; * * * On matters of this kind government must be neutral.' *McGowan* v. *State of Maryland*, 366 U.S. 420, 563–564, 81 S. Ct. 1101, 1219, supra.

"Very recently McCollum (supra) was employed to strike down Maryland's belief in God test for public office as an unconstitutional invasion of freedom of belief and religion and, accordingly, unenforcible (*Torcaso* v. *Watkins*, 367 U.S. 488, 495, 81 S. Ct. 1680, 1683), the Supreme Court stating: 'Neither [a State nor the Federal Government] can constitutionally pass laws or impose requirements which aid all religions as against nonbelievers, and neither can aid those religions based on a belief in the existence of God as against those religions founded on different beliefs.' It is clear, therefore, that the establishment clause should not have the narrow application which a majority here would ascribe to it, and that it bars the action taken by the school board.

"Running through the fabric of these definitive decisions, like the pattern of a tree of life in an intricate tapestry, is a clearly defined line of demarcation between church and state, which may not be overstepped in the slightest degree in favor of either the church or the state. In such light, a board of education may not require the saying of the regents prayer as a daily school procedure. It is a form of State-sponsored religious education; in fact, according to the regents, its purpose is 'teaching our children, as set forth in the Declaration of Independence, that Almighty God is their Creator' (1951 statement of belief) and 'will give to the student an understanding and appreciation of his role as an individual endowed by his Creator * * * and of reverence for Almighty God.' It would thus 'fulfill its (the school's) high function of supplementing the training of the home' (fundamental beliefs, regents recommendations, adopted March 25, 1955). This requirement falls squarely within the categories of disability accounting for the decisions in Everson and McCollum (supra): Use of public school classrooms during regular school hours, limitation of participation to those children whose parents consent and, in addition, being led by a teacher or by a person designated by the teacher. Under such announced purpose and method of performance, it cannot be less than instruction contrary to the establishment and freedom clauses, nor can the requirement be excused on the theory that the saying of the prayer—although conducted in the presence of the student body in the assembly hall of the classroom—is nonetheless a voluntary act, since no child is required or encouraged to join in said prayer against his or her wishes (answering affidavit), or on the theory that during the saying the child may remain silent, leave the room, or report late. This is no answer, for it contains the very elements the prayer is supposed to eliminate: Divisiveness, a type of compulsion, exerting as it does a pressure which an immature child is unable to resist because of his inherent desire to conform, and constituting a subtle interference by the State with the religious freedom guaranteed by the first amendment. As Mr. Justice Frankfurter so aptly phrased it: 'Separation means separation, not something less * * *. The public school is at once the symbol of our democracy and the most pervasive means for promoting our common destiny. In no activity of the State is it more vital to keep out divisive forces than in its schools, to avoid confusing, no to say fusing, what the Constitution sought to keep strictly apart.' *McCollum, supra*, 333 U.S. at p. 231, 68 S. Ct. at p. 475.

"The mere circumstance that the children of these petitioners may constitute a minority is no justification for rejecting their petition. The guarantees of the Bill of Rights, of which the first amendment is the very cornerstone, were designed to protect minorities, which include diverse religious sects and atheists. While majority rule is an accepted incident of the political aspects of the democratic process, nothing in the Bill of Rights permits imposing the will of a majority—even in the slightest degree—upon an objecting minority, contrary to its protective cloak (*Torcaso* v. *Watkins, supra; West Virginia State Board of Educ.* v. *Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 63 S.Ct. 1178, 87 L. Ed. 1628). The very fact that the school board is charged with the duty of educating the young who are compelled to attend public school, except in certain instances not presently pertinent (Education Law, Consol. Laws, c. 16, sec. 3212), is reason enough to observe scrupulously the establishment and freedom clauses here invoked. What was said in McCollum is appropriate here: 'We renew our conviction that "we have staked the very existence of our country on the faith that complete separation between the state and religion is best for the state and best for religion." (*Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. at p. 59, 67 S. Ct. at p. 532.) If nowhere else, in the relation between church and state, "good fences make good neighbors".' (*McCollum, supra*, 333 U.S. at p. 232, 68 S. Ct. at p. 475.)

"The sponsors of the regents prayer claim that it is nonsectarian in nature, a simple statement acknowledging the existence of and our dependence upon a Supreme Being; that such reference is of much the same character as the reference to God in various holiday programs (i.e., Christmas, Easter, Thanksgiving Day), in various official oaths, in invocations and benedictions said at most public gatherings, at meetings of some official bodies as well as in the inscription of the motto 'In God We Trust' on coins, stamps, and banknotes. Although these references may well be regarded as a permissible illustration that we are a religious people (cf. *Zorach* v. *Clauson, supra*), it does not follow that the regents prayer is beyond the reach of the first amendment. Such an approach belies the avowed purpose of the regents which, as we have pointed out, was to commence 'teaching our children' (statement of belief). In our view, this conflicts with the establishment clause which, under the 14th amendment, applies to the state—and boards of education are not excepted (*West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette, supra*). While the Barnette case dealt with the punitive consequences of noncompliance, the U.S. Supreme Court again made it clear that 'If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein' (319 U.S. at p. 642, 63 S. Ct. at p. 1187). The Pledge of Allegiance was neither designed nor intended for other than a patriotic purpose; yet, as applied to children who were expelled for refusal to comply because of religious scruples and whose absence thereby became unlawful, subjecting them and their parents or guardians to punishment was held unenforcible as to them. Under the Federal Constitution, it employed an impermissible means of achieving national unity. 'Compulsory unification of opinion,' as Mr. Justice Jackson in his illimitable forthrightness said (319 U.S. at p. 641, 63 S. Ct. at p. 1187), 'achieves only the unanimity of the graveyard.' The inculcation of religion is a matter for the family and the church. In sponsoring a religious program, the state enters a field which it has been thought best to leave to the church alone. However salutary the underlying purpose of the requirement may be, it nonetheless gives to the state a direct supervision and influence that overstep the line marking the division between church and state and cannot help but lead to a gradual erosion of the mighty bulwark erected by the first amendment. This does not mean that the state is or should be hostile to religion—merely that the state should not invade an area where the constitutionally protected freedom is absolute and not open to the vicissitudes of legislative or judicial balancing.

"The order appealed from should be reversed and the prayer of the petitioners should be granted, directing the Board of Education of Union Free School District No. 9, New Hyde Park, to discontinue the saying of the regents prayer in the schools within its district."

Foster, J., concurs with Desmond, C. J.

Froessel, J., concurs in an opinion in which Van Voorhis, J., concurs.

Burke, J., concurs in a separate opinion.

Dye, J., dissents and votes to reverse in an opinion in which Fuld, J., concurs.

Order affirmed.

[Supreme Court of the United States, October Term, 1961—No. 468]

THE REGENTS PRAYER CASE—BRIEF OF INTERVENORS-RESPONDENTS

(In the matter of the application of Steven I. Engel, Daniel Lichtenstein, Monroe Lerner, Lenore Lyons, and Lawrence Roth, petitioners, against William J. Vitale, Jr., Philip J. Freed, Mary Harte, Anne Birch, and Richard Saunders, constituting the Board of Education of Union Free School District No. 9, New Hyde Park, N.Y., respondents, directing them to discontinue a certain school practice, and Henry Hollenberg, Rose Levine, Martin Abrams, Helen Swanson, Walter F. Gibb, Jane Ehlen, Ralph B. Webb, Virginia Zimmerman, Virginia Davis, Violet S. Cox, Evelyn Koster, Irene O'Rourke, Rosemarie Petelenz, Daniel J. Reehil, Thomas Delaney, and Edward L. MacFarlane, intervenors-respondents.)

(On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of New York)

QUESTION PRESENTED

As phrased by petitioners (br. 3), the statement of the question presented is misleading in two vital respects:

1. It implies the existence of an element of coercion or compulsion which is totally absent from this case. The recital of the prayer in question is purely voluntary. No claim or threat of coercion was made below. The regulations of the respondent school board strictly forbid it; and the record shows that no such coercion has ever occurred or been threatened.

2. It implies that petitioners' attack is directed solely against the particular prayer here involved. On the contrary, as petitioners plainly stated in all the courts below, and as is implicit in their brief here (br. 7, 11), their attack is upon any and every form of voluntary religious observance, and against any use of the name of God, in every public school throughout the country.

In order that this Court may clearly grasp the nature and breadth of the issue here presented, we submit that the question should be restated as follows:

Does the Constitution of the United States peremptorily forbid, in all the public schools of the Nation, and in the absence of any element of compulsion, any voluntary form of prayer or other traditional practice which recognizes the existence of God or our Nation's dependence on Him?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. The background of the regents' prayer

The regents' prayer, which petitioners claim "may endanger the entire constitutional basis of our religious liberty" (petition for certiorari, p. 16), is a brief and simple acknowledgment of the existence of a Supreme Being in accordance with our national heritage of belief and the embodiment of that heritage in voluntary civic prayer. It is 22 words in length, requires approximately 12 seconds for recital and reads:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country" (28).[1]

It was unanimously adopted in 1951 by the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York which is, and since 1784 has been, the highest educational authority in the State (N.Y. Const., art. 5, sec. 4; art. 11, sec. 2) and whose high standing and reputation are acknowledged throughout the educational world. The members of this board included representatives of the Hebrew, Catholic, and Protestant faiths, and at least one prominent Unitarian. The language of the prayer was taken directly from provisions appearings in the constitutions of nearly all the States of the Union.[2]

In recommending the prayer to local school districts, the regents stated:

"Belief in and dependence upon Almighty God was the very cornerstone upon which our Founding Fathers builded.

"Our State constitution opens with these solemn words: 'We, the people of the State of New York grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, in order to secure its blessings, do establish this Constitution.'

"We are convinced that this fundamental belief and dependence of the American—always a religious—people is the best security against the dangers of these difficult days. In our opinion, the securing of the peace and safety of our country and our State against such dangers points to the essentiality of teaching our children, as set forth in the Declaration of Independence, that Almighty God is their Creator, and that by Him they have been endowed with their inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

"We believe that at the commencement of each school day the act of allegiance to the flag might well be joined with this act of reverence to God: 'Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country'" (28).

This awareness of the necessity for recognition in our public educational system of the moral and spiritual values to which the American people have always subscribed was reaffirmed by the regents in 1955 in their unanimous "Recommendations for School Programs on America's Moral and Spiritual Heritage" (30–39).

After recommending intensive study of the fundamental documents of our country, the regents declared:

"The same will give to the student an understanding and appreciation of his role as an individual endowed by his Creator with inalienable rights and as a member of a group similarly endowed; of respect for others, particularly parents and teachers, of devotion to freedom and of reverence for Almighty God" (38).

In this way the regents have sought to impart to the future citizens of the State a recognition of the moral and spiritual values which have been recognized as the basis of our free society since colonial days. The regents' prayer, an integral part of that program, serves as a simple reminder that Americans trust in God, as the Pledge of Allegiance serves as a simple reminder of our obligations to our "one Nation under God."

In recommending this program, the regents were not unmindful of the 1st and 14th amendments. They specifically cautioned against any injection of sectarianism or formal religious instruction into the public school:

"In putting such recommendations into effect teachers will be mindful always of the fundamental American doctrine of the separation of church and state, and careful at all times to avoid any and all sectarianism or religious instruction which advocates, teaches, or prefers any religious creed. Formal religion is not to be injected into the public school. It is a matter for the church and the home, for the religious leaders and the parents of each child" (32).

As the regents make plain, their recommendation was made with the implicit understanding "that no child would ever be forced, contrary to its conscience, to recite this prayer or even the words 'under God' in the Pledge of Allegiance, or even the pledge itself" (regents' brief, p. 24).

This policy the regents have declared they stand ready to enforce if need arises (ibid.).

---

[1] Except as otherwise identified, references are to the pages of the transcript of record.

[2] Direct acknowledgment of dependence on God appears in the constitutions of Iowa and North Carolina. A prayer for God's blessing or guidance appears in the constitutions of Illinois, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Texas. Almost all the rest (including that of New York) contain expressions of gratitude to God as the author of our liberties. These constitutional provisions are set forth at appendix A to the brief submitted by respondent school board.

There is no claim that the regents' policy has ever been violated either in the district where this case arises or in any of the other districts where the prayer is in use.

B. The nature and background of this litigation

On July 8, 1958, respondent school board, acting in accordance with the regents' recommendation, adopted a resolution directing that the regents' prayer be recited in the schools of the district as a daily procedure to follow the salute to the flag (25–26, 40–41, 65–66). On January 22, 1959, petitioners, as interested parents and as taxpayers of the district, commenced a special proceeding against respondent school board under article 78 of the New York Civil Practice Act[3] to require the board to discontinue the recitation of the prayer in the public schools of the district (9–18).

The 16 intervenors-respondents are citizens and taxpayers of the school district and are parents of 37 children actually attending the 7 district public schools (54). They include members of the Hebrew, Protestant, and Catholic faiths, and one (Evelyn Koster) who is a member of no religion or organized church. As persons specially and beneficially interested in upholding the action of the school board under section 1298 of the Civil Practice Act, they asked and were granted leave to intervene below on behalf of themselves and other parents in the district in support of the board's position (43–45).

It must be emphasized that there is no allegation in the petition for relief under article 78 (11–18) that any child of any petitioner or any other child in the district was ever compelled, or even urged, to join in the prayer or was ever disciplined or threatened with disciplinary action for failing to do so. Any child whose parents so desire is either excused from the classroom during the recitation of the prayer or permitted to remain silent while the prayer is recited by others (171–73). The answer of respondent school board (19) and the affidavit of its president (26), the opinions below (66, 136–37, 142, 146) and the affidavit of the school board president read in support of the board's motion for a final order of dismissal (170) make it plain that no such compulsion was contemplated, or has ever occurred. Petitioners, throughout this case, have consistently contended that the mere institution of the regents' prayer—or for that matter any prayer—in the public school system is incurably unconstitutional under any and all circumstances, regardless of the absence of coercion (175–76).

Thus, the issue presented in this case is solely one of law and has been so treated by all courts below: Does the Federal Constitution require the abolition of the noncompulsory recital of this nondenominational prayer?

The New York Supreme Court, special term (Meyer, J.), in a scholarly and well reasoned opinion, held that the recognition of prayer is an integral part of our national heritage—a point petitioners grudgingly admit (br. 7–8)—and that the establishment clause cannot have been intended to outlaw the practice in schools any more than in other areas of our public life; that prayer in the schools has been a traditional and accepted practice, particularly at the times of the adoption of the 1st and 14th amendments; that these amendments were not intended to outlaw this practice; and that the regents' prayer, as a brief and voluntary acknowledgment of God's existence, does not violate either the Federal or State Constitutions (50–116; 18 Misc. 2d 659).

[3] Art. 78, entitled "Proceeding Against a Body or Officer," provides a summary procedure for reviewing the acts of public officials and others, codifying and replacing the traditional proceedings of mandamus, prohibition, and certiorari.

The order entered upon this determination denied the petition, thus refusing to order the discontinuance of the regents' prayer, and directed that the matter be remanded to respondent school board for proceedings not inconsistent with the court's opinion (6–8). That opinion directed the board to adopt certain specific safeguards, confirming its existing practice, to ensure that the recital of the regents' prayer was a voluntary matter, to be observed or not at the election of the child or his parents (8, 105–09).

The appellate division, second department, affirmed per curiam, one justice concurring in part and dissenting in part (124–25; 11 A.D. 2d 340).

Pursuant to the direction of special term, the school board adopted regulations confirming its existing practice and emphasizing that no teacher or school authority was to comment on participation or nonparticipation in the prayer or suggest or require that any posture or language be used or not used, and providing that any child should be excused from participation or attendance upon request. All parents and taxpayers were so notified (172–173). A final order was then entered in supreme court, Nassau County, dismissing the proceeding on the merits on the ground that respondent school board had fully complied with the directions of special term, as affirmed (167–168). Petitioners appealed to the Court of Appeals of New York from this final order and pursuant to sections 588(2) and 590(a) of the New York Civil Practice Act, brought up for review the interlocutory order of the appellate division affirming the prior order of special term, which determined the merits of the constitutional isues raised by petitioners (164–165).

The court of appeals, by a 5-to-2 vote, affirmed the final order and, accordingly, found no error in either the interlocutory or the final order brought up for review (142; 10 N.Y. 2d 174). That court first held that there were "adequate provisions to insure that no pupil need take part in or be present during the act of reverence, so any question of compulsion or free exercise is out of the case (see *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306)" (142).

The court of appeals further ruled that the recitation of the prayer was neither religious education nor the practice of or establishment of religion in any reasonable meaning of those phrases (143), but was in harmony with a universally accepted tradition of public prayer in American life. In the majority opinion, Chief Judge Desmond stated:

'The regents' prayer is an acknowledgment of our dependence upon Almighty God and a petition for the bestowal of His blessings. * * * That the first amendment was ever intended to forbid as an establishment of religion a simple declaration of belief in God is so contrary to history as to be impossible of acceptance" (143).

Judge Froessel, in his concurring opinion, found that the voluntary recital of the regents' prayer was within the scope of this Court's decision in *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306 (1952), rather than that of *McCollum* v. *Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203 (1948), stating:

"The narrow question presented is: Do the Federal and State constitutions prohibit the recitation by children in our public schools of the 22 words acknowledging dependence upon Almighty God, and invoking His blessing upon them, their parents and teachers, and upon our country? To say that they do seems to me to stretch the so-called separation of church and state doctrine beyond reason (145).

* * * * *

"One may earnestly believe in God, without being attached to any particular religion or church. Hence a rule permitting public school children, willing to do so, to acknowledge their dependence upon Him, and to invoke His blessings, can hardly be called a law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof in transgression of the first amendment which in no wise prohibits the recognition of God, or laws respecting such recognition.

"The challenged recitation follows the pledge of allegiance, which itself refers to God. Schoolchildren are permitted to sing 'America,' the fourth stanza of which is indeed a prayer, invoking the protection of God, author of liberty. The preamble to our State constitution, which is taught in our public schools, provides: 'We the people of the State of New York, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom.' Virtually every State constitution in the United States, as well as the Declaration of Independence, contains similar references. To say that such references and others of like nature employed in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government (see *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, at pp. 312–313), unrelated to any particular religion or church, may be sanctioned by public officials everywhere but in the public school room defies understanding (145–146).

* * * * *

"Here no partiality is shown, nor are classrooms being turned over to religious instructors as in *McCollum* v. *Board of Educ.* (333 U.S. 203). Any effort of a particular group to promote its own beliefs, doctrines, tenets, and dogma must be carried on outside the public school, and any law to the contrary would violate the first amendment. (*McCollum* v. *Board of Educ., supra.*)

"As we see it, then, the challenged recitation was rightly upheld. It is not compulsory, is clearly nonsectarian in language, and neither directly nor indirectly even suggests belief in any form of organized or established religion. It permits each child to express gratitude to God and to invoke His blessing, to be steadfast in the faith of his acceptance if he has one; it compels no one, directly or indirectly, to do anything, if that be his or his parents' wish. All remain free, and thus we do not show preference as between those who believe in no religion and those who do believe (*Zorach* v. *Clauson, supra,* p. 314)" (146–147).

C. What this case does and does not involve

To correct several misconceptions which arose in petitioners' arguments below, some of which are reflected in their brief here, we wish to make plain, as we did below, what this case does not involve:

1. It involves no element and no claim of coercion or penalty, actual or threatened, against any of the petitioners or their children.

2. It involves no element and no claim of unlawful taxation or pocketbook injury.

3. It involves no attack either upon the sincerity of petitioners' religious beliefs or lack of belief or upon their right to hold and practice their views without interference from any source.

4. It involves no claim that the views of these petitioners, or of any others, are entitled to any less protection than those of the majority.

By the same token, it is our position that these petitioners, who have shown no injury to themselves, have no right under color of the establishment clause, to impose their views upon the vast majority of their fellow citizens, to deny to others the rights which they claim for themselves, to force all others to conform to their views or, in short, to deny to others the free exercise of religion. It is the basic thesis of this brief that, in the absence of any compulsion, the voluntary recital of such a prayer is in full accord with our traditions; and that to force its abolition upon unwilling local authorities and unwilling parents would be a distortion not only of the first amendment but of all our history. What is here involved is not simply

a basic clash between two philosophies, but an assertion by petitioners that they are entitled, not only to voice and practice their philosophy, but to impose it throughout the entire field of public education as a constitutional mandate upon the vast majority who disagree.

The basic clash is squarely recognized by petitioners in these words (brief 32):

"The Board of Regents of the State of New York have stated that '[b]elief in and dependence upon Almighty God was the very cornerstone upon which our Founding Fathers builded.' Petitioners disagree."

That they have the constitutional right so to disagree is conceded. What we deny is their right to magnify that disagreement into a constitutional and historical absolute, and to coerce all others into passively accepting it as an essential element of our entire public educational system.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

1. This Court has recognized the historical fact that "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being" (*Zorach* v. *Clauson, supra,* at 313).

Those institutions surely do not exclude our schools. Parents have a constitutional right to insist that their children should not be forcibly subjected in those schools to that atmosphere of complete and uncompromising secularism toward which petitioners' approach must lead. Such parents have a right to insure that their children should not be compulsorily forbidden by judicial mandate from a brief, nondenominational, and voluntary recognition of that belief in and gratitude to Almighty God which lies at the foundation of all our institutions, secular as well as religious. The prayer itself is nothing more than a simple affirmation of that faith in a higher power exemplified on innumerable solemn occasions throughout our history, from the Declaration of Independence to the present day. It reflects the present embodiment of traditions and customs existing in this country prior to the adoption of either the Federal or State constitutions and which those constitutions were emphatically not intended to destroy.

2. The regents' prayer was adopted by the unanimous vote of the highest educational authority of New York. As recommended by the regents, as actually used in all the schools of this district, and as confirmed by the orders of the courts below, it embodies no element of coercion. No child can be compelled to say the prayer. No child can be disciplined for refusing to join in it.

3. Petitioners have the right to believe, and to have their children believe, what they choose about the basic principles which guide our lives and upon which our institutions are established. No one is here attacking that belief or that right. No one seeks to force petitioners' children to utter a single word, or to do a single act, which is contrary to law or to their own convictions. But petitioners have no right, we insist, to warp our educational system so as to force all others to conform to their views.

These are matters of deep and abiding principle. We ask the Court to approach its decision having constantly in mind two questions: (i) whose civil liberties are really here at stake; and (ii) which side is really upholding, and which side is attacking, our Constitution?

POINT I

The regents' prayer is an embodiment of traditional civic prayer. Voluntarily recited, it represents a reasonable and proper method of developing an appreciation and understanding of the basic principles of our national heritage and, as such, does not violate the Constitution.

A. Civic prayer is an integral part of our national heritage and tradition

Belief in and dependence upon God as the author of our liberties and the source of our inalienable rights, are woven into the fabric of our institutions and are affirmed in our basic civic documents from the Declaration of Independence onwards. They are specifically recited in the constitutions of all but one of our States.[4] No one, it is true, can be compelled to accept that belief or acknowledge that dependence; but they are nevertheless present, and form an inescapable part of our national tradition and heritage, in which both adults and schoolchildren share.

With that belief, in the minds of the great majority at least, is associated the idea of prayer. Prayer may be personal, family, or liturgical—in which case it is entirely outside the scope of government. But prayer may also be civic—i.e., performed on occasions or in contexts that reveal the prayer as performed by the citizen in union with his fellow citizens. Civic prayer is traditionally said voluntarily, without rite or ceremony, and contains no denominational teaching.

By such civic prayer, in the words of our State constitutions, our people express their "profound reverence for the Supreme Ruler of the Universe" (Colorado), express themselves as "grateful to Almighty God for the privilege of choosing our own form of government, for our civil and religious liberty" (Arkansas), as "acknowledging our dependence upon Him for the continuance of those blessings to us and our posterity" (North Carolina), and as "humbly invoking" His blessing (Texas). The regents' prayer says no more than do these State constitutional declarations.

The custom of prayer on public occasions in the United States has a long and honored history for the first citizens of our Republic realized that unalienable rights are only those which come from God. By the Declaration of Independence, a compulsory subject in all New York schools (education law, sec. 3204(3)(a)(2)), they set forth this religious declaration as a self-evident truth:

"That all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

These ideas, simple enough for children to understand yet profoundly influencing our entire philosophy of government, are a declaration of dependence on God and of human rights unalienable because God given.

On June 12, 1775, the Continental Congress issued a proclamation for a day of fasting and prayer:

"As the great Governor of the World, by His supreme and universal providence, not only conducts the course of nature with unerring wisdom and rectitude, but frequently influences the minds of men to serve the wise and gracious purposes of His providential government; and it being at all times our indispensable duty devoutly to acknowledge his superintending providence, especially in times of impending danger and public calamity, to reverence and adore His immutable justice as well as to implore His merciful interposition for our deliverance:

"This Congress, therefore, considering the present critical, alarming, and calamitous state of these colonies, do earnestly recommend that Thursday, the 20th day of July next, be observed by the inhabitants of all the English colonies on this continent as a day of public humiliation, fasting, and prayer" (2 Journals of the Continental Congress 87 (1775)).

Days of prayer and thanksgiving were proclaimed in 1777, 9 id. at 851, 854, 873 (1777), in 1782 after the victory of the American armies, 23 id. at 646–647 (1782), and again in 1783 after the signing of the peace treaty with Great Britain, 25 id. at 699 (1783). On June 20, 1782, Congress approved the design of the Great Seal which pictured the eye of God above a pyramid of 13 steps and contained the inscription "Annuit Coeptis" signifying "He (God) hath favored our undertakings." Cf. 22 id. at 338–339 (1782).

In 1789 it was moved by the Senate that there be a religious service in connection with Washington's inauguration:

"*Resolved,* That after the oath shall have been administered to the President, he, attended by the Vice President, and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, proceed to St. Paul's Chapel, to hear divine service, to be performed by the Chaplain of Congress already appointed." (1 Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States 25.)

With slight changes the measure passed both Houses. (Id. at 29.)

On the very same day that the First Congress approved the first amendment (Sept. 24, 1789), it resolved:

"That a joint committee of both Houses be directed to wait upon the President of the United States to request that he would recommend to the people of the United States a day of public thanksgiving and prayer, to be observed by acknowledging, with grateful hearts, the many signal favors of Almighty God, especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a Constitution of government for their safety and happiness." (Id. at 949.)

Pursuant to this resolution, President Washington issued a proclamation October 3, 1789, which declared:

"Now therefore I do recommend and assign Thursday the 26th day of November next to be devoted by the People of these States to the Service of the great and glorious Being, who is the beneficent Author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be. That we may then all unite in rendering unto him our sincere and humble thanks for his kind care and protection of the People of this country previous to their becoming a Nation, for the signal and manifold mercies, and the favorable interpositions of His providence." See Cousins, "In God We Trust" 72 (1958).

In 1853 petitions seeking the abolition of chaplaincies in the Armed Forces and in Congress on the ground of alleged unconstitutionality were considered and unequivocally rejected by the Senate Judiciary Committee, which emphasized that there was no intent on the part of the framers of the Constitution to make this an irreligious nation or to prohibit public expressions of religious devotion (S. Rept. No. 376, 32d Cong., 2d sess. (1853)). Congress has continued to affirm our national tradition of civic or organic prayer. In 1952 it directed the President to set aside by proclamation a National Day of Prayer (36 U.S.C. sec. 185). Our national motto, established in 1956 by act of Congress (36 U.S.C. sec. 186) is "In God We Trust," a phrase which has long been required on all of our coins and paper currency (31 U.S.C. sec. 324(a)). In 1954 Congress added the words "under God" to the prescribed Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag (36 U.S.C. sec. 172). In recommending this amendment the House Judiciary Committee stated:

"This is not an act establishing a religion or one interfering with the free exercise of religion. A distinction must be made between the existence of a religion as an institution and a belief in the sovereignty of God. The phrase 'under God' recognizes only the guidance of God in our national affairs" (H. Rept. No. 1693, 83d Cong., 2d sess. (1954)).

The constitutionality of this amendment has already been sustained against attack, on the same first amendment grounds here presented, by the courts of New York in *Matter of Lewis* v. *Allen,* 5 Misc. 2d 68 (Sup.

[4] West Virginia appears to be the sole exception.

Ct. Albany Co. 1957), aff'd, 11 A.D. 2d 447 (3d Dept. 1960).[5]

Judicial observance of civic prayer is found throughout the land and in the supplication with which this Court opens each session:

"God save the United States and this honorable Court."

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt fully summed up our Nation's religious heritage of acknowledgment of and dependence upon God:

"Thus from our earliest recorded history, Americans have thanked God for their blessings. In our deepest natures, in our very souls, we, like all mankind since the earliest origin of mankind, turn to God in time of trouble and in time of happiness. 'In God We Trust'." Thanksgiving Day Proclamation, 3 Stokes, "Church and State in the United States" 190 (1950).

Former President Eisenhower warned:

"Each day we must ask that Almighty God will set and keep His protecting hand over us so that we may pass on to those who come after us the heritage of a free people, secure in their God-given right and in full control of a government dedicated to the preservation of those rights" (37).

These are not meaningless gestures. They are not, as petitioners' counsel contended below, mere "incidental mentions of God" which "prove nothing." They prove that the practice of civic prayer is an integral part of our national heritage.

"There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious Nation. These are not individual sayings, declarations of private persons: They are organic utterances; they speak the voice of the entire people." *Holy Trinity Church* v. *United States*, 143 U.S. 457, 470 (1892).

The specific issue here presented concerns the voluntary recital in the public schools of this traditional form of civic prayer which does no more than recognize the existence of God and our dependence on Him. Voluntary civic prayer in the schools does not differ from civic prayer on other public occasions. The essential point is that the child attends school as one of a community of fellow citizens-in-training, in pursuit of learning, character, civic standards, and moral values, the possession of which is necessary to any well-ordered society. Hence the school prayer situation can be valid compared with that of civic prayer on other public occasions, in Congress, at the opening of the courts, and at the inaugurals of our Presidents. All are secular situations; all are public; in all it is a matter of citizens convening as citizens.

The question then seems to be this: If voluntary civic prayer is constitutionally appropriate on other public occasions, why must such prayer, as distinguished from formal denominational training, be completely forbidden on school occasions? If it is permissible, and even praiseworthy, for public officials publicly to invoke the Providence of God for the protection and furtherance of the good of the Commonwealth, what is wrong with a voluntary invocation for the good of pupils, parents and teachers, upon whom the good of the Commonwealth so largely depends?

Petitioners seem to accept the fact of our tradition of civic or organic prayer but they contend that the regents' prayer, as a nondenominational prayer "composed by laymen who are State officials, acting in their official capacity" does not come within that presumably acceptable classification (br. 14). The same criticism could, of course, be leveled at the Declaration of Independence and all of our other civic prayers or invocations of God, including the State constitutions from which the wording of the regents' prayer was adopted.

Nor is the regents' prayer objectionable on the ground (advanced by petitioners below) that it is a "new-fangled" idea originating in 1951. On the contrary, it is in line with a tradition in New York going back for over a century (52), and its language is borrowed from documents some of which are even older. Far from being a State-dictated form of worship as charged by petitioners, the regents' prayer, a type of prayer common to virtually all religions, is squarely within our tradition of civic or organic prayer because it, like the preambles to our State constitutions, our Presidential proclamations and similar utterances, simply acknowledges man's dependence on God and requests His blessings.

B. The first amendment was not intended to abolish civic prayer as an expression of our national heritage and tradition of belief in God and dependence on Him

The first amendment states:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

In seeking to ascertain the meaning of this amendment or of any constitutional provision, the intent of the framers, particularly as expressed in their actions; and the sense of the Nation at the time are paramount. *Cf. Ex Parte Bain*, 121 U.S. 1, 12 (1886); *Rhode Island* v. *Massachusetts*, 37 Pet. 657, 723 (1838).

To determine the sense of the Nation and the intent of the framers we shall examine: (i) the religious beliefs of the people of the time and their attitude toward public prayer; (ii) existing and subsequent educational practices; and (iii) the meaning of the establishment clause in the context of civic prayer as revealed by legislative and administrative practices contemporaneous with the adoption of the first amendment.

The framers of the Constitution were representatives of a people who from the first birth pains of the new nation had exhibited a sense of personal responsibility to God; and the documents of the times give eloquent testimony of the religious convictions of the Founding Fathers.[6] Canon Stokes, in his authoritative work "Church and State in the United States," observed:

"Much less recognized, but equally clear, is the conviction of the founders of the vital importance of religion to the new nation. I expected, before I began this study, to find this to be true as far as President Washington and some of his associates were concerned; but I have been surprised at the mass of evidence to support the claims of religion in a republic as expressed by men like Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin, who have often been classed as freethinkers. Even Thomas Paine was not an atheist" (1 Stokes, "Church and State in the United States," 514–515).

Canon Stokes is simply summarizing the view of Jefferson himself, who said:

"The God who gave us life gave us liberty at the same time." See "Rights of British America" (1774) (1 Writings of Thomas Jefferson 142) (Washington ed. 1853–54).

"Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are a gift of God." See "Notes on Virginia" (1782) (8 Writings of Thomas Jefferson 404) (Washington ed., 1853–54).

Jefferson's great opponent, John Adams, who presided over the Senate when it considered the first amendment, held the same views. In an address to the Militia of Massachusetts on October 11, 1798, he said:

"Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other" (9 Charles Francis Adams, "The Works of John Adams," 229).

The guarantees of religious freedom contained in the first amendment are the expression not merely of a political conviction of the Founding Fathers, but of a religious concept as well.

"One cannot speak of religious liberty, with proper appreciation of its essential and historical significance, without assuming the existence of a belief in supreme allegiance to the will of God." Hughes, C. J. dissenting, in *United States* v. *Macintosh*, 283 U.S. 605, 634 (1931) (concurred in by Justices Holmes, Brandeis, and Stone). The decision in that case was subsequently overruled and the minority view was upheld in *Girouard* v. *United States*, 328 U.S. 61 (1946).

The belief in God so deeply felt by the Founders was expressed in the actions taken by the early Congresses and Presidents. Public schools, as we know them today, did not exist in the Colonies and, as special term noted (78–79), colonial education was largely under religious auspices. However, there is no contemporaneous indication that the framers of the first amendment intended to outlaw all reference to religion from the educational process, even in areas where that amendment operated directly from the outset, such as the District of Columbia and the territories. Indeed, the actions taken by the early Congresses impel the opposite conclusion. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787, adopted in the very year in which the Constitution was drafted, affirmed this philosophy:

"Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged" (1 Stat. 51–52).

This ordinance was adopted verbatim by the First Congress August 7, 1789 (ibid.), and its language was also adapted to the government of the territory south of the Ohio River by the First Congress May 26, 1790 (1 Stat. 123). When the Indiana Territory was formed from the Northwest Territory in 1800, the identical language of the original Northwest Ordinance was made applicable to it by the Sixth Congress (2 Stat. 58–59).

The principles of religion appear to have been taught more than 100 years ago in the Distrct of Columbia, an area to which the first amendment has from the inception of our Nation, been applicable:

"Free to all, without sectarian taint or bias, and without any question as to the political or religious belief of those who desire to enjoy their benefits, the principles of morality and religion are taught by individuals who are themselves exemplifications and patterns of that morality without which all national institutions are feeble, and all human glory are unsubstantial shadows" Annual Report of the Trustees of Public Schools of the City of Washington, August 1850, contained in "Communications of the Mayor of the City of Washington to the Board of Aldermen and Board of Common Council, Sept. 9, 1850," page 451.[7]

---

[5] We are advised that a notice of appeal to the New York Court of Appeals has been filed but that the appeal has not yet been perfected.

[6] See, e.g., "Mayflower Compact"; "Articles of Confederation"; "Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms," 2 Journals of the Continental Congress, 154–157; "Declaration of Independence"; "Washington's Farewell Address," 4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 5562; John Adams, "Address to the Militia of Massachusetts," Oct. 11, 1798, quoted, infra, at 22.

[7] Bible reading and prayer, with provision for excuse of children upon request, are today, and have long been the practice in the District schools. See appendix at p. 64, infra.

Thus, a belief in God has been associated with morality and education from our beginnings. George Washington spoke for all the founders when he said:

"Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." Farewell Address, 4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 5562.

Governor Lewis, of New York, in his address to the legislature in 1804, stated:

"In a government resting on public opinion, and deriving its chief support from the affections of a people, religion and morality cannot be too sedulously inculcated. To them science is an handmaid, ignorance the worst of enemies. * * * Common schools under the guidance of respectable teachers should be established in every village, and the indigent be educated at public expense." (State of New York, Messages from the Governors: Charles Lincoln, vol. 2, pp. 550–551.)

In 1812 a common school system was established in New York on the basis of recommendations made by a special commission. This commission reported that:

"Morality and religion are the foundation of all that is truly great and good, and are consequently of primary importance" (Id. at 720–721).

The Public School Society founded in New York in 1805 by private philanthropists received State money after 1807 to assist it in its work. The society was regarded as nondenominational, though chartered to teach the sublime truths of religion and morality contained in the Holy Scriptures in its schools.

The secularizing movement in the schools commenced in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts under Horace Mann, but in the final report of the board of education headed by Mann (1847), it was observed that the public schools should adhere to a program of "daily Bible reading, devotional exercises and the constant inculcation of the precepts of Christian morality." Mann himself in his final report in 1848 said:

"I believed then (1837) as now, that sectarian books and sectarian instruction, if their encroachment were not resisted, would prove the overthrow of the schools. I believed then, as now, that religious instruction in our schools, to the extent which the Constitution and the laws of the State allowed and prescribed, was indispensable to their highest welfare, and essential to the vitality of moral education.

"I avail myself of this, the last opportunity which I may ever have, to say in regard to all affirmations or intimations that I have ever attempted to exclude religious instruction from the schools, or to exclude the Bible from the schools, or to impair the force of that volume, that they are now, and always have been, without substance or semblance of truth. Our system earnestly inculcates all Christian morals; it founds its morals on the basis of religion; it welcomes the religion of the Bible; and in receiving the Bible, it allows it to do what it is allowed to do in no other system, to speak for itself." (4 Mann Annual Reports 308 (Boston 1891), quoted in 2 Stokes, op. cit., supra, at 57.)

The views of Jefferson and Madison have been frequently cited by this Court in first amendment cases, and are referred to by petitioners at pages 26–28 of their brief. On the particular question whether Madison and Jefferson believed or intended, by the first amendment, to abolish all vestiges of God from our public school system, we are faced at the outset by the facts (i) that no public school system existed in their lifetime and (ii) that Jefferson himself, though devoted to the cause of free public education, flatly opposed the idea of making it compulsory.[8]

However, Madison, as pointed out by Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the McCollum case, 333 U.S. 203, 216, was a deeply religious man, as evidenced by his letter to Frederick Beasley written in 1825:

"And the belief in a God all powerful wise and good, is so essential to the moral order of the world and to the happiness of man, that arguments which enforce it cannot be drawn from too many sources nor adapted with too much solicitude to the different characters and capacities to be impressed with it." See Cousins, "In God We Trust," 321 (1958).

Although Madison went as far as any of the Founding Fathers (and further than most) in his ideas of separation of church and state, we have found nothing in his writings to indicate that even he would have pressed his doctrine to the extent of asserting that the first amendment would forbid all voluntary expressions of reverence for God in a compulsory public educational system which in his day was nonexistent, but which has now come to embrace the great majority of all the children of the Nation.

His views, as expressed in the remonstrance (already extensively considered by this Court), have, we submit, no direct application here. At the time of that remonstrance, the Anglican Church, which had previously held a practical monopoly over not only religion but also education in the State of Virginia, was in process of being removed from that position. The proposal made in the assessment bill, against which Madison's remonstrance was directed, was to establish a tax system primarily for the direct support of all Christian religious bodies in the State and incidentally for supporting their sectarian educational enterprises. Precisely such a mingling of sectarian and governmental functions was held to be involved in the McCollum case, in which the remonstrance was cited (333 U.S. at 214). But the circumstances of this case, we submit, are quite different; and there is nothing in the remonstrance which would indicate that its author intended to outlaw all mention of God from public life, or from school life. Indeed, the remonstrance itself contained not only a recognition of God's existence but an earnest appeal for His help.

Jefferson worked long and hard for the establishment of a system of free public education in his native State. His efforts in this respect, together with many of the original documents, are set forth in Honeywell (cited supra, p. 26, footnote). Jefferson's proposed Virginia school bill of 1817 (Honeywell, appendix H) set up a system of free tax-supported primary schools under local supervision in each county. The only reference to religion is contained in section 11:

"The said teachers shall, in all things relating to the education and government of their pupils, be under the direction and control of the visitors; but no religious reading, instruction or exercise, shall be prescribed or practiced inconsistent with the tenets of any religious sect or denomination" (Honeywell, p. 235).

When we consider that the existing school system which Jefferson's bill was designed to replace or supplement was a system almost entirely under sectarian auspices, the need for such a directive is apparent. But the bill itself, in the section quoted, recognized and allowed for the possibility of some simple nondenominational recognition of God in the school. It therefore seems probable that, were Jefferson alive today, he would repudiate any contention that the first amendment requires a compulsory excision from our whole public educational system of all voluntary mention of God or of that dependence upon Him which Jefferson himself acknowledged in the Declaration of Independence.

There is, on the contrary, evidence that both Jefferson and Madison recognized the place for voluntary religious exercises even within the bounds of a tax-supported educational system and indeed on State property. When Jefferson came to set up the University of Virginia, he prepared a report for the commissioners which was signed by Madison as one of that body. In the section of that report dealing with the proposed buildings, it was stated:

"It is supposed probable, that a building of somewhat more size in the middle of the grounds may be called for in time, in which may be rooms for religious worship, under such impartial regulations as the visitors shall prescribe, for public examinations, for a library, for the schools of music, drawing, and other associated purposes" (Honeywell, app. J, at 249).

The regulations enacted by the board of visitors of the University of Virginia on April 7, 1824, were prepared by Jefferson as rector and approved by Madison as a member of the board. These regulations provided:

"Should the religious sects of this State, or any of them, according to the invitation held out to them, establish within, or adjacent to, the precincts of the university, schools for instruction in the religion of their sect, the students of the university will be free, and expected to attend religious worship at the establishment of their respective sects, in the morning, and in time to meet their school in the university at its stated hour.

"The students of such religious school, if they attend any school of the university, shall be considered as students of the university, subject to the same regulations, and entitled to the same rights and privileges.

* * * * *

"The upper circular room of the rotunda shall be reserved for a library.

"One of its larger elliptical rooms on its middle floor shall be used for annual examinations, for lectures to such schools as are too numerous for their ordinary school room, and for religious worship, under the regulations allowed to be prescribed by law" (Honeywell, app. M, at 274–275).

At brief 28 petitioners cite as authority for their position the 1808 letter from Jefferson to the Reverend Samuel W. Miller, explaining his unwillingness to issue Thanksgiving Day proclamations. Jefferson's practice in this regard was not followed by any other President with the sole exception of Andrew Jackson. See 3 Stokes, "Church and State in the United States," 180–193 (1950). And despite his aversion to Thanksgiving Day proclamations Jefferson felt no hesitation in publicly invoking God's name in public documents, such as the Declaration of Independence and both of his inaugurals.[9]

Madison also invoked God's name in his public documents, such as the remonstrance

---

[8] Roy J. Honeywell, "The Educational Work of Thomas Jefferson" 35–6 (Harv. Univ. Press 1931 (hereafter cited as "Honeywell").

[9] The concluding sentence of Jefferson's first inaugural said:

"And may that Infinite Power which rules the destinies of the universe lead our councils to what is best, and give them a favorable issue for your peace and prosperity." Davis, Newton, and Lott, "The Inaugural Addresses of the American Presidents From Washington to Kennedy," 17 (1961).

In his second inaugural he said:

"I shall need, too, the favor of that Being in whose hands we are, who led our fathers, as Israel of old, from their native land and planted them in a country flowing with all the necessaries and comforts of life; who has covered our infancy with His providence and our riper years with His wisdom and power, and to whose goodness I ask you to join in supplications with me that He will so enlighten the minds of your servants, guide their councils, and prosper their measures that whatsoever they do shall result in your good, and shall secure to you the peace, friendship, and approbation of all nations." Id. at 22.

and his first inaugural.[10] During the War of 1812, he acceded to the insistent demands of Congress, expressed in a joint resolution (Annals of Congress, 12th Cong., 1st sess. 310), that a proclamation be issued requesting Divine assistance in the war. In addition to this proclamation issued on July 9, 1812, Madison issued three others, on July 23, 1813, November 6, 1814, and March 4, 1815. See Fleet, "Madison's Detached Memoranda," 3 Wm. & Mary Quarterly Historical Magazine 562 (3d series).

As a Member of the First Congress, Madison had served on the committee to arrange for the appointment of a chaplain to Congress, a precedent that has endured to this day (id. at 457). As President, he approved statutes providing for compensation to the chaplains of both Houses (act of Apr. 30, 1816, c. 170; 3 Stat. 334) and for chaplains in the Armed Forces (acts of Jan. 11, 1812, c. 14, sec. 24, 2 Stat. 674; Jan. 29, 1813, c. 16, sec. 16, 2 Stat. 796; April 18, 1814, c. 82, sec. 9, 3 Stat. 135; April 24, 1816, c. 69, sec. 2, 3 Stat. 297). It was not until late in life and long after retirement from the Presidency that Madison in his "Detached Memoranda" expressed serious doubt about the propriety of these practices (1 Stokes, op. cit., supra, at 456).

Jefferson seems never to have expressed any opposition to service chaplains, and as President he approved an act providing one chaplain, with the rank of major, for each brigade of the Army (act of Apr. 12, 1808, c. 43, sec. 7, 2 Stat. 482). The Articles of War, which he also approved, not only provided for chaplains but also "earnestly recommended to all officers and soldiers, diligently to attend divine service" (act of Apr. 10, 1806, c. 20, 2 Stat. 359).

The issues involved in this case cannot be resolved, as petitioners attempt to do, by reiteration of the words "wall of separation." As Mr. Justice Frankfurter observed in the McCollum case:

"The mere formulation of a relevant Constitutional principle is the beginning of the solution of a problem, not its answer. * * * But agreement, in the abstract, that the first amendment was designed to erect a 'wall of separation between church and state' does not preclude a clash of views as to what the wall separates" 333 U.S. at 212–213).

It can hardly be contended that a Congress composed of the very men who had drafted, debated and voted on the first amendment, and who were intimately familiar with the intended scope of that amendment, would immediately violate it and pass statutes, such as those authorizing chaplains, which would obviously prefer believers over nonbelievers, and would aid the general cause of religion or the particular sect with which the congressional chaplain was affiliated. The same principle applies to the statutes appointing military chaplains.

These and all the other actions by the early Congresses, and all the invocations of the Almighty which pervade the public utterances of the Founding Fathers, are not at variance with this Court's interpretation of the scope of the establishment clause as set forth in *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1, 15–16 (1947). Traditional voluntary civic prayer of the type envisaged and practiced by the early Congresses and by the Founding Fathers is, we submit, within an area which they intended to preserve and transmit as part of our national heritage, and to which the prohibitions of the establishment clause cannot reasonably be held to extend. "That is the commonsense of the matter," as the Court clearly indicated in pointing out that the references to the Almighty which run through our laws, our public rituals and our ceremonies in no way flout the provisions of the first amendment (*Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, 312, 313 (1952)).

Recognition of this principle does not require any deviation from the Everson definition of the meaning of the establishment clause, and is in no way inconsistent with past decisions of this Court. On the contrary, we submit that the extension of the Everson interpretation which petitioners now urge would, in reality, rewrite our entire history.

C. The adoption of the 14th amendment was not intended to prohibit prayer in public schools

In *Cantwell* v. *Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296, 303 (1940), and subsequent cases, this Court declared that the due process clause of the 14th amendment operated to carry over against the States the provisions of the first. Very recently, however, this Court declared in *Bartkus* v. *Illinois*, 359 U.S. 121, 124 (1959):

"We have held from the beginning and uniformly that the due process clause of the 14th amendment does not apply to the States any of the provisions of the first eight amendments as such. The relevant historical materials have been canvassed by this Court and by legal scholars. These materials demonstrate conclusively that Congress and the members of the legislatures of the ratifying States did not contemplate that the 14th amendment was a shorthand incorporation of the first eight amendments making them applicable as explicit restrictions upon the States."

The Court relied on its prior decision by Mr. Justice Cardozo in *Palko* v. *Connecticut*, 302 U.S. 319 (1937), to hold that the only provisions of the first 10 amendments which are brought into operation against the States under the 14th amendment are those which "have been found to be implicit in the concept of ordered liberty," and that the 14th amendment prohibits to the States only those practices "repugnant to the conscience of mankind." Elsewhere in the Palko decision it was held that the prohibitions applied against the States are only those without which it would be impossible to maintain "a fair and enlightened system of justice" (302 U.S. at 325), those without which "neither liberty nor justice would exist" (id. at 326) and those whose absence would create "a hardship so acute and shocking that our polity will not endure it" (id. at 328).

Citing the Bartkus case on this point special term held, we submit correctly:

"While the concept of ordered liberty clearly includes freedom of religion, with respect to both establishment and free exercise, legislative permission for the noncompulsory public recital of prayer cannot be said to be repugnant to the conscience of mankind" (85).

Nor, we submit, can such permission be said to create "a hardship so acute and shocking that our polity will not endure it."

There is nothing in the legislative background of the adoption of the 14th amendment which shows any intent to alter settled habits and customs with respect to religion or to change the meaning of the 1st amendment. See opinion of special term (72–78) and the authorities that cited (Flack, "Adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment" (1908); James, "The Framing of the Fourteenth Amendment"; "Illinois Studies in Social Sciences," vol. 37 (1936); Fairman, "Does the Fourteenth Amendment Incorporate the Bill of Rights?" 2 Stan. L. Rev. 5 (1949)).

Indeed, the complete lack of any such intent is shown not only by the debates on the unsuccessful Blaine amendment of 1875 (discussed by special term at 76), but by the very language of that proposed amendment. In the form introduced in the House (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 205) it read:

"No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and no money raised by taxation in any State for the support of public schools, or derived from any public fund therefor, nor any public lands devoted thereto, shall ever be under the control of any religious sect, nor shall any money so raised or lands so devoted be divided between religious sects or denominations." The House by a two-thirds majority adopted the amendment in this form, with two minor changes (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5189–5192).

In the Senate the amendment was completely rewritten by the Judiciary Committee and was presented and debated in this form[11] (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5453):

"No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under any State. No public property and no public revenue of, nor any loan of credit by or under the authority of, the United States, or any State, territory, district, or municipal corporation, shall be appropriated to or made or used for the support of any school, educational or other institution under the control of any religious or antireligious sect, organization, or denomination, or wherein the particular creed or tenets of any religious or antireligious sect, organization, or denomination shall be taught. And no such particular creed or tenets shall be read or taught in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by such revenue or loan of credit, and no such appropriation or loan of credit shall be made to any religious or antireligious sect, organization, or denomination, or to promote its interests or tenets. This article shall not be construed to prohibit the reading of the Bible in any school or institution; and it shall not have the effect to impair rights or property already vested.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to provide for the prevention and punishment of violations of this article."

The amendment in this form failed to receive the necessary two-thirds support in the Senate (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5595) and was accordingly never submitted to the States. Cf. Ames, "The Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States During the First Century of Its History," House Document No. 353, part 2, 54th Congress, 2d session 277–278 (1897).

Obviously, if the Members of Congress at that time (including many who had voted for the 14th amendment) had believed that the 14th amendment had settled the problem of prayer or Bible reading in the public schools, the Blaine amendment—in either the House or Senate version—would have been superfluous. In fact opponents of the measure pointed out in the Senate that, under its broad wording, denominational teaching (even on a voluntary basis) to prisoners or to inmates of orphanages, hospitals, and other charitable institutions receiving State aid would be unconstitutional (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5455–5456, 5581–5583). Senator Edmunds, a supporter of the measure, agreed that this would be so (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5588). Yet not withstanding this broad language, the Senate

[10] In the last paragraph of his first inaugural Madison spoke of: "the guardianship and guidance of that Almighty whose power regulates the destiny of nations, whose blessings have been so conspicuously dispensed to this rising Republic, and to whom we are bound to address our devout gratitude for the past, as well as our fervent supplications and best hopes for the future." Id. at 27.

[11] In a footnote to Mr. Justice Frankfurter's opinion in the *McCollum* case (333 U.S. at 218, n. 6) the Senate version which we have quoted above is set forth at length, but is cited (erroneously, we believe) as the House version.

version contained an express reservation permitting Bible reading in the public schools. It is likewise noteworthy that supporters of the Blaine amendment vigorously stressed the fact that it would not bar the teaching of nonsectarian religious principles. Thus, Senator Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey, said (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5562):

"Sir, does that prohibit religious instruction in prisons? Does it prevent religious instruction anywhere? * * * Institutions supported by the money of all persuasions, even though they be prisons, are not to be made schools for teaching Presbyterianism, or Catholicism, Unitarianism, or Methodism, or infidelity, or atheism, and this article says so. But this article goes no further. There is nothing in it that prohibits religion as distinguished from the particular creed or tenets of religious and antireligious sects and denominations being taught anywhere."

A similar plea in favor of teaching of general religious principles in contrast to teachings of particular tenets, which alone were to be barred by the Blaine amendment, was made by Senator Edmunds, who referred to the offering of prayer in Congress in the following words:

"Do we not here, in this public council Chamber of the Nation, whose members probably represent all Christian creeds, daily from your [the President's] desk hear prayer to Almighty God, not the prayer of creed but the prayer of man imploring the beneficent protection of his Creator" (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5588).

Thus, the most extreme limit of the amendment in either House did not reach religion per se but only "Any religious or antireligious sect, organization, or denomination, or wherein the particular creed or tenets of any religious or antireligious sect, organization or denomination shall be taught" (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5453).

In the Blaine amendment we have an attempted expansion of the establishment clause by some of the most ardent advocates of absolute separation of church and State in our history. Yet, even to them it was clear that the Blaine amendment would not exclude all prayer from the schools but rather would recognize both Bible reading and nondenominational prayer as acceptable and constitutional.

Having failed of passage initially, the Blaine amendment was thereafter reintroduced on 20 further occasions between 1876 and 1929, but only once reported out of any committee, in that case with an adverse recommendation. See "Proposed Amendments to the Constitution," H. Doc. No. 551, 70th Cong., 2d sess. 182.

POINT II—THIS COURT'S INTERPRETATION OF THE 1ST AND 14TH AMENDMENTS DOES NOT BAR THE REGENTS' PRAYER

A. The regents' prayer does not constitute an establishment of religion

Ignoring our entire national tradition and practice outlined above, petitioners place their full reliance on *McCollum* v. *Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203 (1948), and on two recent decisions of this Court—*McGowan* v. *Maryland*, 366 U.S. 420 (1961) and *Torcaso* v. *Watkins*, 367 U.S. 203 (1961). None of them, correctly interpreted, supports petitioners' position and *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306 (1952), is plainly against them.

The McCollum case held unconstitutional a program of released time religious education operated in the classrooms of the public schools in the city of Champaign, Ill. That program involved these features:

1. Formal and detailed sectarian instruction in the public schools was the essence of the program.[12]

2. Pupils were segregated for instruction by the school authorities according to their several faiths.

3. The choice of sectarian programs was limited, and approval by the school authorities was a necessary prerequisite to participation by any sect.

4. School officials supervised and approved the religious teachers.

5. Pupils were solicited for denominational instruction on school premises, and registration cards were distributed by the school.

6. Nonattending pupils were isolated or removed to another room.

7. In the specific case of the McCollum child, there was evidence of hardship and disciplinary problems arising from this segregation.

It is obvious that the program of instruction found unconstitutional in the McCollum case differs markedly from the regents' prayer at issue in this case. In McCollum the core of the program was formal sectarian instruction to pupils grouped according to their sectarian preferences. This was in effect the conduct of sectarian schools on public school premises and subject to the supervision of the public school authorities. To the contrary, the regents' prayer, as found by the New York courts (112–113, 146), is not sectarian instruction of any type but rather constitutes a simple—and wholly voluntary—affirmation of belief in and dependence on a Supreme Being in full accord with the heritage and traditions of our people. It does not relate to the tenets of any particular sect or denomination. It does no more than recognize the theistic principle of our heritage. There are those who do not accept that principle—a right which is undeniably theirs to hold. But they have no right to abolish what most of us conceive to be an essential part of our heritage, or to force others to accept their views. Judicial repudiation of the regents' prayer would involve the enshrinement of a principle which is at war with our cultural and constitutional experience and would in effect amount to an establishment of secularism. In the words of the Supreme Court of New Jersey in *Doremus* v. *Board of Education*, 5 N.J. 435, 449, 75 A. 2d 880, 887 (1950), the freethinker "lives in a country where theism is the warp and woof of the social and the governmental fabric and he has no authority to eradicate from governmental activities every vestige of the existence of God." Cf. *Carden* v. *Bland*, 199 Tenn. 665, 288 S.W. 2d 718 (1956); *Lewis* v. *Board of Education*, 157 Misc. 520 (Sup. Ct., N.Y. Co. 1935), modified on other grounds, 247 App. Div. 106 (1st Dept. 1936), appeal dismissed, 276 N.Y. 490 (1937).

This proposition is reinforced by the clarification which this Court placed upon McCollum in the Zorach decision. In Zorach the Court clearly indicated that the first amendment does not forbid all cooperation between religion and the state and a fortiori between parents and the state. The philosophy of Zorach is in full accord with the past decisions of this Court and with the principles underlying our national heritage.

Zorach involved the validity of the New York released time program whereby children are, on request of their parents and without any governmental compulsion, permitted to leave public school premises and attend religious instruction of their choice. Objections that this program violated the 1st and 14th amendments were rejected by all New York courts (198 Misc. 631; 278 App. Div. 573; 303 N.Y. 161). The court of appeals, speaking through Judge Froessel, declared (303 N.Y. at 172):

"It is thus clear beyond cavil that the Constitution does not demand that every friendly gesture between church and state shall be discountenanced. The so-called 'wall of separation' may be built so high and so broad as to impair both state and church, as we have come to know them."

In affirming, this Court asserted (343 U.S. at 312–314):

"The first amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of church and state * * * That is the common sense of the matter. Otherwise the state and religion would be aliens to each other—hostile, suspicious, and even unfriendly. * * *

* * * * *

"We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. We guarantee the freedom to worship as one chooses. We make room for as wide a variety of beliefs and creeds as the spiritual needs of man deem necessary. We sponsor an attitude on the part of Government that shows no partiality to any one group and that lets each flourish according to the zeal of its adherents and the appeal of its dogma. When the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions. For it then respects the religious nature of our people and accommodates the public service to their spiritual needs."

Petitioners rely heavily on the recent decision in *McGowan* v. *Maryland*, *supra*, relating to Sunday closing statutes. This case is not apposite in interpreting the first amendment insofar as the practice of voluntary civic prayer in our public schools is concerned. The Court in McGowan affirms by way of dictum the propositions laid down in the McCollum case but the precise issue in McGowan is related to this case only in that there was at stake a national tradition which had been reinforced by State legislative action. After thoroughly reviewing the Sunday law practice this Court concluded that the legislation satisfied a public purpose and consequently the incidental benefit accruing to religion would be insufficient to invalidate the common observance of Sunday.

Finally, petitioners refer to another recent decision of this Court involving the first amendment—*Torcaso* v. *Watkins*, *supra*. In that case it was held that a Maryland statute requiring an individual to profess a belief in a Supreme Being as a condition to holding public office was a violation of the first amendment. It is a reflection of the proposition that the free exercise clause is offended by any requirement of a test oath as a condition to holding public office. The Torcaso case is a classic example of the State forcing a person "to profess a belief or disbelief" on penalty of specific and immediate civil disability, 367 U.S. at 495, and is thus clearly distinguishable from practices such as the regents' prayer, which are wholly voluntary reflections of the basic principles of our Nation and involve no penalty or disability whatever.

The teaching of these cases and of Zorach is that church and state need not—indeed cannot—be implacably hostile to each other. Rather, each must to some extent accommodate the other and enable our Nation to maintain and fulfill its heritage and traditions. In Zorach, a program of released time sectarian education was approved as a permissible accommodation of the spiritual needs of our people. The regents' prayer, a voluntary civic prayer squarely within a tradition antedating the ratification of the Constitution, and continuing unbroken since then, is clearly within the area of permissible accommodation recognized in Zorach.

B. Petitioners' claim that the regents' prayer violates the free exercise clause is unfounded

Contrary to the impression which petitioners seek to create (brief, 5) that "certain features of the procedure connected with the prayer were objectionable because 'compulsory,'" special term did not find that any

[12] At 333 U.S. 226 Mr. Justice Frankfurter pointed out that the candid purpose of the Champaign program was sectarian teaching.

coercion had ever occurred, but merely remanded the case in order to permit respondent school board to take explicit steps to record and confirm their existing practice as to the voluntary nature of the prayer. This the board has done[13] (171–173); and a final order of dismissal has been entered (167–168). However, any formal procedure to insure that participation in the prayer be voluntary is simply a restatement of existing practice, since there is no claim and no showing whatsoever in the record, that any child in the district has ever been coerced or threatened.

The argument of inherent coercion or divisiveness, discussed by petitioners at brief, 29–32, differs little from similar claims made to this Court (and rejected) in the Zorach case. Indeed, far more divisive practices than the regents' prayer have in fact been repeatedly sustained by the courts. It is the regular practice in New York and elsewhere to excuse children of particular religious faiths on their several respective holy days, thus marking them out for the attention of all their classmates as being different. In *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, counsel for the unsuccessful petitioners went so far in argument as to claim that this was divisive and therefore probably unconstitutional. Though there were dissenting opinions in the appellate courts in *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, no judge accepted that argument.

In the Zorach case, and in other cases sustaining released time, another factor of divisiveness is inevitably present. Children who leave school to attend released time religious instruction are publicly marked off and separated, as are those who decline to participate and remain under compulsion in the classroom. Yet that factor of alleged divisiveness as a matter of law was strenuously urged and decisively rejected by the decisions of all the courts in that case.

The same divisiveness exists in every case in the schools of New York when a Christian Scientist pupil, in accordance with the requirement of education law, section 3402(5), presents a written request from his parents to be excused from a hygiene course and thereupon is marked out as different by being openly excused for a known religious reason for an extended period. The same element of divisiveness would occur when, in obedience to the mandate of this Court in *West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1942), the child of a Jehovah's Witness declines to take part in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag or to make the open and public gesture required of those who participate.

The best answer to petitioners' conclusory claim of divisiveness is to be found in the words of Mr. Justice Jackson, concurring in the *McCollum* case (333 U.S. at 232–233):

"But here, complainant's son may join religious classes if he chooses and if his parents so request, or he may stay out of them. The complaint is that when others join and he does not, it sets him apart as a dissenter, which is humiliating. Even admitting this to be true, it may be doubted whether the Constitution which, of course, protects the right to dissent, can be construed also to protect one from the embarrassment that always attends nonconformity, whether in religion, politics, behavior or dress. Since no legal compulsion is applied to complainant's son himself and no penalty is imposed or threatened from which we may relieve him, we can hardly base jurisdiction on this ground."

[13] The board's regulations include not only provisions that children may be excused on request either from attendance or from joining in the prayer, but also specific prohibitions against comment by teachers on participation or nonparticipation, and against any suggestion by teachers "that any posture or language be used or dress be worn or be not used or not worn."

Thus, there is here no constitutional problem of inherent coercion. Any such coercion could only occur if, as discussed below, the prayer is prohibited and the free exercise of religion by the majority of the parents and children concerned is thereby curtailed.

POINT III—PETITIONERS SEEK, UNDER THE CLOAK OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT, TO COERCE THE VAST MAJORITY INTO SUBSERVIENCE TO THEIR DEMANDS—THE INVALIDATION OF THE REGENTS' PRAYER WOULD ERADICATE ALL MENTION OF GOD FROM OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND WOULD IMPAIR THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF INTERVENORS-RESPONDENTS TO THE "FREE EXERCISE" OF THEIR BELIEFS

Petitioners demand that, because they do not like the prayer or desire their children to participate, the prayer and any other devotional reference to God must be outlawed for every teacher and child and from every public school. This goes far beyond any decided case, carries implications reaching far beyond the facts of this case, and, we submit, is neither necessary nor proper to protect petitioners' undisputed right to abstain.

On this point *West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1942)—not cited by petitioners—is strong authority in our favor.

In that case, this Court struck down as unconstitutional a regulation of the West Virginia State Board of Education which required all teachers and pupils in public schools to participate daily in the customary Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.[14] The complaining parties were Jehovah's Witnesses, who regarded the pledge as an act of idolatry and insisted that compulsory participation in it was contrary to their religious convictions. Under the applicable regulations and statutes, failure to participate in the pledge was declared to be insubordination, dealt with by expulsion. The expelled child could be proceeded against as a delinquent, and his parents or guardians were liable to prosecution (319 U.S. at 629).

The essence of this Court's decision lay in these drastic compulsory factors. This was made plain not only throughout this Court's opinion but also by the opinion of the court below, whose decision was affirmed. The latter opinion concluded:

"We are clearly of opinion that the regulation of the board requiring that schoolchildren salute the flag is void insofar as it applies to children having conscientious scruples against giving such salute and that, as to them, its enforcement should be enjoined. Injunctive order will issue accordingly" (47 F. Supp. 251, 255).

The injunctive order thus granted, and affirmed on appeal, enjoined the defendants "from requiring the children of the petitioners, or any other children having religious scruples against such action, to salute the flag of the United States, or any other flag, or from expelling such children from school for failure to salute it." (P. 46 of Supreme Court record in *Barnette* case, No. 591, October term, 1942.)

In the instant case, special term pointed out that the Zorach decision, by refusing to prefer "those who believe in no religion over those who do believe," recognized but refused priority to the nonbelievers' right (290), and held further that although every individual had a constitutional right personally to be free from religion, that right is a shield, not a sword, and may not be used to compel others to adopt the same attitude (97). This is completely in accordance with the opinion of this Court in Barnette, which said (319 U.S. at 630):

"But the refusal of these persons to participate in the ceremony does not interfere with or deny rights of others to do so."

[14] The pledge at that time did not contain the words "under God." See 319 U.S. at 628.

In the case at bar, we should have not the slightest objection to the entry of an order such as was entered in the Barnette case and we believe that the order of special term is fully consistent with the Barnette principle. Such an order would be merely declaratory of the existing position of the board that recital of the regents' prayer is purely voluntary, and that no child is to be coerced into saying it or punished for not saying it. But such an order or directive is not what these petitioners ask. On the contrary they insist that the prayer—or indeed any prayer—be completely outlawed for everyone and under all circumstances. No case supports any such sweeping proposition; and the Barnette case, as we read it, is directly contrary.

POINT IV—PETITIONERS' CONTENTIONS, IF ACCEPTED, WOULD HAVE REPERCUSSIONS OF VAST CONSEQUENCES THROUGHOUT OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM AND WOULD OVERTHROW PRACTICES COMMONLY ACCEPTED FOR GENERATIONS

This Court must of course decide the case before it and not some other case. But as Mr. Justice Frankfurter observed in his dissent in the Barnette case:

"That does not mean that a case is dissociated from the past and unrelated to the future. We must decide this case with due regard for what went before and no less regard for what may come after" (319 U.S. at 661).

While petitioners' attack is directed in form only against the regents' prayer, the entire thesis of their argument, and the claim which they made below, is that any and every form of voluntary prayer, any and every form of voluntary devotional exercise, any and all forms of Bible reading and indeed anything that would constitute a voluntary recognition of God's existence and overriding providence, must constitutionally be banished from the public school system of every State in the Union.

In approaching a task of this magnitude, we believe that among the considerations which this Court will have in mind are the following utterances of some of its members, even though some of these were given in dissent:

"These questions are not lightly stirred. They touch the most delicate issues and their solution challenges the best wisdom of political and religious statesmen. But it presents awful possibilities to try to encase the solution of these problems within the rigid prohibitions of unconstitutionality." (Frankfurter, J., dissenting in *Barnette*, 319 U.S. at 661.)

"What is asked is not a defensive use of judicial power to set aside a tax levy or reverse a conviction, or to enjoin threats of prosecution or taxation. The relief demanded in this case is the extraordinary writ of mandamus to tell the local board of education what it must do." (Jackson, J., concurring in *McCollum*, 333 U.S. at 234.)

"We must leave some flexibility to meet local conditions, some chance to progress by trial and error. * * * The task of separating the secular from the religious in education is one of magnitude, intricacy and delicacy. * * * If with no surer legal guidance we are to take up and decide every variation of this controversy, raised by persons not subject to penalty or tax but who are dissatisfied with the way schools are dealing with the problem, we are likely to have much business of the sort." (Jackson, J., concurring in *McCollum*, 333 U.S. at 237–38.)

"Devotion to the great principle of religious liberty should not lead us into a rigid interpretation of the constitutional guarantee that conflicts with accepted habits of our people." (Reed, J., dissenting in *McCollum*, 333 U.S. at 256.)

In the case at bar, it is clear that a decision in petitioners' favor would necessarily result in outlawing, in addition to the particular prayer here involved, any and all prayers of

any form, as well as a variety of time-honored school practices such as Bible reading, the singing of even such hymns as "America" and many other similar practices, even when conducted on a purely voluntary basis with no compulsion to participate and no penalties for nonparticipation. A decision in petitioners' favor, we submit, would necessarily result in outlawing even the voluntary recital of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, a well-nigh universal practice throughout all the schools of the country.

As noted above, the Pledge of Allegiance was altered by act of Congress in 1954 to read as follows (36 U.S.C., sec. 172):

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

In the case at bar, that pledge (including the words "under God") and the regents' prayer are recited at the opening of the school session as the regents recommended and the petition alleges (14). The inclusion of the words "under God" is presumably contrary to the professed convictions of at least some of the petitioners. The entire pledge in any form is contrary to the convictions of all Jehovah's Witnesses. Under present practice, there is no compulsion on any pupil to recite either the prayer or the pledge. But that is not enough to satisfy petitioners. What they ask is to have the prayer (and by inevitable inference the present form of the pledge) completely abolished. They are thus calling upon the judicial arm of the State to impose enforced conformity with their own views.

Such a claim has already been made, and decisively rejected, with respect to the amended Pledge of Allegiance in *Matter of Lewis* v. *Allen*, 5 Misc. 2d 68 (spec. term, Albany Co. 1957), aff'd, 11 A.D. 2d 447 (3d dept. 1960).

In that case petitioners sought mandamus against the Commissioner of Education of New York to compel the deletion of the words "under God" from the pledge. It was established without contradiction that no child was compelled to recite those words, and indeed that there was no compulsion to recite the pledge itself. Petitioners nevertheless claimed, on the same first amendment grounds as are urged here, that because they objected on religious grounds to the use of the words "under God," it should be abolished for everyone. An appeal in this case is now pending in the Court of Appeals of New York and presumably will be eventually prosecuted to this Court. The New York courts relied heavily on the decision of this Court in *Zorach* v. *Clauson, supra*, where it was forcefully stated that religion and the State need not be hostile to each other:

"Otherwise the State and religion would be aliens to each other—hostile, suspicious, and even unfriendly. Churches could not be required to pay even property taxes. Municipalities would not be permitted to render police or fire protection to religious groups. Policemen who helped parishioners into their places of worship would violate the Constitution. Prayers in our legislative halls; the appeals to the Almighty in the messages of the Chief Executive; the proclamations making Thanksgiving Day a holiday; 'so help me God' in our courtroom oaths—these and all other references to the Almighty that run through our laws, our public rituals, our ceremonies would be flouting the first amendment. A fastidious atheist or agnostic could even object to the supplication with which the Court opens each session: 'God save the United States and this honorable Court'" (343 U.S. at 312–313).

In the case at bar, if petitioners are right, both *Board of Education* v. *Barnette* and *Lewis* v. *Allen* were wrongly decided. In *Lewis* v. *Allen*, the courts of New York should have sustained the petition and stopped the use of the pledge by anyone. In Barnette, instead of relieving the children of Jehovah's Witnesses from compulsory participation in the pledge, this Court should have outlawed that pledge completely. If petitioners are right, then a single Jehovah's Witness parent can today achieve that result by appropriate action in any school district where the Pledge of Allegiance is used.

The Barnette case is not cited in petitioners' brief on the merits; but in their reply brief in support of their petition for certiorari (pp. 2–3) they say:

"Respondents and intervenors-respondents would have us accept the theory advanced by the Jehovah's Witnesses that the addition of the phrase 'under God' to the Pledge of Allegiance converts the saying of the pledge into a religious activity such as the saying of the regents' prayer."

The Jehovah's Witnesses never advanced any such theory and could not have done so, since at the time of the Barnette decision in 1943 the pledge did not contain the words "under God" (see 319 U.S. at 628). In fact, the theory that the addition of those words to the pledge does convert the saying of the pledge into an unconstitutional religious activity has been publicly espoused by the very organization which is prosecuting the present case for petitioners.[15]

Nor is it any answer to argue, as petitioners did below, that the Pledge of Allegiance is a practice which has nothing whatsoever to do with religion, and that the Barnette case is, therefore, inapplicable. The Jehovah's Witnesses insisted that the pledge, even without the words "under God," had very much to do with religion, and won their case upon that very ground. Their position was that the pledge was to them a religious rite of a particularly repulsive kind, constituting idolatrous worship of graven images (contrary to Exodus 20, verses 4–5) and subjecting a participant to peril of damnation. This Court accepted their contention without agreeing with their theology, and decided the case squarely on religious grounds (see opinion of Jackson, J., for the Court, 319 U.S. at 630–631, and the concurring opinions of Black and Douglas, JJ., at p. 643, and Murphy, J., at pp. 645–646).

Similarly, petitioners in *Lewis* v. *Allen, supra*, insisted that to pronounce in the public schools the words "under God" in the same pledge as amended in 1954, caused that pledge to become a religious rite which was offensive to the consciences of unbelievers. In each case the Court held that the consciences of the objectors were entitled to respect and protection, but not to sanctions denying the rights of others or compelling them to conform to the objectors' views.

Prayer in public schools is not, as petitioners seem to imply, an isolated or recent phenomenon confined to New York, where, as special term noted, the practice goes back for well over a century (52). The public school systems of many other States have long required or permitted a variety of religious or quasi-religious practices without apparent damage to the body politic or to the children receiving training in the public schools. Insofar as any of these practices involve any element of coercion or penalty, problems may of course be presented which are not present in the case at bar. But if petitioners are correct, any and all such practices are incurably unconstitutional per se, regardless of their voluntary nature and regardless of any absence of coercion or of pecuniary or personal injury.

Accurate statistics as to the exact nature and extent of such practices are difficult to obtain; but the available information indicates that they are widespread.

Cannon Stokes, writing in 1950, says (2 "Church and State in the United States" 551):

"Although no comprehensive statistics are available, it is believed that a majority of public schools in the country still open their daily sessions with reading without comment from the Bible, and that a substantial minority open with a hymn and the Lord's Prayer. The latest careful survey I have seen (1946)—and this is not complete—showed that 13 States including the District of Columbia required Bible reading in all public schools; 25 States permitted it; and in 8 States no public schools read the Bible."

The most recent published survey is contained in the May–June 1961 issue of the periodical Religious Education in an article entitled "The Extent of Religious Influence in American Public Schools," which consists principally of statistics compiled as the result of a questionnaire addressed to school superintendents in all sections of the country. The replies showed, inter alia, that some form of homeroom devotional exercises are held in over 50 percent of the country's school systems, and Bible reading in over 41 percent.

Annexed to this brief as an appendix [not printed in RECORD] is a compilation of available statutory, decisional, and administrative material showing the current status of religious practices in the public schools of various States. This list is not exhaustive or complete as it covers only States having some affirmative statutory or other material requiring or permitting such practices. This appendix shows in summary that 24 States and the District of Columbia require or expressly permit the reading of the Bible; that 7 States and the District of Columbia require or expressly permit the recitation of the Lord's Prayer or similar devotional exercises; and that 1 State requires the Ten Commandments to be displayed in classrooms. Inquiries, necessarily not comprehensive, made by us as to the prevalence of such practices, especially in States having no specific statutory or other authority relating to such practices, confirm Canon Stokes' judgment that such exercises are indeed the rule and not the exception. According to petitioners, all of these time-honored methods of providing children with an appreciation of their national heritage must be prohibited.

In New York itself, recognition of God in the public schools is by no means confined to the recital of the regents' prayer, which was recommended by the regents for voluntary adoption—a recommendation which school districts are free to disregard. Throughout the schools of New York City, for example, daily sessions are started with the singing of the last stanza of "America,"[16]

---

[15] The American Civil Liberties Union, which has announced (in its 1960 annual report) that it is prosecuting the appeal in the case at bar, has likewise announced its support of the proposition that the words "under God" make the Pledge of Allegiance unconstitutional. At p. 48 of its annual report for the year 1954, in the section dealing with the religious provisions of the first amendment, appears the following comment on the enactment of the statute which placed those words in the pledge: "Although this legislation may be no more than advisory, a recommendation by Congress without any legal effect, the widespread use of the revised pledge may well raise a test case of constitutional import. If the constitutional issue of separation of church and state is properly raised, the American Civil Liberties Union will file a friend of the court brief."

[16] Last stanza of "America" reads:

"Our fathers' God, to Thee
Author of Liberty,
To Thee we sing;
Long may our land be bright
With Freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King."

which is definitely and unequivocally a prayer and for that reason is subject to all the constitutional infirmities here claimed by petitioners. The last stanza of the national anthem [17] contains an unequivocal invocation of God and is presumably equally objectionable. In fact, the display of our national motto in the public schools has been opposed in some quarters as a violation of the first amendment.

Other illustrations, by no means fanciful, come to mind. In *Hardwick* v. *Board of School Trustees*, 54 Cal. App. 696, 205 Pac. 49 (1921), the prescribed course in physical education included compulsory dancing lessons. A parent, on the stated ground of religious scruple, objected to having his children participate, and they were thereupon expelled. The court ordered their reinstatement, basing its decision solely on the element of coercion. At the same time it observed that it would be "wholly untenable and unreasonable" for any such parent to insist that the dancing lessons be dropped for others.

More specifically, in New York, section 3204(3) of the education law includes hygiene, the history of New York State, and American history, including the "principles of government proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence and established by the Constitution of the United States," as compulsory subjects of instruction in all the schools of the State. By the same token, a study of the history of New York State would certainly include some mention of its constitution, which commences with an invocation of the Deity. The prescribed study of the "principles of government" proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence brings us face to face with the fact that the Declaration at four separate places refers to God, to whom the Founding Fathers attributed all of our "unalienable rights," to whom they appealed, and on whose protection they declared their reliance. On petitioners' theory, each one of these subjects involves constitutional difficulties.

Christian Scientists object on religious grounds to instruction in certain aspects of hygiene (notably the germ theory). The New York Legislature, scrupulously endeavoring to accommodate the needs of education to Christian Science views, has provided that any pupil on request may "be excused from such study of health and hygiene as conflicts with the religion of his parents or guardian." (Education Laws, sec. 3204(5)). Similar provision is made in the laws of Alaska, Florida, Iowa, Pennsylvania and Washington. If petitioners are right, then any Christian Scientist parent in this or any other school district would be entitled merely to have his own children excused or "segregated" from the objectionable portions of the hygiene course, but to insist that the course itself—or large portions of it—be dropped.

A prophetic warning against this sort of thing was voiced more than a decade ago by Mr. Justice Jackson, concurring in the *McCollom* case (333 U.S. at 237):

"The task of separating the secular from the religious in education is one of magnitude, intricacy and delicacy. To lay down a sweeping constitutional doctrine as demanded by complainant and apparently approved by the Court, applicable alike to all school boards of the Nation 'to immediately adopt and enforce rules and regulations prohibiting all instruction in and teaching of religious education in all public schools,' is to decree a uniform, rigid and, if we are consistent, an unchanging standard for countless school boards representing and serving highly localized groups which not only differ from each other but which themselves from time to time change attitudes. It seems to me that to do so is to allow zeal for our own ideas of what is good in public instruction to induce us to accept the role of a superboard of education for every school district in the Nation."

The responsibility of preserving our public educational system against such results is not solely that of school boards. Parents are equally and vitally concerned. *Meyer* v. *Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390 (1923); *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510 (1925). Those parents who wish to have their children brought up to revere their flag are entitled to have their children afforded the opportunity to recite the Pledge of Allegiance in the public schools, as the regents recommend. Those who wish to have their children brought up to participate in our national tradition of reverence for their Creator are entitled to have them afforded the opportunity, as the regents suggest, to acknowledge that reverence through the medium of the regents' prayer. Those who do not wish to recite the pledge or participate in the prayer are not subject to the slightest compulsion, but they have no right, under color of the Constitution, to compel all others to conform to their views.

The fact that the American tradition is emphatically not godless needs no further elaboration here. The point is covered in point I, supra, as well as in the brief of respondent school board.

Nor is there any tradition which requires the public school to be completely Godless. As Dean Weigle [18] put it:

"There is nothing in the status of the public school as an institution of the State, therefore, to render it godless. There is nothing in the principle of religious freedom or the separation of church and state to hinder the school's acknowledgment of the power and goodness of God." ("Religion and Public Education," American Council on Education Studies, vol. XI, No. 26, p. 19, 1945.)

Or as stated in Stokes, "Church and State in the United States" (1950), vol. II, p. 493:

"It is realized that the public school in a democracy is almost necessarily a secular institution, being intended for pupils of all religious groups. This however does not and should not imply that it is irreligious, and a people with our background should not permit it to become antireligious. Indeed, every such school should show its sympathy with a spiritual outlook that involves recognition of the existence of God as the Creator of the world and of man, and the Judaeo-Christian teaching of our duty to Him and to our neighbor. These are the foundations of our national creed based on the Declaration of Independence, the spirit of the Constitution, the Ordinance of 1787, the decisions of our higher courts, and the papers of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and our other great statesmen."

It is no answer to say that parents who do not like a godless education in the public schools are free to send their children elsewhere. This assumes (i) that the public schools must of necessity be godless, and (ii) that private or parochial schools, within the parents' means and suitable to their faiths, are available in the community. The second assumption may or may not be true in any given community. The first assumption is false to our whole tradition, and is something which these petitioners have no right to impose on others.

As Dean Weigle puts it:

"More serious than these attempts of educational theorists to foist their atheism—or their nontheistic humanism, as they prefer to call it—upon the schools and colleges is the disposition to expel God from both government and education as an illegal entry. This disposition is due to an extreme interpretation of the principle of the separation of church and state, which confines God to the church and outlaws Him in the state." ("Religious Education," vol. 49, p. 76 (1954).)

Nor is it any answer to say that parents are free to teach religion at home, and that they cannot complain if the public school is forced by these petitioners to adopt an attitude which the vast majority regard as contrary to their most cherished beliefs and traditions.

As Dr. F. Ernest Johnson, professor emeritus of Teachers College, Columbia ("The Study of Religion in the Public Schools"), stated in a report of a conference sponsored by the American Council on Education, 1958, page 32:

"I have never heard anyone refute the statement that, if the general education program in the public school covers practically everything else that is vital, yet excludes religion entirely, it tends to create the impression that religion is peripheral to education."

Or as said by a leading British educator (Moberly, "The Crisis in the University," 1949, p. 56):

"It is a fallacy to suppose that by omitting a subject you teach nothing about it. On the contrary, you teach that it is to be omitted, and that it is therefore a matter of secondary importance. And you teach this not openly and explicitly, which would invite criticism; you simply; take it for granted and thereby insinuate it silently, insidiously, and all but irresistibly."

Belief in a Divine Being lies at the basis of our institutions and in the recognition of individual worth and dignity. It is also the point at which our American way of life and values differ most sharply from the totalitarian. No pupil can be educated for his duties as an American citizen if the school is forced to ignore the existence of God and assume a completely negative rather than a neutral attitude toward religion. We cannot solve the problem of the necessity of imparting moral values to our young if we are forced by law to ignore the heritage and traditions of our Nation. God-fearing parents have the right to protest against the total and compulsory elimination of God's name from our schools. These petitioners have no right to force that abolition upon others in the name of the constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion. To allow such a result would be a subversion of our entire tradition and would give to a single fastidious atheist or agnostic a veto power over any public expressions of reverence for God. It would, contrary to the Barnette decision and to the first amendment, deny to children and parents approving of the regents' prayer, the free exercise of their beliefs, and of their right to participate in that tradition.

CONCLUSION

We accordingly respectfully submit:

1. The voluntary recitation of the regents' prayer is nothing more than a recognition of the basic principles which form our national heritage and tradition.

2. It would be a departure from those principles, unwarranted by the Constitution and contrary to its traditions, for these petitioners to impose upon our educational system, and upon thousands of unwilling parents, enforced conformity with petitioners' views.

3. On this record petitioners are clearly not entitled to an order granting them the only relief which they seek—the total abolition of the regents' prayer.

---

[17] Last stanza of national anthem reads:

"Blest with victory and peace, may the heav'n-rescued land
Praise the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation.
Then conquer we must, for our cause it is just,
And this be our motto: 'In God is our trust.'"

[18] Luther A. Weigle, dean emeritus of the Divinity School of Yale University.

We therefore urge that the order under review be affirmed in its entirety.

Respectfully submitted.

THOMAS J. FORD,
Counsel for Intervenors-Respondents.
PORTER R. CHANDLER,
RICHARD E. NOLAN,
Of Counsel.

Dated March 2, 1962.

WHAT MAKES AMERICA GREAT?

(Sermon preached July 1, 1962, at the Metropolitan Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., by the pastor, Dr. R. B. Culbreth)

"Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord" (Psalm 33:12).

One hundred and eighty-six years ago one of the most important documents ever penned by man for American people—the Declaration of Independence—was signed by the Thirteen Colonies that then composed what is now the greatest nation on the face of the earth. This document, written largely by Thomas Jefferson, depicts deep faith in the power and living reality of God. It has stood as one of the greatest milestones in the history of civilization.

Our text today is one of God's principles for success laid down many years ago in the Old Testament: "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." America is living proof of the truth of this statement. It was founded on the Christian faith, inspired by Christian hope, guided by Christian truth, and nurtured by prayer.

Who among us doesn't thrill at the sight of the American flag waving in the breeze all over our land and especially here in Washington. We love to sing:

"My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing:
Land where my fathers died,
Land of the pilgrims' pride,
From every mountainside
Let freedom ring!

"My native country, thee,
Land of the noble free,
Thy name I love:
I love thy rocks and rills,
Thy woods and templed hills;
My heart with rapture thrills
Like that above.

"Let music swell the breeze,
And ring from all the trees
Sweet freedom's song:
Let mortal tongues awake;
Let all that breathe partake;
Let rocks their silence break,
The sound prolong.

"Our fathers' God to Thee,
Author of liberty,
To Thee we sing:
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King!"

As Wheeler McMillan wrote recently in the Farm Journal "Ours Is a Country"—

"Where farmers outproduce all other farmers, and the people are better fed for fewer hours of work;

"Where the benefits for unemployed wage workers are higher than wages in most of the world;

"Where gifts to charity by private persons year after year are the world's greatest;

"Where three-fifths of the people own their homes;

"Where more than 15 million people own stock in the Nation's industries;

"Which after defeating them has aided its enemies to rebuild themselves;

"Which has extended $90 billion in aid to less fortunate countries;

"Which has no wishes for conquest;

"Where with less than 6½ percent of the world's people we own 65 percent of the world's passenger automobiles;

"Where more Negroes go to college and more Negroes own automobiles than all the people of their race elsewhere on earth;

"Where we have the right to choose our work, homes, religion, education, and how we spend our money;

"And which liberty has made rich and productive.

"May we then, thoughtfully and sincerely, celebrate our greatest American holiday, the Fourth of July."

In our national anthem we acknowledge God and on our money is inscribed our motto: "In God we trust." We have ever been a religious people. It is ingrained in our very culture and you can't separate a man's faith from the man. When Christ Jesus saves a man, He gives to him a new nature and the man is different 7 days a week. We have ever been a Nation of people who believe in prayer.

Now, I want to make a few statements about the decision of the Supreme Court June 25, 1962, regarding prayer in the public schools. This decision has caused an uproar throughout the land and we should do well to give serious study to all of its implications.

The headlines of the newspapers at first left me, as perhaps they did you, in shocked unbelief. Since then, with more time to study the decision, I have drawn several conclusions.

First of all, it should be said that the Supreme Court was not passing judgment on all prayers nor on all religious practices. Their immediate concern was the prayer composed by the board of regents of the State of New York for the New York public schools. So the issue was—shall government agencies define and direct the prayers of the American people?

We should remember that Baptists have long been distinctive for their belief in the separation of church and state. We take pride in the fact that our Baptist forebears were willing to die for religious freedom and that men like Roger Williams had a lot to do with the first amendment of our Constitution. Furthermore, Baptists have no prayer book, nor written prayers for we believe that prayer should come from the heart and not be mechanical because "prayer is the soul's sincere desire, unuttered or expressed, the motion of a hidden fire that trembles in the breast." Therefore, no court of authority can rule prayer unconstitutional. An individual is free to pray in school, in Congress, or wherever he may be, for this is a God-given right that no earthly power can destroy. The New York board of regents' prayer was a compromise prayer and did not serve the cause of devout religion. I question the value of reciting the 22-word prayer in the first place.

Now, the matter which causes me greatest concern is, What will come next? Is this action of the Supreme Court the forerunner of many similar decisions which will reach beyond the limited scope of this particular decision and will ultimately destroy our traditional way of life? Justice Douglas cited 18 kinds of "aids" from the Government for religion now available. He said that there is a long list of additional aids in each State. The context in which he made his remarks would indicate that he considered them all unconstitutional. Will we before long not have chaplains in Congress and all our Federal institutions including the military? Will churches soon have to pay taxes on all their property? Will it be long before contributions to religious organizations will not be exempt from the Federal income tax? Will it just be a matter of time until churches will no longer have mailing privileges? If so, our children will live in a nation strikingly different from the America that our forefathers died to establish.

One other concern disturbs me deeply. I know that our Constitution provides that any citizen can have his say, but when you look at the printed releases of the religious background of those bringing these suits, you wonder just what is their ultimate objective? Is it "freedom of religion" or "freedom from religion"?

It is the duty of the public schools to teach truth—all truth. The Bible in the public schools is part of the great body of truth and should be taught as any other book that reveals truth. It should not be taught with sectarian slants, neither should it be ignored or left out simply because a few do not agree with its teachings. No book taught in the public schools today would receive 100 percent endorsement of everyone.

God's statement is: "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." This is not—blessed is that nation that ignores God, or forgets God, but the nation that makes God its Lord is the one blessed. Is America determined to depart from that which has made her great? Pericles built a civilization upon culture, and it failed; Caesar built a civilization upon power, and it failed; our forefathers founded our Nation upon Christianity, and America will live so long as the Lord is our God.

Now, I share with you a simple outline and a few statements by Dr. Millard A. Jenkins in "The Hope of America" (pp. 128–139—Special Day Sermons).

Let us consider three negatives and three positives regarding America's greatness.

1. America's greatness does not lie in her illustrious past. There is no real assurance that past success guarantees future hope. America has been called "The Paradise of Liberty," but, like Eden, she may become a "paradise of fools." It is well to look back at history to gain inspiration for the present, but we must keep that forward look to those things that safeguard the future. We do well to remember the proverb, "Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall" (Proverbs 16: 18). Another proverb that should be remembered daily is, "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people" (Proverbs 14: 34).

America has risen to the highest of all nations in the world but we should remember God's warnings to Edom: "The pride of thine heart hath deceived thee, thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rocks whose habitation is high; that saith in his heart, who shall bring me down to the ground? Though thou exalt thyself as the eagle, and though thou set thy nest among the stars thence will I bring thee down, saith the Lord" (Obadiah 1: 3, 4).

2. America's greatness does not lie in her politicians. We thank God that there are dedicated men who are elected and appointed to public office. We need to pray for more of them. The prayer of Josiah Gilbert Holland could well be the prayer of each of us as we think of our politicians:

"GOD, GIVE US MEN

"God, give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great heart, true faith and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office can not buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty, and in private thinking;
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land and waiting justice sleeps."

But when you realize that there is a tavern for every 326 persons in the United States, or 1 tavern for every 96 families, and 213,955 more taverns than churches in our Nation, you can't help but feel that somebody has sold out to the liquor interests. This damnable business is responsible for a large percentage of the slaughter on our highways and has caused more than 5 million Americans to become alcoholics, losing business ability, causing absenteeism and all sorts of other problems.

I talked with an alcoholic recently. He was a young man in his twenties. I asked him when he started drinking. His reply was, "I took my first drink when I was 18, immediately after going into military service." He further stated that it was there for him in his Army camp. I wish there was some way that these teenage youths, who haven't reached anything like maturity, could be protected by our Government, rather than our Government becoming a party to their downfall.

3. America's greatness does not lie in her great culture and wealth.

History speaks to us of the failure of culture and wealth. Witness Egypt, Babylon, Greece, Rome. Witness faded glories of the past. History tells a tragic story of nations once voluptuous in wealth sunken into decay, and their greatness only a memory.

The story goes that a certain monk, an anchorite of Nitra, had accumulated one hundred crowns by weaving cloth. After his death his brethren met to decided what to do with the money. Some proposed to give it to the poor, another to a church, but the majority said that it was hoarded money, and that it should be cast into the grave with him. By doing good with money, man, or nation, stamps the image of God upon it. Hoarded, ill-gotten, or selfishly used, it perishes with them. Jesus told of a man whose wealth increase made a fool out of him (Luke 12).

America's greatness does not lie in material things—banks, skyscrapers, real estate, commerce, oil, and cattle—material wealth is easily swept away. Her imperishable wealth is in her Christian ideals, and Godly institutions. It is in her freedom of conscience, and her untrammeled liberty and untarnished name, and her unsullied patriotism, and her youth today and generations to follow, if they be endowed with Christian culture, and endued with Christian principles that make for peace among men, and the permanency upon the earth.

By these things nations live. Without them they perish. Denis A. McCarthy wrote:

"This is the land where hate should die, no feuds of faith, no spleen of race,
No darkly brooding fear should try beneath our flag to find a place.
Lo, every people here has sent its sons to answer freedom's call;
Their lifeblood is the strong cement that builds and binds the nation's wall.

"This is the land where hate should die, though dear to me my faith and shrine,
I serve my country well when I respect beliefs that are not mine.
He little loves his land who casts upon his neighbor's word a doubt,
Or cites the wrongs of ages past from present rights to bar him out.

"This is the land where hate should die, this is the land where strife should cease,
Where foul suspicious fear should fly before our flag of light and peace,
Then let us purge from poisoned thought that service to the state we give,
And so be worthy as we ought of this great land in which we live."

WHEREIN LIES AMERICA'S GREATNESS

What are the elements of her enduring strength? What are the stars that should guide her? America's hope is not behind her, but before her. But that hope depends upon what course she follows.

1. The hope of America lies in her moral purity.

The spine of America has a serious curvature. Like Rome before her fall—divorce and rottenness exist. When will we find a cure? When will worldly wise men quit discrediting the glorious gospel of our blessed God? When will young women cease trying to outdo standards of the half world? When will commercialized vice cease to be popular, and immorality a fine art? When will the impulse of the moment be refused unchecked sway, and I want to no longer occupy the throne of I must not? When will we cease to glorify Hollywood and make sex and immorality prizes? When will we cease to debauch the youth of our land with strong drink? When will we cease to glorify criminals and make a laughing stock of our courts? When will gambling, with its $6½ billion a year be restrained? When will we be free of the tragic record of a murder every 30 minutes, and a crime bill of $15 billion a year and 90 percent of criminals going free to continue their nefarious work upon others? When will our TV be free from making policemen look stupid?

All of these things have been brought upon us, because man has turned away from the God of heaven, and bowed down to the god of gold. When two liquor distilling firms roll up $50 million dividends in 1 year, the sad story is written that America is willing to see fat fortunes built on cold fire grates, and empty flour barrels, and coffin lids and damned souls of their victims; and encourage a business to the destroying of human bodies, debauching human morals, and sending countless throngs to hell. No wonder the Lord hath declared that "* * * hell hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure; and their glory and their pomp and he that rejoiceth in it shall descend into it" (Isaiah 5: 14).

No nation can sell its morals for gold and survive. Belshazzar tried it. We pray "God bless America" but which America? Drunken America? Gambling America? Sunday-desecrating America? Mammon-worshiping America? Lawless America? To your knees, O America! God is calling, "If My people, which are called by My name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek My face and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven and will forgive their sin and heal their land" (II Chronicles 7:14).

2. The hope of America lies in her political sanity.

The Roman historian, Gibbon, reminds us that the fall of the Roman Empire was due, among other things, to excessive taxation. We would do well to examine our deficit spending in the light of Roman history. Dr. Jenkins points out that "political sanity calls for American idealism with its free schools, separation of church and state, adjusted differences between capital and labor; every man's home his castle, and every man his own priest before God—free to call upon Him, and to worship as conscience alone dictates."

Will America sail straight ahead, guided by the chart and compass of her liberty guaranteeing Constitution; or will she be burned upon the rocks of political tyranny by siren voices of timesavers and exploiters?

3. The hope of America lies in her religious integrity.

Darwinism has produced for us evolution's caveman. Nazism has produced the superbigot who holds himself to be in possession of the only philosophy by which the race can grow great. Marxism has produced the human beast that goes forth to wreck Christian civilization and bring back the dark ages of the world. Formalism has produced religious anemia. Modernism has robbed religion of the supernatural, set up rationalism in the place of inspiration, and has taken the glory from God and given it to man.

People become like the gods they worship, and to worship these cold, dead gods is to become cold and dead. Religious integrity calls for the arousing of America from her religious indifference. The churches are not being opposed in America, they are being ignored. "Ignore" and "ignorance" are from the same root stem. American people are "ignorant" when they ignore the church. "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." Worldliness says the strength of spiritual Christianity is from within, and indifference ignores it from without.

The decision of the Supreme Court could be a blessing in disguise. Back in the years between the Old and New Testament, the Jewish people had grown indifferent to their ancient religion. Many of the priests forsook their study to engage in the Greek customs and games of the day. But when Antiochus Ephiphenes, about the year 167 B.C., passed his act of religious uniformity compelling all people to worship in common the religion he proposed, this led to the revolt of the Jews under the leadership of the Maccabees and subsequently to their reestablishment of all religious practices and finally to their independence as a nation. Maybe God is going to use this decision of our Supreme Court to stir up the religious fervor of America. If so, America's greatest achievements may be ahead. We pray that this will be the outcome.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to make it crystal clear that the resolution I am submitting has nothing to do with the doctrine of the separation of church and state as it is reflected in our constitutional principles. On June 26 of this year, I introduced into the RECORD, beginning at page 11710, a speech that I had previously made outlining Madison's contribution to religious freedom. The principles that Madison, as well as Washington and Jefferson, followed as regards the separation of church and state would in no way be affected by my proposed resolution. I have consistently supported the position of our Founding Fathers with regard to separating church and state, and I shall consistently continue to do so in the future.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION, TO PERMIT OFFERING OF PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 27, 1962, the names of Senators BYRD of West Virginia, BENNETT, MUNDT, CARLSON, FONG, TALMADGE, and WILLIAMS of Delaware were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 205) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the offering of prayer in public schools, introduced by Mr. BEALL (for himself and other Senators) on June 27, 1962.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc.,

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KERR:

Address by Hon. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, delivered before the international convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in Washington, D.C., on June 25, 1962.

SUPREME COURT RULING ON PRAYER—WHAT NEXT?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on yesterday there appeared in the Washington Star an unusually timely and penetrating article entitled "Supreme Court Ruling on Prayer—What Next?" This is a most worthy presentation of this highly important question; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in full at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

SUPREME COURT RULING ON PRAYER—WHAT NEXT?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Fourteen years ago this month, the Star printed, by permission, the accompanying editorial from the American Bar Association Journal. It commented on the then recent decision in the McCollum case, interdicting religious instruction in the public schools of Champaign, Ill. We are reprinting it here again as apt comment on the Supreme Court's decision last Monday, which found unconstitutional the recitation in New York public schools of an officially approved prayer. The Bar Association Journal's editorial now seems even more prophetic of things yet to come in the Court's broadening interpretation of the establishment clause in the first amendment than it did when it first appeared.)

In our May issue we commented on what appears to be a tendency in the Supreme Court to invalidate under the 1st and 14th amendments State laws and State law enforcement measures which have worked well in the State for many years and have long been upheld, as valid under the same constitutional provisions, by the highest courts of law in the States. We here comment on another propensity, instanced by the decision in *Illinois ex rel McCollum* v. *Board of Education* ("the Champaign County school case"), decided on March 8, to invalidate and proscribe local and State "practices embedded in our society by many years of experience," not expressly contained in State statutes although carried on under their authority and expressly upheld by the State courts as valid under the constitutional provisions now held to outlaw them.

In the McCollum case, Mr. Justice Jackson, who concurred with the 8-to-1 majority in reversing the Supreme Court of Illinois, wrote that: "It is idle to pretend that this task is one for which we can find in the Constitution one word to help us as judges to decide where the secular ends and the sectarian begins in education. Nor can we find guidance in any other legal source. It is a matter on which we can find no law but our own prepossessions." He avowed that: "We should place some bounds on the demands for interference with local schools that we are empowered or willing to entertain." And Mr. Justice Reed, who alone dissented, warned that: "This Court cannot be too cautious in upsetting practices embedded in our society by many years of experience. A State is entitled to have great leeway in its legislation when dealing with the important social problems of its population. A definite violation of legislative limits must be established. * * * Devotion to the great principle of religious liberty should not lead us into a rigid interpretation of the constitutional guarantee that conflicts with accepted habits of our people."

A FATEFUL DECISION

The McCollum case may be one of those fateful decisions which is ignored at the time and regretted in the future. It deserves thorough consideration now. The people should have the assistance of lawyers in coming to an understanding of its effect and implications. The latent consequences of the ruling could hardly be overemphasized. It is a pronouncement by our Supreme Court on a fundamental principle, not only of national policy but of our civilization and way of life. The journal wishes to assist in analyzing the case and, to the extent of available space, invites a discussion of its import.

Statutes of the State of Illinois were involved to the extent that its compulsory education law required attendance at schools within specified ages and gave to district boards of education supervisory powers over the use of public school buildings. What was done and permitted by the Champaign board, in agreement with accredited representatives of different religious faiths, was held to violate the 1st amendment, extended by the 14th amendment to apply to State legislation. What the courts were asked by the petitioner-appellant to do was not an invalidating of any State law but the granting of a writ of mandamus telling the local school board what it should and should not do.

VOLUNTEER IN ASSOCIATION

Interested members of the Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Protestant faiths in the school district had formed a voluntary association called the Champaign Council on Religious Education. They obtained permission from the board of education to offer classes in religious instruction to public school pupils. Classes were made up of pupils whose parents had signed printed cards asking that their children be permitted to attend. Such classes met once a week in the regular school rooms of the school building. The council employed the religious teachers at no expense to the school authorities, but the instructors were subject to the approval and supervision of the superintendent of schools. The classes were taught in separate groups by Protestant teachers, Catholic priests, and a Jewish rabbi. Students who did not choose to take the religious instruction went to some other room in the building to pursue their secular studies. Students present at any of the religious classes were released for that time from secular study. Accordingly, reports of their presence or absence at religious classes were made to secular teachers. No coercion, discrimination or favoritism for any one religious faith or sect was shown. The challenge was of any religious teaching at all on school property and during school—in the religious faith chosen by parents or pupils with freedom for any to stay away.

The plaintiff, an avowed atheist, asked that the court order the board of education to "adopt and enforce rules and regulations prohibiting all instruction in and teaching of all religious education in all public schools in Champaign District No. 71 and in all public school houses and buildings in said district." She asked the court to ban "every form of teaching which suggests or recognizes that there is a God." She specified the proscribing of the teaching or reading of any parts of the Scriptures, including the Twenty-third Psalm. Two hundred years ago a woman like Mrs. McCollum would have been persecuted as an infidel and heretic. Today she sought and obtained the aid of a judicial decree to suppress the teaching which was the very genesis of the freedom which she exercises for herself by trying to take it from others.

The best available figures of the U.S. Office of Education and the National Education Association show that at least 2 million children were attending some kind of religious classes in 2,200 cities, towns and communities a year ago, with the number at least 3,000 this year and the number of children correspondingly increased. Nearly all children in public schools are present during reading of Scriptures or nonsectarian prayers. According to a survey reported by the United Press, Bible reading in public schools is required by law in Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and the District of Columbia. Another 24 States permit reading of the Bible and repeating of the Lord's prayer without comment.

The extent of the Court's disruption of local practices and habits of the people in many States is shown by the NEA survey as reported by the United Press. "Definitely unconstitutional" under the decision is any plan under which the school system releases pupils from regular school classes and provides classrooms and other services for the religious classes. Some school districts in at least 11 States conduct such programs: Alabama, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, and Hawaii.

OFF PREMISE PLANS

Also "unconstitutional" under the ruling is any plan where religious education is conducted off school premises but during school hours and with the active cooperation of the school administration, pupils being released from the regular school, and teachers and church authorities cooperating in keeping attendance records. Some schools in at least these 34 States have that type of plan: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia and Wisconsin and Alaska and Hawaii. In New York State this type of plan was upheld as constitutional by the court of appeals in a suit by an atheist and later embodied in the State's education law.

The first amendment provides that: "Congress shall make no law respecting establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The 14th amendment has been construed by the Court to extend to lawmaking by a State the prohibitions contained in the 1st amendment. Looking at the matter in the light of our country's history as Mr. Justice Reed urged, it is difficult to see how the Constitution was violated by what the local community and school board in Champaign did. Did it constitute an establishment of religion? Was not "the free exercise" of religion denied by what the Court did rather than by the State law? Mr. Justice Reed said that the amendments "do not bar every friendly gesture between church and state" and are not "an absolute prohibition against every conceivable situation where the two may work together." It has never been so in our history.

MADISON IS CITED

James Madison wrote that: "He apprehended the meaning of the words to be that Congress should not establish a religion and enforce the legal observation of it by law, nor compel men to worship God in any manner, contrary to their conscience," Thomas Jefferson, oft-quoted foe of giving governmental support to any one religious sect or faith to the exclusion of others, did not oppose the use of public funds in support of religious education along with other edu-

cation. On the contrary, he recommended for his beloved University of Virginia a theological school for the training of clergymen, a large room for religious worship, an elaborate arrangement for students of the religious institutions which he proposed that the various denominations should be set up in connection with the university—all at public expense. As President of the United States, Jefferson used public funds and Government properties in aid of religion and religious education in various ways, as has every President to this day. Recognition of an interest in and support for religion of the recipient's choosing has not been regarded as an "establishment," so long as no one faith is singled out, favored or established to the exclusion of others.

Sessions of the Senate and House of Representatives, under their historic rules, are opened always with a prayer by chaplains paid from public funds. Chapels are maintained on the Government reservation at West Point and Annapolis; "no cadet will be exempted from attendance." Millions of dollars were spent in erecting and maintaining chapels at army camps and bases during World War II; they were used interchangeably by clergymen of the different faiths. Chaplains went everywhere with the troops and on ships of war and conducted services. Money of taxpayers and properties of Government were used freely to see to it that our young men who went into the face of danger and death did not lack the ministrations of those who believed in God and the verities of religion. Must State and local governments do less for those who are being educated for citizenship and life?

Under the 1944 legislation, a discharged veteran may be educated at public expense to be a clergyman, in a denominational school of his choice. A month after the decision in the McCollum case, the Congress passed and the President signed an appropriation of $500,000 to erect a chapel for religions at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y. On May 28 the U.S. Post Office placed on sale a postage stamp bearing the legend: "These Immortal Chaplains * * * Interfaith in Action." It bears portraits of four young ministers of religion—a Methodist, a Roman Catholic priest, a Jewish rabbi and a Baptist—and also a painting of a torpedoed troopship which carried them to their graves off Greenland on February 2, 1943—the SS *Dorchester* of our Navy. They were on Government property at taxpayers' expense, to hold religious services and give instruction and ministration in religion. And when they made their way to the deck of the stricken ship, they gave their lifejackets to four young men who had lost theirs in the confusion. Having given away their own chance to live, the four chaplains stood close together, holding hands, as the ship went under—an immortal demonstration of the unity of religious faith and what religion does for people—now appropriately commemorated by our Government. Was all this "constitutional"? Maybe there was something in the *Dorchester* incident which the majority in the Supreme Court missed—something to which the highest courts of our States and countless local communities have held fast.

SOVIET CONSTITUTION

The Constitution of the Soviet Union provides (art. 124): "In order to insure to citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the U.S.S.R. is separated from the state and the school from the church. Freedom of religious worship and freedom of antireligious propaganda is recognized for all citizens."

Fortunately, the framers of our Constitution did not go that far, and the institutions and practices of our people have not gone that far. Nothing in our Constitution commands that the first amendment should now be interpreted as though it read like the above-quoted provision. Nothing in our Constitution commands that "freedom of religion" shall be freedom from religion.

Of course, the decision has a far deeper significance, in the philosophy of law and government and the role of the court, than the interdiction of the arrangement worked out by the religious faiths with the school board in Champaign, Ill. As Mr. Justice Jackson and Mr. Justice Reed solemnly warned, new and far more vexatious aspects will arise, in litigation which will seek to carry the present ruling to further extremes. The traditionally religious sanctions of our law, life, and government are challenged by a philosophy and a judicial propensity which deserves the careful thought and concern of lawyers and people.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF SIGNING OF MORRILL LAND GRANT ACT OF 1862

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, today marks the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862. It is most appropriate that the act was signed into law so close to Independence Day, because the Morrill Act was in itself revolutionary, a piece of legislation rooted in the protest against the extremely limited educational opportunities then existent.

Thomas Jefferson would have approved this legislation. This greatest of all American statesmen, the man who drafted the Declaration of Independence, realized the indispensibility of general educational opportunity if the infant nation were to succeed. Thus, in 1818 he wrote to a friend:

> If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in this state of civilization it expects what never was and never will be.

And again, the same year, Jefferson, who was to found the University of Virginia in the following year, expressed a long cherished ambition to devote his energies to the establishment of a democratic educational system in this country. He described such a system as follows:

> A system of general instruction which shall reach every description of our citizens from the richest to the poorest.

The system of education envisioned by Jefferson has come to fulfillment, under the Land Grant Act, in 68 institutions of higher learning through the United States, including the Mississippi State University, which is my alma mater. I hope that I may be forgiven if I employ Mississippi State as an example of the manner in which land-grant colleges have kept pace with the advances in learning and the growth of the Nation. Originally, like the others, Mississippi State was founded to provide education for the sons of farmers and the sons of mechanics, but it now includes many other schools in a widely diversified educational spectrum. Among others, it has a school of engineering, a school of arts and sciences, and a school of business and industry, to mention the undergraduate curriculum alone. Mississippi State enrolls over 5,000 students; and its buildings and grounds have a total value of over $28 million.

We have been fortunate, too, in the educators and administrators who have had a hand in building this wonderful institution; and at this time I want to specially commend President D. W. Colvard, as well as Ben L. Hilbun, president emeritus.

As I have said, Mississippi State's growth has paralleled the advances in education and the growth of our Nation, as have land-grant colleges generally. Another bright example is the University of Wyoming, at Laramie, where it was my pleasure to deliver an address on May 28, at the dedication of several new buildings. The University of Wyoming had grown from the most humble of beginnings, with a faculty of 6, to a huge institution numbering 30 major buildings and approximately 4,500 students. It has grown to this size under the Land Grant Act, and is planning to expand even further.

The significance of their wide contribution to the scientific, the technical, the social, and other professional aspects of the national community is evident from the number and caliber of land-grant school graduates and their broad fields of interest. Twenty percent of all the Nation's undergraduate students attend these schools. While land-grant schools comprise only 4 percent of all institutions of higher learning in this country, they award almost 40 percent of all doctorate degrees annually conferred. They produce, in addition, more than one-third of all the university and college teachers. Finally, as the highest compliment of all, we should note that 25 of 42 living American Nobel prizewinners attended land-grant colleges and universities.

One hundred years ago only 1 in 1,500 Americans went to college. Today, one in three attends college. The Land Grant Act of 1863 has been a prime factor in this great change in educational opportunity, and it was truly described as "the most important single Government step in the training of scientific and professional personnel."

Those of us who conceive as the proper function of a central government the performance for the States only of those things the States are unable to do for themselves, will find encouragement in the success of the land-grant institutions, now largely self-sustaining.

Under the terms of the original act, each State received a grant of Federal land apportioned on the basis of 30,000 acres for each Member of Congress, with the income from the sale of the land to be used as an endowment fund for the continuing support of the colleges. However, with the passage of amendments to the act providing additional direct grants for operating purposes, the States began to recognize their own obligations. I am advised by the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities that—

> Today Federal funds comprise a minor part of the general operating and endowment income of most land-grant colleges.

This history of the land-grant colleges should be an object lesson for government planners. This history proves that big government, once moving in on the States, need not stay there forever.

Looking to the future, our land-grant colleges will continue to provide even

broader opportunities for our people; and I predict that in their second century their contributions and their record of achievements will far exceed those of the first century.

DELAWARE AND THE CENTENNIAL YEAR OF THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGE ACT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, today marks the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Morrill Land-Grant Act by President Lincoln.

I consider it a great privilege to join in the nationwide centennial observance of the enactment of this far-reaching law.

This act was a great stimulus in making higher education available throughout our country. It initiated the establishment of an educational system which has a magnificent record of accomplishment.

The State of Delaware recognized the great opportunities of the Land-Grant College Act, and accepted its provisions and responsibilities.

There are two land-grant institutions in Delaware. They are the University of Delaware, at Newark; and Delaware State College, at Dover. Both schools have been greatly benefited, with resulting greater educational opportunity, service, and effectiveness.

The historic and present relationship of the land-grant concept to the State of Delaware and the University of Delaware was appropriately presented in "The President's Report—The University of Delaware—1960–61." The able and distinguished author of this report, Dr. John A. Perkins, President of the University of Delaware, was President of the American Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges in 1961.

Mr. President, as a part of the observance of this centennial year of the Land-Grant College Act, I ask unanimous consent that this very appropriate report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT, UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE—1960–61

I

The University of Delaware, along with the 67 other land-grant universities and colleges in the country, is celebrating the centennial of the Land-Grant College Act sponsored by Representative Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont, and signed by President Abraham Lincoln July 2, 1862.[1] And well this university might celebrate the so-called Morrill Act.

Delaware College, privately chartered in 1833, defunct for a little over a decade after 1859, was enabled to reopen its doors in 1870 only because the legislature made it the beneficiary of the 90,000 acres of land the State received under the act. Proceeds from the sale of this land were to constitute a permanent endowment for paying professors' salaries when Delaware, along with the other States, founded or designated "at least one college" which would emphasize "agriculture and the mechanic arts and teach military tactics." Such education, heretofore neglected in established colleges, was quite as much needed at that juncture in the Nation's history as the predominant preparation for the vocations of law and theology. The special mandate that other scientific and classical studies were not to be excluded meant, according to the sponsor of the legislation, they were to be included.

In short, the idea was "a liberal and practical education for the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life at a cheaper cost by reason of being close at hand." Delaware's and other legislatures in accepting the benefactions of the act and designating a college to receive the proceeds of the 30,000 acres of land given for each of its Members in Congress henceforth assumed responsibility that facilities for instruction would be provided. The institutions (which in our instance became the University of Delaware) in accepting this benefaction and subsequent advantages enacted in behalf of land-grant colleges likewise assumed special curricular responsibilities. In this land-grant centennial year, it is most appropriate to frame my annual report with special reference to our land-grant stewardship.

As for our responsibility to provide "a liberal and practical education for the industrial classes" which, incidentally, in our broadly based Republic means virtually everybody, the university enrolled this autumn 6,300 young people and adults in courses for credit. About half of these, 3,204 are full-time undergraduates, an increase of 400 over last year.

While such rapid growth makes for difficulties, in several respects it is encouraging that this university should have a 14-percent jump in enrollment as compared with an increase nationwide of between 6 and 8 percent. First, Delaware has been behind other States in the percentage of its capable youth going on to higher education.[2] Secondly, the University of Delaware with a mandate upon it "to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts" has, since its land-grant affiliation, had too few students, especially in the most practical vocational programs (engineering, agriculture, home economics, and education), to provide rich and increasingly more sophisticated instruction except at a relatively high cost per student. When Delaware College reopened its doors as a land-grant institution in 1870, it offered an engineering course of 3 years, an agricultural course of 4 years and a classical one of 4 years to a total of 22 students.

For the good of its students and the taxpayer, this university not only has a responsibility to grow to accommodate capable youth but to encourage their distribution among these mandated programs. Our effort must be that they receive a quality education and do so at a cost that compares even better with programs given in similar but larger universities.

With such considerations in mind a more detailed breakdown of current enrollments is at the same time encouraging and disappointing. Our other scientific and classical studies are not only available but well enrolled. Our school of arts and science is growing much faster than our uniquely land-grant schools. Four years ago arts and science constituted but 45 percent of the undergraduates; today it constitutes over 52 percent.

Engineering, when today's seniors were freshmen, enrolled one-quarter of our baccalaureate degree seekers; this year engineering enrolls but 16 percent. Meanwhile, the engineering school budget has had to be considerably increased to strengthen faculty and keep curriculums abreast of scientific developments. Both have been accomplished to a heartening extent. Today if one is to maintain an engineering program of integrity, it must be more like what ours has become than what it was. Unfortunately, in view of the strength of program and the Nation's need for technically educated talent, engineering enrollments at the University of Delaware, as the Nation over, have remained fairly stable. While the university is running ahead of forecast enrollments by 300 undergraduates, it is lagging behind predicted enrollments in engineering by 300. Under the circumstances, one must speculate whether the high schools are satisfactorily preparing and motivating potential young engineers for a modern curriculum in engineering science. One wonders, too, whether both parents and high school teachers are sufficiently aware of the high quality engineering education available to Delawareans on this campus.

The enrollment situation in home economics is not dissimilar. There is a failure to recognize that collegiate home economics is not simply an extension of high school homemaking for girls who have neither the interest nor ability to attend college. It is a highly challenging, scientifically oriented curriculum requiring intelligent enrollees which leads women graduates to well-paying jobs as nutritionists, textile experts, fashion designers, and child care specialists, all desperately sought after by employers. The reason for the dearth of home economics students here was diagnosed years ago as partly reflecting an inadequate home economics program in many of Delaware's secondary schools. It may also reflect a lack of understanding by guidance counselors that collegiate home economics is academically respectable, making intellectual demands commensurate with the abilities of their very best girls and offering far better paying employment opportunities than commonly do programs in the humanities and social sciences where clever women students are often directed. Our placement director informs me that many girls in the humanities and social sciences have unrealistic aspirations for their first job. Moreover, young women, the Nation over, tend to conclude overquickly that by majoring in these fields and attaining a "B" average or better they are among the intellectually elite. Too late they awaken to the fact that they can do little more than hire out at low paying and ultimately routine jobs and fail to make the contribution to society, whether they marry or not, which might be expected from their native ability.

In spite of an encouraging increase in the number of freshmen enrolled in our school of agriculture, a similar enrollment situation obtains in that school. The decided decline in the percentage of the population engaged in farming especially in Delaware, inevitably adversely affects enrollments. By mentioning this fact, I would not further the common misconception that the majority of agricultural graduates here or elsewhere, because they usually enter with rural backgrounds, become family farm operators upon graduation. They are far more

[1] In 1953 the National Manpower Council described this act of 1862 as "The most important single governmental step in connection with the training of scientific and professional personnel * * *." A task force of the Hoover Commission of 1949 described it as "the most effective grant-in-aid ever made by the Federal Government."

[2] Incidentally, Delaware has not made much progress in educating a higher proportion of its college-bound students at home. Last year Delawareans sent a greater proportion of their youth out of State for their higher education than did any other State. Hence, if only the factor of fairness is considered, our university is obligated to reciprocate by admitting a reasonable number of especially capable students from other Commonwealths. Even if Delaware were not a "debtor State" educationally, it would still be advantageous to have out-of-State students. By reason of careful selection they can enrich the education of our own Delaware youth. As for the economics of out-of-State admissions, the subject warrants consideration in the body of the text.

likely to enter agri-business, which includes food distribution and marketing of farm products, development and sale of farm machinery, fertilizers and insecticides as well as estate management and corporate-type agricultural production. Low agricultural enrollments also reflect the fact that in many rural high schools the boy without special intellectual motivation, but still with plenty of brains, is too often proselytized into the high schools' not-too-challenging vocational agriculture course. It prepares the boy for a type of farming that may no longer exist as a profitable enterprise or won't last as such throughout his adult life. Moreover, this course too seldom fits him, especially in English, for the alternative of entering and succeeding in a first-rate agricultural college. The college curriculum in agriculture also has become more scientific. In today's changing world such a training is more practical than "how to do it" courses that may soon be outmoded by scientific advances.

Our schools of agriculture and home economics each continue to enroll under 200 degree-seeking undergraduates. Again, to have programs of quality for so few students makes per-student costs of instruction high. Obviously, we have to give certain courses in order to educate a student as a bona fide home economist, agriculturalist or engineer. It costs the university very little, if any more, to have an upper division class of 10 students grow to 15, a third of which comes from out of State. Nonresident students pay 100 percent higher fees which more than cover the added incremental costs of their instruction. Our admission policy has been not only to take into account the high academic ability of the out-of-State students who apply but to give preference to those seeking admission to our schools where enrollments are especially low and our operating costs consequently high.

The preparation of schoolteachers was not one of the expressed land-grant injunctions. It soon became clear, however, that democracy's colleges could not prosper unless democracy's elementary and secondary schools were better staffed. Hence, teacher education soon became a prime responsibility of most land-grant colleges. Since World War II teacher education has come into a larger role on this campus both in the preparation of undergraduates and in improving teachers in service through formal graduate courses and through workshoplike courses offered afterhours in the schools.

Again, owing to the small size of Delaware and the relatively few who go on to college, particularly from the lower counties, the number of teacher-candidates at this university has never been large. This has made it difficult to offer teacher education in many of the specialities which have developed under the general banner of pedagogy.

In recent years the growth of our school of education has been considerable, but it has just kept pace with the university's general growth in enrollments. In view of the great need for teachers in all areas of Delaware a still larger enrollment would have meant much to the State. There is no better source of teachers for each local community than its own boys and girls graduating from the local university. They are the teacher-trainees most likely to want to teach in smaller cities and somewhat rural towns. For several reasons this teacher potential has not been available in Delaware to the extent required. In the first place the areas most desperate for teachers are too often the ones sending the fewest students to our university. Secondly, because an inordinate number of young Delawareans go out of State for their higher education, they are naturally likely, upon graduation, to accept teaching positions in far places rather than home places.

Meanwhile, those rightly worried about staffing our public schools are prone to criticize the university for not providing a larger supply of teachers replete with the specializations desired by conscientious school districts. One hears of proposals for the establishment of a teachers' college or makeshift arrangements for teacher training. The meat of the coconut is simply that the university needs many more than the 519 students now enrolled in its school of education. If it had a thousand such students, all of the State's school districts would have more well-trained teachers. Further, the university would be justified from a cost standpoint in developing a few specialized curriculums such as those training teachers for the handicapped, business education, industrial arts, and guidance and counseling even though the numbers needed each year with such specializations are few.

To acknowledge what is still needed should not obscure the many services that the university has, on a relatively small student base, been providing for Delaware's schools. For a decade this university has had a nationally recognized program in the teaching of reading. Our faculty has given special assistance to the secondary schools in the revision of the mathematics and English curricula. Special summer institutes, awarded the university by the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Office of Education, have increased the skills of teachers in foreign languages, mathematics and science, and guidance and counseling. The Delaware School Study Council was financed for a decade largely by the university directly or by foundation grants the university secured expressly for this purpose. Each year a number of conferences on educational problems for both teachers and parents are sponsored by the university.

The university and its school of education are not limited by either ideas or desire to be of service to the schools of Delaware. If the funds were forthcoming, present services could be enriched and other needed ones, particularly a bureau of school services and a circulating visual aids and film library, would be gladly provided. For both needs, funds have been unsuccessfully solicited from local foundations. The legislature is seemingly always so pressed to meet the direct financial requests of the public schools that the time and mood never seem right for the university—concerned as it necessarily must be to secure funds for its own growing operations—to ask for considerable sums to enable it to assist further the public schools.

The university, conscious of long having had too many programs for the size of its enrollment, is wary about taking on new schools and curriculums, such as those sometimes advocated in medicine and social work. Our steadfast objection to the proliferation of duplicating and competing junior colleges in Delaware grows out of similar wariness. Such improvement as the university has been able to effect in its teaching costs has been owing to larger entering classes. The comparatively low-cost instruction of freshmen and sophomores helps to offset the inevitably high cost of quality education in the upper 2 years where scientific advances require many specialized courses with fewer students in each. This is true everywhere, but especially so in Delaware. It would therefore be particularly costly to the people of Delaware to establish new junior colleges whose costs would be no lower than the university's freshman and sophomore work and by the same stroke increase the university's cost of providing instruction for other students who will enroll here.

Enough consideration of this university's endeavors to provide for too few students the spectrum of professional curriculums called for by the Land-Grant Act. Another injunction of the land-grant idea is to provide these curriculums at a cheaper cost to the student. This meant, for many years of this institution's history, mediocre to poor higher education. Such quality as our mandated curriculums have had was owing to a tendency to disregard the land-grant philosophy of keeping fees minimal. In 1950, fees charged Delaware students were the fourth highest among State-assisted universities. Since then the quality of many of our programs has been vastly improved. Fortunatelly, fees—in the interval—have been raised less than in comparable universities, dropping our university from 4th to 14th highest. This was possible in part because the State legislature began more nearly to carry out its responsibility to maintain and provide facilities for instruction under the Land-Grant Act. Lest it be thought, however, that our appropriations have been unusually generous, it should be understood by Delawareans that last year among the 10 States of lowest population (those confronted with similar paucity of students and corresponding high costs), only Idaho provided less money per capita for higher education. The prime reason Delaware has begun to have quality in its higher education is private benefactions. A few individuals have helpfully provided annual gifts and endowments, all the land, many of the buildings and much of the equipment—all of which have greatly embellished the development and operation of the university so modestly supported from tax sources. Even if the State does better (which it must if the university is to accommodate foreseen enrollments, keep abreast of rising costs, and pay competitive salaries), fees and other charges to students undoubtedly must rise in the years ahead. My hope is that charges will not go up here at a rate faster than at sister land-grant universities.

While the land-grant philosophy makes it incumbent that this university keep its doors open to those who are in modest circumstances, there is an equally important corollary. The doors of higher learning are also to be ajar for those who have native ability and eagerness for learning although lacking some of the formal requisites for admission. With all the concern of faculty and trustees to provide quality higher education for Delaware youth, we try continually to guard against academic snobbishness under the guise of standards, and selfishness in placing esoteric desires and academic convenience ahead of the welfare of youth and their needs for flexibility and consideration on an individual basis.

When Delaware College reopened in 1870, "Perhaps not a single student," Professor Vallandigham wrote, "was really well prepared for the work to be done or could have entered any of the larger colleges without conditions."[3] This autumn—in keeping with the tradition that brought the land-grant institutions into being—we admitted over 200 students on a "limited admissions" program. Many of this group are not candidates for degrees. They are enrolled in our newly designed 2-year terminal curricula. In the same spirit, this last summer the university offered on the campus and in Georgetown programs especially designed to prepare able young Delawareans for admission by filling in gaps in their secondary school preparation.

It should not be thought that this and other land-grant institutions do not have their full measure of excellent students. Sixty percent of all living American Nobel Prize winners hold earned degrees from the land-grant colleges. Our present freshman class has among it 30 high school valedictorians and at least 40 finalists and semifinalists in the national merit scholarship competition. There are 12 students whose college board scores are in the top 1 percent

[3] Vallandigham, Edward N., "Fifty Years of Delaware College, 1870–1920," Newark, Del., Kells, 1920.

of the Nation. Our seniors scored higher than those in 75 percent of the colleges and universities administering the graduate record examination.

II

The colleges in the land-grant system are more than a reflection of the Morrill Act of 1862.[4]

Two other Federal acts specified functions that have given these institutions further uniqueness in higher education. The first, the Hatch Act of 1887, called for an agricultural experiment station in each of the colleges, "to aid in acquiring and diffusing * * * useful and practical information on subjects connected with agriculture and to promote scientific experiment and investigation." The second, the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, created in each a cooperative extension service in association with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Under it agents in every county were to diffuse practical research findings "on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics and to encourage application of the same."

Owing to these three major Federal acts, our type of university commonly describes its purposes to be threefold teaching, research, and service. They also generally have a tripartite organization to implement these purposes. The undergraduate teaching function at this university has already been discussed. Moreover, instruction is our most commonly understood activity. In this centennial account of our stewardship, special emphasis needs be upon our research and service activities.

According to the late Dr. George A. Harter, a longtime servant of the university, the Hatch Act of 1887 was as important to the continuance of the university as the act of 1862 had been to its reopening. "The establishment of the experiment station probably saved the college. * * * The Federal aid * * * gave us a great impetus. In this period the State was making no contribution to the expenses of the college." Delaware's agricultural experiment station, begun in a two-story brick building costing only $3,000, has made significant contributions. Around 1897 Prof. Frederick D. Chester presented the first systematic arrangement for determining the identity of various bacteria. A decade later Dr. C. L. Penny developed a soluble oil emulsion which greatly advanced horticultural sprays. In the 1930's Dr. George L. Baker and associates did fundamental research in pectins and jellies giving impetus to a new industry.

Today, the University of Delaware's agricultural experiment station staff of over 60 researchers expends three-quarters of a million Federal and State dollars annually in research on plants, animals, poultry, and food production and distribution. Over and above this, 30 corporations, foundations, and Government agencies sponsor agricultural research here on problems ranging from development of disease-resistant peppers, to analysis of the organic structure of soils, to human-related research on cancer in chickens and on proteins and new vitamins. In 1960–61, the experiment station published 247 scientific papers in professional journals and distributed the fruits of their research in 64,400 pamphlets, bulletins, and commodity newsletters.

The Hatch Act directive to promote "scientific experiment and investigation" admittedly was related specifically to agriculture. It spread to others the truth discovered in this field: If material worthy of the designation of higher learning was to be taught to truly advanced learners, it would have to develop out of research. The better the American university, the quicker the awareness and implementation of this truth. University research was also forwarded by absorption of the inventive and scientific spirit of the late 19th century and the example of the German universities.

In general, it was not until the era of World War II that, aside from agriculture, our university awakened to its research responsibility. In 1947, the late Allan P. Colburn was appointed assistant to the president for research. A few years later the University of Delaware Research Foundation, a separate but university-related lay enterprise, was incorporated and began its important contributions.[5]

Organizationally, there have been developed, in the past decade, several research policies to which general adherence has been given. Rather than create a separate administrative structure for research, our endeavor has been to appoint, whenever the opportunity arose, deans, department chairmen and teaching faculty members who accepted research as a coordinated function of teaching. For example, our provost, now, in addition to being the top research coordinator, is the chief educational officer as well. Similarly, we determined that the right man to head our school of engineering was one not solely interested in undergraduate teaching but one who was aware that if this teaching was to be done well, research and graduate work must likewise be a concern of that school. In short, research responsibility has become an integral part of university life in all units and at all levels of personnel. A second policy has been not to accept organized research enterprises on our campus except as they grow out of the teaching interests of faculty members. The one exception to this was mitigated this year when our independent center for research on social behavior was melded to the department of psychology with a common head, Prof. John T. Lanzatta.

Still another policy has been that we would not contract for research to the extent that our strongest faculty members would be diverted entirely from undergraduate teaching. With us the teaching of undergraduates must never be neglected. It is with satisfaction that I report no faculty member has relinquished more than half his teaching duties for research, the average being more nearly one-quarter. A corollary policy is that salaries are not to be so largely dependent on research funds that the university could not, from its own stable resources, meet the full payroll of its tenure faculty should outside research moneys dry up.

These policies mean that research within this university is inevitably in phase with the university's basic financial support from the legislature and our endowment and that the growth of our faculty is primarily based upon enrollment growth. Such conservatism may mean that the university's research renown may not rise as a rocket but it should continue forever in orbit, financially and economically stable.

Even with such guiding principles, in the decade 1950–60 sponsored research (aside from that in agriculture), grew in dollar volume from a quarter of a million dollars to five times that amount. Last year 20 departments of the university shared 152 research projects sponsored by 14 governmental agencies, 10 foundations and 18 corporations. To illustrate with a few examples, research on oyster diseases, formation of plastics, fuel for rockets, nonverbal communication in groups, synthetic hormones, viruses, the chemistry of cancer and the effect of radiation on cells is currently being carried on by our faculty.

To review our research activity only in terms of dollars would be to overlook creativity in the humanities and social sciences which seldom enjoy contracts or outside sponsors. Research in these areas is, relatively speaking, financially neglected. Necessarily, productive scholarship in fields other than the exact sciences has been, in this and other land-grant universities, mostly incidental to classroom instruction rather than a completely coordinate activity.

To encourage creative work here in the nonscience fields, several steps have been taken. Their principal research facility, our library, has been greatly strengthened in several directions. In the past 5 years the budget for the purchase of books has been doubled, enabling book holdings to be increased by 50 percent to 328,000 volumes. The number of magazines and scholarly journals received periodically has increased from 575 in 1950 to 1,994 this year. Over and above these acquisitions, special grants from endowment income and gift funds also have been made for book purchases to departments where scholarly activity and leadership seemed to warrant it.[5a] Further, the University of Delaware Library Associates, a second helpful lay-citizen group, organized with the fostering of the university's library and our humanities as its raison d'etre, has greatly enriched research possibilities. Gifts such as "Hansard's Parliamentary Debates" from 1902 to 1959, the 51-volume "Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopedia," and classical art slides are but a few of the hundreds of potential research tools the associates have added. In addition, the University of Delaware Library Associates has supplemented library equipment with map cases, microfilm readers, and record players. Sponsored research funds help the science professors to travel. The university's own limited funds for travel make it less easy for other professors to go to farflung places to original sources of data. Our library associates have wisely given funds for this purpose, too.

Just as research contracts create a double standard among university faculty who would travel, so they do with respect to released time from teaching to do research. Universities, like this one, which are not rich enough to lighten teaching loads across the board to foster faculty research, can, as we have, adopt a policy of administered teaching loads. Under it department chairmen are encouraged to arrange lighter teaching schedules on a semester-to-semester basis for first one and then another faculty member who has a specific and well-begun research project to be brought to completion. To give such preferential treatment requires fairminded courage on the part of the department chairman and understanding on the part of the faculty. Our three Winterthur assistant professorships in art, English, and history were created specifically to give these three departments the flexibility of staff to enable all the faculty in these departments with research interests related to Winterthur Museum to spend time by turns at the museum. More funds are needed to permit this granting of released time to bona fide researchers in all the humanities and the social sciences. This arrangement, if more funds were available, would put research

[4] The second Morrill Act of 1890, and the Nelson amendment of 1908; the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 as amended in 1960—all modestly subsidized funds for teaching.

[5] In recent years the University of Delaware Research Foundation has been especially helpful in providing funds for projects of at least two types: One, sponsoring over an extended interval research in brucellosis, the effects of organic matter upon soil fertility and the improvement of nutrition in Delaware field hay; two, subsidizing ten or more faculty research projects each year with particular concern to help younger faculty members whose repute or interest was not yet such as to attract governmental, foundation or industrial support.

[5a] The Delaware General Assembly has granted the university's capital fund request of $3,127,000 for a new open stack library. This facility will greatly improve the research as well as service functions of our library.

opportunities in these fields on exactly the same competitive basis as exists in the sciences where sponsored research funds and commensurate released time go to the faculty-scholar who can deliver completed research. Light teaching loads for all on the supposition that research will be forthcoming from all is one of the great managerial fallacies in higher education.[6]

Another modest effort which fosters research and scholarship in the humanities and social sciences, although not restricted to these fields, is our program of summer research fellowships. Here, faculty compete for grants to enable them to spend the summer doing research. In the past 5 years 86 percent of the fellowships available went to faculty members in the humanities and social sciences. Our arrangements and funds on deposit with the University Publishers, Inc., making possible publication of books under the University of Delaware imprint, are largely to the benefit of the humanities and social sciences. Up to now, our funds, limited as they are, have been more than adequate to subsidize the manuscripts worthy of publication.

Lack of productivity in the nonscience fields is by no means all to be chalked up to insufficient subsidy. Academicians must admit and perhaps look to their Ph. D. training for the reasons why, with notable exceptions, most of the creative work in literature, music, painting, and even in social research is done outside the universities.[7]

Because of the longtime obligation upon the land-grant universities to do research, it should come as no surprise that they together produce 40 percent of the Nation's doctoral degrees in all subjects, all of those in agriculture, and half those in the sciences, engineering and health professions. They even produce one-quarter of all doctorates in the arts, languages, business and education.

Exactly as might be expected, graduate study at the University of Delaware has grown with research as a post-World War II phenomenon.[8] For example, all our Ph. D.'s are educated by those departments which together receive 85 percent of our sponsored research funds. To develop a well-balanced strength in this university, the problem is to continue but not over extend research and graduate study in a few departments and to foster both in a number of others. To go forward on this model, as I said in my report a year ago, may in the long run be actually no more expensive.[9] The fact is that a university can't have graduate students without research or much research activity without such students. You can have neither without outstanding faculty members. Where a university lacks both it is hard to attract or to retain the quality of faculty person a true university must have. The dilemma can be occasionally overcome. It is believed we have done it in the physics department with the appointment of Dr. Ferd E. Williams as chairman.[10]

A university like Delaware, in seeking and holding faculty members with these specialized talents, is confronted with several realities of the "academic marketplace." First, all qualified college teachers are in short supply and those of high caliber are in especially high demand. Second, academia is plagued by its own species of "organization man," the fellow who would rather be an underling in a well-established, prestigious, large institution than a top-to-middling person venturing to build another distinguished place of higher learning.[11]

Another reality perhaps is best described in the words of the distinguished Swedish physical chemist, Prof. Stig Claesson, who is on our campus this year as visiting land-grant centennial professor.

"I don't understand why faculty in this country are always on the move. * * * Science is a very democratic thing. You can do good work in it at any institution. It will be recognized for what it is and it doesn't matter if the place is here, the University of Texas or Princeton. The attitude in America seems to be to do a good job so that an invitation will be forthcoming to join a university of higher prestige. In Sweden we take pride in where we are and work to reflect well upon that place as well as ourselves."

True as his comment is, Professor Claesson may not have emphasized enough a related factor which, in addition to prestige, causes people to move. It is the considerable differentials in salaries and in space and facilities that exist among American universities.

The American situation is well explained to a Britisher by former President C. W. de Kiewiet of the University of Rochester:

"In brief, I am indicating to you the highly competitive position within the university and between universities. This phenomenon can be viewed from various angles. From the point of view solely of the professors, this highly flexible situation can be very attractive. An able man in a sought-after field * * * is in an exceedingly good bargaining position. I would not, however, say that the faculty is happy about the ranges which exist, since after all, the less able people (or those in less competitive situations such as English or history) tend to be more poorly paid. From time to time they necessarily get moody or cynical, though I must say that by and large this competition for good men at good salaries keeps universities very much on their toes. The good ones simply must develop an enormous amount of activity in soliciting and generating funds. This causes a very marked differential in quality to develop between the rich universities and the poor ones, for those with active programs of solicitation and those without.

"From the point of view of the administration of the university, this competitive situation produces very difficult problems indeed * * * every administrative officer lives under the yearly burden of knowing that a relatively significant number of the faculty will move elsewhere. It is very usual for a faculty member to move elsewhere at short notice, even though the university has gone to considerable expense to appoint him and to provide him with facilities. From time to time, therefore, a very disturbing collapse of established programs may occur."

As our salaries have improved, our laboratories and library expanded and equipment purchases stepped up, this university has done better not only in recruiting but in the retention of its staff. Our annual retention rate is 13 percent better this year than 5 years ago, but such improvement can be very short lived. If there is the least sense that our university is no longer moving ahead with respect to these items, the competition for distinguished faculty will cause us quickly to lose our best people and the quality they give both instruction and research. Moreover, it should be understood why the university administration must always be seeking (and hopefully receiving) additional funds both in Dover and among potential donors.

III

The service function of the land-grant universities has expressed itself particularly through cooperative extension and courses for adults on and off the campus. Justin Morrill's admonition to disseminate higher learning more widely has meant taking it to the farmer's dooryard and country kitchen, the industrial establishment and the schoolhouse occupied evenings by adults.

Appropriations under the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 matched by State funds enabled this university, and others like it, to begin agricultural extension. From a staff of 6 our extension service has grown to 25 professionals supported by more than twice that number of full- and part-time functionaries. In this 47-year interval, great changes also have taken place in Delaware's agriculture. The problem now is not so much to increase production but to market the greater volume of products. The number of farms has decreased and those remaining are larger in acreage. Delaware, once a rural State, has come to be predominately an urban one. Insofar as possible, adaptations to these changes are being made in our extension work. For example, consumer forums and landscaping for suburbanites have become a larger part of the home demonstration and county agents' activities. The residual farmers at the same time expect, and up to now have received, the same variety and

---

[6] Such loose practice may, to some extent, have prompted such suggestions as that made a few years ago by the late Beardsley Ruml in his "Memo to a College Trustee," advocating that trustees assume larger and active responsibility for costs of instruction.

[7] It may be that in the selection of college teachers disproportionate emphasis is put upon hiring the grade-getter rather than the one who gives evidence of creativity. In a study of the creative person by the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research it was concluded that above a substantial minimum level there seems to be no relationship between the degree of intelligence and a person's creativity. Many of today's most creative people haven't been grade-getters enough to be admitted to graduate study under present competitive conditions. This does not augur well for overcoming present disappointment in tomorrow's college teachers. See New York Times, Sunday, Oct. 22, 1961, p. 63.

[8] To look simply at the graduate school's total enrollment and its relative stability is deceptive. There were 950 in 1956 and 1,055 now. However, most of these students are teachers and full-time employees of local industry. Both types are pursuing study beyond the bachelor's degree on a sporadic part-time basis. Over a period of years they may earn a master's degree, even securing credits toward a doctorate. The latter degree, however, requires at least a year of full-time campus study; actually 3 to 4 or even 5 such years is not unusual. It is the number of graduate students who are in residence that are the meaningful statistics of the growth, cost and sophistication of graduate instruction here. The number of students in this category has increased about 10 percent a year for the past several years and now stands at 340, most all of whom have graduate fellowships or teaching assistantships.

[9] On balance, it costs a university no more money to hire one full-time instructor and a fair-to-middling professor than to subsidize two first-rate graduate students and pay well an outstanding faculty member.

[10] A few outstanding appointments which should augment our strength for research and graduate teaching and also make a first-rate undergraduate education inevitable are: Dean Roy M. Hall in education, Prof. Jerzy Nowinski in mechanical engineering, Associate Prof. Robert W. Kennard in mathematics, Assistant Prof. Norman Axelrod and Associate Prof. John W. Preiss in physics, Assistant Prof. Arlette Rasmussen in nutrition, Assistant Profs. Don Dennis and Carl von Frankenberg in chemistry and Assistant Prof. Edward O. Pfrang in civil engineering.

[11] We tried without success to lure several men here this past spring who were purportedly being trained by Ford Foundation grants in engineering for just such academic entrepreneurship. But almost vitiating the whole idea, they chose to or were prevailed upon to stay on in the large, graduate institutions to carry on already established research.

quality of services rendered when the State was largely agricultural. In spite of all the university is doing for fewer farmers, a recent resolution was offered by the Sussex Farm Bureau asking that our extension service tell them how to sell crops, not how to increase production. This assignment was undertaken as long ago as 1954 under the able direction of Mr. Robert L. Bull, entirely with Federal and business grants. Today we have one of the most remarkable agricultural marketing and food distribution programs in the Nation.

The land-grant idea of service—perhaps influenced by the Lyceum and Chautauqua movements—broadened to include the giving of college courses to adults in the evening. With us this came to be known as university extension.[12] Its development began in earnest following World War II. Last year our university extension division offered 318 courses for credit to over 3,000 enrollees. It sponsored 43 campus conferences or lectures which attracted well over 8,000 people to the campus. By contract arrangements, we are offering this year courses for teachers in several school districts, for military personnel at arsenals and bases and for technicians in company office buildings, not to mention a wide variety of credit course offerings in the evenings on campus and in four other centers of the State. In serving young people and adults who would overcome at night their lack of collegiate education, the university has had no financial help from either the Federal or State Governments. This enterprise has had to be a "tub on its own bottom," dependent entirely upon fee charges. Perhaps a more fitting figure of speech would be "a burden on the backs of the professors," for they are the ones who make the enterprise possible. They teach on an overtime basis at rates that pay them less than half instead of 1½ times their regular pay. They are expected to advise extension students for no additional pay at all.

This weakness of the program is dramatically illustrated in the school of education where the faculty members already have a heavier-than-usual number of full-time undergraduates to advise. Each member of this staff tries to offer some work in extension and teaches in the summer school as well. Try as they do, it is not possibly for our 12-man faculty in this school to meet all the demands for courses in university extension. It is necessary to co-opt especially well-qualified personnel from nearby public school jurisdictions to offer the wide range of courses sought by teachers goaded to garner more credits by the State salary plan.

In 1960–61 for the first time in recent years our own faculty was able to teach slightly more than half of all the courses offered in university extension. Our extension clientele have come to expect ever more courses to suit their personal advantage. Reports about university extension that filter in too often complain about too few courses at too high prices, rather than commend the university and its faculty for their struggle to offer the many courses they do. Although it is our declared intention to offer the same quality work in extension as is offered daytime on the campus—and this is done with surprising frequency—it cannot always be expected from co-opted instructors whose first loyalty must be to their regular employers and to their full-time jobs. They cannot attend departmental meetings, know our university philosophy, standards, or expectations. Under the circumstances, my concern is that we may give too much college credit in extension already, considering the staffing problem and the general library and laboratory limitations. But the ambitious fellow who piles up credits in extension complains that we do not offer our University of Delaware degree for work taken entirely in extension. He is apt to be infected with the American disease of being more concerned with degrees than with learning. And why not? Job opportunities and social prestige seem to depend upon the former rather than the latter.

In an earlier and simpler organization of a rural society, the land-grant institution could best be of service by helping the individual farmer and his wife with their problems. Now the children of these farmers have moved to the cities. Their problems, aside from employment, have become less individual and more an outgrowth of urban life. The solutions depend not so much upon individuals as upon their governments and social and civic organizations. The land-grant institution has long been conscious of the need to respond to calls for service by governments and citizen groups struggling with urban-related problems of land use, planning, zoning, redevelopment, water supply and other services required for health and decency when people live in rundown central cities and run-up-for-quick-profits housing developments. Efforts to secure funds enabling our universities to provide an urban extension service have not been helped along by a Congress now beset by fears about Federal control (the 100 years of land-grant experience to the contrary) and the quite opposite corollary that Federal assistance shall not go to public universities unless the benefits of the evil are shared by private institutions as well. Legislators from rural constituencies, and most legislators come from them, have not, understandably, the same sense of urgency about urban problems that they have about farm ones. Delaware, with its high per capita income and enlightened citizenry, when it has a job that needs doing should not have to be pushed into doing it by Federal matching grants as has been the pattern in the past. With the assistance of the Ford Foundation, our university has this year been able to establish an urban services program underwritten for 5 years.

This university with the need to coordinate three distinct types of extension services, with an alumni body which has doubled in size in the past 11 years, with an increasing number of problems owing to the growth of activities and higher public expectations, not to mention preparing for annual instead of biennial legislative sessions, has taken steps to unify responsibility for these related, multifarious activities. This was done with the appointment of our dean of agriculture, George M. Worrilow, to the newly created post of vice president for university relations.

These past 11 years as president of a small, atypical but nonetheless land-grant institution, have been satisfying ones. A prominent educator with intimate knowledge of many of America's institutions of higher education in unsolicited comment said, "Delaware is probably the best of its kind and size." If true, it has been made so by the unusual support of trustees, administrative and faculty colleagues, alumni, and enlightened and generous citizens—all of whom realize that to a considerable degree a university is a mosaic of their individual standards of excellence, intellectual and other, their sense of responsibility and even their shortcomings.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN A. PERKINS,
President.

NOVEMBER 15, 1961.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in pointing out that today is the 100th anniversary of the Morrill Land-Grant Act. On July 2, 1862, President Lincoln signed into law the Morrill Act, which authorized the donation of public lands to the several States and Territories as an incentive to them to provide colleges which would be established primarily for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts. This act marked the first step in the establishment of the land-grant system. In the ensuing 100 years, 68 land-grant colleges and universities have been established in the United States. The land-grant colleges today educate 1 out of every 5 students enrolled in all colleges in the United States. I believe that, in part, the success of our public educational system, and certainly that of the land-grant colleges, is a tribute to the foresight of the Congress which enacted the Morrill Act 100 years ago.

At that time, only 1 out of every 1,500 hundred young Americans went to college. Today, 1 out of every 3 attends a college. In 1862, the United States was considered to be a rural nation and, at that time, one farm worker was able to support 4.53 persons. Today, 1 farm worker supports 27 persons. The productivity of our farms provides more food and fiber than we need for home consumption, for normal exports, and for distribution under authority of the Agricultural Trade and Development Act. The credit for the increase in agricultural productivity in the past 100 years must go to the ingenuity of many individuals, industrial agencies, and corporations, in addition to the land-grant college system. The land-grant institutions, however, through the stimulus of the Morrill Act, established educational facilities and, later on, established research and extension programs as they were authorized by Congress, which have made remarkable contributions to the growth of the agricultural economy, as well as to the entire economy of the United States.

For example, in my own State of Arizona, which was admitted to the Union in 1912, only 50 years ago, a land-grant college was authorized to be established by the Territorial legislature in 1885. In the 75 years since the establishment of the University of Arizona, it has been in the forefront of agricultural and economic development in the State. I am informed that 75 percent of the land devoted to field crops is planted to varieties that have been originated in or were introduced by the University of Arizona. New varieties of long staple and other types of cotton have been developed which have completely revolutionized cotton production in the State of Arizona, and, today, it leads all States in yield per acre. Similarly, the large increases in the yields of sorghum, barley, and other crops grown in the State, reflect in large measure the work of the university and its graduates who are engaged in agriculture and other related activities within the State. It has been a fundamental precept at our State land-grant university—the University of Arizona—that the way to increase and broaden a man's understanding is to teach him not only what to do, but how to do it and also why it should be done. I take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the land-grant college

[12] A division of academic extension was created here in 1920. The following year 4 courses were offered and 20 years later there were only 14 offered.

system, comprised of educators, research workers, and extension workers, that have done a good job during the first 100 years, and I wish them continued success in the years to come.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, July 2, 1962, will be the 100th anniversary of the first Land-Grant College Act known as the Morrill Act, which was first signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln. Today there are 68 land-grant universities and colleges.

The Morrill Act provided for "the endowment, support and maintenance of at least one college—in each State—where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and mechanic arts in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

An act of Congress which revolutionized higher education was signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln on July 2, 1862. Sponsored by Congressman Justin Smith Morrill of Vermont, the act put higher education within reach of all Americans. It pushed back the old horizons of learning and brought the colleges to the people.

The Morrill Act offered to every State 30,000 acres of Federal land, or land scrip, for each of its Members of Congress, to be sold to endow at least one college in the State. Today, there are land-grant institutions in all of the 50 States and in Puerto Rico.

The Morrill Act is significant because it helped to bring to life the democratic idea of equality of educational opportunity. An "open door" to college for all who had the will and ability to learn was unprecedented in world history. One hundred years ago 1 young American in 1,500 went to college, compared with 1 in 3 today. The land-grant system has become the Nation's largest single source of trained and educated manpower.

A second reason for the fundamental significance of the Morrill Act is that for the first time colleges were brought to the people. Teaching and research were not limited to the confines of campuses. Throughout the States they serve, land-grant people conduct special classes, they go to factories and farms to test research results, they contribute to the cultural life of the community, and they seek solutions to economic, social, and physical ills that beset their fellow citizens.

Mr. President, I quote from page 11 of a pamphlet, "The Centennial Year 1961–62 and Beyond—Land-Grant Universities and Colleges," as follows:

To assess and evaluate: This purpose is being carried out by critical studies of the job the institutions are doing, in order to find better ways of doing it. The findings of study groups and the insights of foreign observers and local citizens will be used to guide future actions and programs of land-grant institutions.

World perspective: Visiting lecturers and students from foreign countries are participating, observing, evaluating. From their perspectives of cultural and geographical distances, they are giving critical insights to the role of land-grant colleges in the world today. From a different viewpoint, study committees from the land-grant colleges are preparing four critiques on land-grant work in the international field.

National studies: Work in eight subject areas is being evaluated with the aid of "outside" experts. The convocation of the land-grant colleges at Kansas City in November of 1961 provided an opportunity for full discussion and review by land-grant people and international and national leaders in higher education.

State projects: Many of the State universities and colleges are conducting their own centennial projects of assessment and evaluation. Informed citizens are being called upon to consider the functions and the current problems of land-grant institutions and to give their views of educational and public service needs.

I bring this matter to the attention of my colleagues in Congress and to interested people throughout the country.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, this day marks the 100th anniversary of the signing of one of the most important acts of Congress. On July 2, 1862, President Lincoln signed into law the Morrill Land-Grant Act.

This act was to have a profound effect in helping to build a nation then torn by civil war into the greatest industrial and agricultural power of the world. The men instrumental in the passage of this act certainly shared a part of the insight and wisdom of those who drafted our Constitution.

The University of Missouri was created by an act of the Missouri Legislature in 1839. It is the oldest State university west of the Mississippi and the third oldest west of the Allegheny Mountains.

In 1862, the university was closed down for a while when Federal troops occupied the university building. But this has always been looked upon as a good year for the struggling university too, because of the passage of the Morrill Act. Under the Morrill Act, the university received 330,000 acres of land. This was a great encouragement for the university for up to 1867 there was no State appropriation for the school's operation. One of the results of the act was the establishment of the School of Mines and Metallurgy at Rolla, Mo., in 1871 as a part of the university. Also in 1870, the College of Agriculture was established as a division of the university under the provision of the act.

Lincoln University at Jefferson City, Mo., is also a land-grant school. It was established in 1866 as Lincoln Institute by officers and men of the 62d and 65th Regiments of the U.S. Colored Infantry as an institution to serve the needs of the newly freed Negro. In 1879, the State of Missouri undertook the support and control of the institute as a State school.

Under the second Morrill Act of 1890, Lincoln became a land-grant college. In 1921, its name was changed to Lincoln University and in 1954, following a ruling by the Missouri attorney general, the university was opened to all qualified students.

There can be no question but that the Morrill Act has contributed greatly to the progress of the State of Missouri. It is only proper that we give due recognition to this program on this its 100th anniversary.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am sure that all of us who serve in this body often have fond hopes that ideas which we have, legislation which we sponsor, laws which we enact, will still be effective, helpful, inspiring, and useful, even after 100 years. Perhaps that is often a vain hope. However, today we are honoring the 100th anniversary of an act which has done much to improve the economic and social welfare of our country—and which is doing much to improve the economic and social welfare of the world.

One hundred years ago, the beloved Abraham Lincoln signed into law the Morrill Act, which was introduced in Congress by Justin S. Morrill of Vermont. This act of Congress brought into being the land-grant colleges, which today number 68, and which enroll 20 percent of the Nation's undergraduate students and grant nearly 40 percent of all doctoral degrees in all fields of study.

The land-grant colleges are the people's colleges, because they get their student body from the modest homes of average Americans, and their purpose is to prepare informed, educated men and women for service to their fellow man.

Several laudatory speeches have been made about the high purpose of the land-grant colleges. I shall not attempt to review the objectives or the accomplishments in a general way. What I would like to do today is to review a case history of a land-grant college which is responding to the most modern challenges facing the world, and which is serving the people of America well in traditional educational, technical training, and other avenues of intellectual pursuits. That college is South Dakota State College, located in Brookings, S. Dak.

I believe that the land-grant college was primarily designed to lend help to areas like South Dakota. It brought the college to the doorstep of midwestern pioneers, and provided opportunities for study which might otherwise have been denied to many of our citizens.

The land-grant college also brought to our area teachers, technicians, laboratory workers, who studied our particular problems and who tried to find methods of improving the economic opportunities for the great agriculture areas of our country.

How well South Dakota State College has lived up to the basic purpose of the land-grant college is very aptly demonstrated by a statement which I have taken from the 1962 Fact Book on that college. Under the subtitle "Philosophy of the College," the following information is set out:

The philosophy of South Dakota State College is reflected in its aims and purposes: To provide professional and vocational training in the fields of agriculture, engineering, home economics, pharmacy, nursing, and the sciences and arts on both the undergraduate and graduate levels; to provide citizenship training and general education essential for the understanding and appreciation of the American way of life; to promote, through extracurricular activities, student self-development in cooperation and leadership; to promote and conduct research particularly in the fields of agriculture, engineering, home economics, and science; to

promote and conduct statewide programs in practical education for the youth and adults of South Dakota in agriculture, homemaking, and other vocational pursuits.

South Dakota State College—like all land-grant colleges—places great stress on the idea that it is there to be of service to the people of our State. School authorities say, and I believe with accuracy, that the activities of State colleges touch the lives of practically every South Dakotan. They claim that it is almost impossible to find any person in the State who does not have some connection, either direct or indirect, with the college. What a wonderful purpose the faculty and students of our South Dakota land-grant college serve.

One of the information booklets which I have obtained from South Dakota State College has outlined what some of these services are. I shall not elaborate on all of them, but I think the value of the college to our citizens of the State is vividly and significantly set out under the portion of the story relating to extension work and special services. I ask unanimous consent to include these pertinent paragraphs in the RECORD at this point.

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

IMPROVING THE ODDS—THROUGH EXTENSION

Most people will help themselves if they are shown the way.

Bringing knowledge to farmers, ranchers, and their families, in a form which they can adapt to their daily tasks, is the way the Cooperative Extension Service helps South Dakotans improve the odds.

Faith in the ability of people to work together in mapping their own destiny is at the core of the extension program, a truly cooperative arrangement involving State College, the Federal Government, and South Dakota counties.

Local people in each county determine the problems which need to be solved. The county extension agent and home demonstration agent, located at the local level, then help the people marshal their resources to get the jobs done. Often these extension workers are called professors at the grassroots.

Informal, out-of-school education helps the people solve their everyday problems and take advantage of opportunities through individual and community action.

Extension activities fall into three areas—agriculture, home economics, and 4–H. Theses are mainly for the benefit of rural people, but nonfarm families can also get the advice on such topics as homemaking, consumer buying, gardening, lawns, and landscaping.

The grassroots professor has all of the resources of State College at his fingertips if needed to help solve local problems. He can call upon extension subject matter specialists at the college or the research staff.

The county agent brings people together on the local level so they can plan the work to be done. As an expert who keeps up on new trends and ideas, he often is asked for advice and counsel. He helps local leaders organize 4–H clubs and other groups. He helps them locate information to solve local problems.

To get a better idea of the scope of this program in the State, here are some statistics for a recent year:

More than half of the boys and girls, fathers and mothers in South Dakota participated in one or more of the extension programs.

Eighteen thousand boys and girls were active in 4–H clubs.

Nearly 19,000 homemakers were members of home demonstration study groups.

More than 7,000 educational meetings were held with an attendance of 301,271.

County and home agents made 31,121 farm and home calls.

A total of 127,479 persons visited extension offices seeking information.

Hundreds of field demonstrations were given.

Agents prepared more than 15,000 news articles, radio broadcasts, and television programs.

Nearly 400,000 educational bulletins were distributed to South Dakotans.

The extension service has taken the lead in community and area development programs in which the people are mustering their resources to hold their own and make progress in a modern and changing world. It is promoting development of water conservancy districts.

As the people of the State try to improve their odds for success, they look to the extension service to point the way through information, planning, and leadership.

IMPROVING THE ODDS—THROUGH SERVICE

Another way in which State College helps South Dakotans improve the odds is through service. Workshops, short courses, institutes, and other types of meetings are held to give information on new and current developments in special fields.

Among the many groups which benefit from such meetings are school lunch cooks, highway engineers, school administrators, and school board members, sewage plant operators, nurses, teachers, pharmacists, printers, and numerous others.

Another type of service is called statewide services. This includes testing of soils, seeds, water, and diseased animals—the type of service requiring trained personnel and special equipment often not available elsewhere.

In a recent 2-year period 41,605 animal specimens were examined, 12,000 soil samples were analyzed so that efficient use could be made of fertilizers, 834 water samples were tested, 1,370 seed samples were analyzed, and 36,613 acres were examined in seed certification.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, while the importance of South Dakota's land-grant college to the people of my home State can be easily demonstrated, the importance of that institution to the people of the world is becoming more evident.

In about 2 weeks, South Dakota State College is to begin a special international seminar in soil and water utilization. This is a new concept in international seminars—the bringing together of peoples from around the world to attack the common problem of food production through better utilization of our natural resources. We hope that this is but the first of a series of seminars on this and other related problems.

To this pioneer seminar are coming 54 citizens from 25 nations. Their work will mark the first exchange of technical information on the whole range of soil and water utilization, including the economic and sociological benefits which accrue to a country which adopts workable conservation projects.

South Dakota State College has agreed to host this important event. The president of the college, H. M. Briggs, and the entire faculty have bent every effort toward making this event a great success. Numberless man-hours of voluntary work has gone into the planning phases. The schedule of events will include, not only discussions, but many field trips which will carry the visitors to a variety of areas where soil and water utilization techniques will be demonstrated. South Dakota offers some of the very best demonstration projects of this kind.

This seminar is not aimed solely at the technical training level—but it is hoped that it will provide guidance to legislative and executive department leaders who make policy in their own countries, and who, after returning, will be able to implement some of the ideas which they have gained. I may say that our own people may learn many skills and get much information from visitors who are working on these same problems in arid and semiarid areas of the world.

But the important thing—and the thing which I wish to stress now—is that a land-grant college, established for the principle purpose of assisting areas neighboring it, has pushed back its horizons to give a helping hand to other neighbors in other lands—giving fuller meaning to its philosophy and purpose.

The campus of State College is prepared to welcome these visitors. The citizens of our State are cooperating to see that each foreign national who spends a month in South Dakota goes home with good impressions and happy memories of his visit here. This demonstration of typical, friendly midwestern life should be inspiring to everyone who attends the seminar. We sincerely hope the broad goals of peace through understanding will be achieved in some measure by this visit.

And from a more selfish viewpoint, we hope that information gleaned from the seminar will assist other peoples, now dependent on us for food and foreign aid, in building their own economies and thus lessen the demands on the resources of the United States.

It is in this manner that South Dakota State College—a land-grant college—fulfills a need in a modern world.

Indeed, this chain of land-grant colleges provides one of the best means of supplying information to foreign nationals. It is a network through which our Government officials can work efficiently and effectively, and I am informed by Cannon Hearne, director of the Foreign Agriculture Training Division, that South Dakota State College and all other land-grant colleges have done splendid work in this field—cooperating in our giant effort to help others help themselves, and, at the same time, to promote the philosophy of the exchange-of-persons programs which have been enacted by the Congress.

Mr. President, it is well that Congress eulogizes the work of a former colleague today. I predict that 100 years from today others who follow us will pay homage, as we are doing, to the great idea of Justin Morrill and to the work which the land-grant colleges of America will have carried on.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at this point, a brief history of South Dakota State College and an article on

the purpose of South Dakota State College, which appears in the general catalog of that institution—which stands as a living memorial to the memory of Justin Morrill and the Land-Grant College Act.

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

HISTORICAL SKETCH

ESTABLISHMENT

An act of the Territorial legislature, approved February 21, 1881, provided that "an agricultural college for the Territory of Dakota be established at Brookings, provided that a tract of land not less than 80 acres be secured and donated to the Territory of Dakota."

The legislature of 1883 provided for the erection of the first building. This building, now known as the Central Building, was opened for use September 24, 1884.

The enabling act admitting the State of South Dakota, approved February 22, 1889, provided that 120,000 acres of land be granted for the use and support of the agricultural college, in accordance with the act of Congress making donations of land for such purpose. The acts of Congress referred to are primarily the act of July 2, 1862, known as the Morrill Act, providing that 30,000 acres of public land for each representative in Congress be given to each State toward "the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college, where the leading object shall be, without excluding scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and mechanic arts." By the enabling act of 1889 Congress granted to South Dakota for the agricultural college 40,000 additional acres, in lieu of a grant that had been made to the new States in 1841. Thus the total land grant for the agricultural college was 160,000 acres.

In the Morrill Act of 1862, such colleges were spoken of as colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts. In order that the name might more nearly conform to the object for which the college was established, the legislature of 1907 changed the name from "The Agricultural College of South Dakota" to "The State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts."

The agricultural experiment station was organized in 1887, under the Hatch Act of Congress, which provided for the establishment of agricultural experiment stations in connection with agricultural colleges. These stations were established for the purpose of conducting experiments and research in connection with all branches of the home and agricultural industries of the United States, due regard being paid to the various conditions and needs of the respective States. It is also their object to aid in diffusing among the people useful and practical information in all subjects connected with homes and agriculture. The South Dakota station conducts its investigations chiefly along the following lines: livestock, dairying, soils, field experiments with crops, greenhouse work, trees and small fruits, injurious insects, chemistry of plant growth, and foods.

PURPOSES

In accepting the provisions of the Morrill Act of Congress of 1862, the State of South Dakota, in 1889, "bound itself legally and morally to carry out the purposes for which the grants and annuities were intended." The purposes of this so-called Land-Grant College Act are "the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college (within each State) where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agricultural and mechanic arts, in such a manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

The South Dakota Code in 1939 carries a statement of purposes which originally appeared in the Session Laws of Dakota Territory in 1887 and which reads as follows.

"The purpose of this institution is to afford practical instruction in agriculture and the natural sciences connected therewith, and also the sciences which bear directly upon industrial arts and pursuits."

South Dakota State College accepts these statements of purpose as fundamental, but of necessity takes account of the tremendous changes in conditions since 1862. Agriculture and the mechanic arts have since become applied sciences and corresponding emphasis is placed upon the sciences and their applications. The right of women to educational opportunities has become an established principle and is recognized in this college by placing homemaking and nursing on a par with agriculture and the mechanic arts, and by providing other career opportunities for women as well as for men. In addition, the college accepts responsibility for the promotion of research, adult and youth education as authorized by Federal and State laws passed subsequently to those mentioned above.

Thus, stated in terms of modern conditions, but within the spirit of the Morrill Act and the early legislative acts of South Dakota, the purposes of State college are (1) to provide professional and vocational training in the fields of agriculture, engineering, home economics, pharmacy, nursing, and the sciences and arts on both the undergraduate and graduate levels; (2) to provide citizenship training and general education essential for the understanding and appreciation of the American way of life; (3) to promote, through extracurricular activities, student self-development in cooperation and leadership; (4) to promote and conduct research particularly in the fields of agriculture, engineering, home economics and science; (5) to promote and conduct statewide programs in practical education for the youth and adults of South Dakota in agriculture, homemaking, and other vocational pursuits.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today we are privileged to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Morrill Land-Grant College Act—a landmark in the history of higher education. This act led to the development of the land-grant college system which has been a leading factor in the evolution of America and in the development of the United States to its present position of world leadership.

It is extremely difficult for one to visualize the state of higher education prior to 1862. Educational opportunity was, for the most part, limited to those privileged by birth, by social status, and by wealth. College curriculums were unchanged for a period of 200 years, from the inception of the first college, and frozen into a traditional mold designed for members of traditional professions and leisure classes. The term "higher education," if applied to these early institutions, must be with tongue in cheek. Even the Harvard of the 1850's was characterized by Louis Agassiz as "a respectful high school where they taught the dregs of learnings."

The State of New York claims credit for what was probably the real forerunner of land-grant colleges. In 1824 Steven Van Rensselaer founded an institute, which still bears his name, in Troy, N.Y., to "apply science to the common purposes of life." His principal objective was "to qualify teachers for instructing sons and daughters of farmers and of mechanics in the application of experimental chemistry, philosophy, and natural history to agriculture, domestic economy, the arts, and manufactures."

The immediate effect of the Land-Grant College Act in the State of New York was the founding of Cornell University which was authorized in 1865 and opened October 7, 1868. Since this time Cornell has gained world recognition and standing for its contributions to agriculture and many other fields.

Mr. President, the contributions of land-grant colleges are too numerous to list in detail. It is, however, a fact that our agricultural productivity is unparalleled in world history, that our problem today is how best to use this abundance rather than to prevent starvation, a fact that today we are sharing our abundance with those less fortunate in other countries. One American farmer produces enough food for himself and 26 others—an efficiency ratio unmatched throughout the world. All of these blessings are due in immeasurable degree to our land-grant colleges. Other significant contributions include the discovery of streptomycin; development of the television tube and the first cyclotron; research in space, rockets, and rocket fuels; control of botulism for the canning industry; and findings responsible for the beginnings and growth of the ceramics, wood pulp, and soybean processing industries. The value to America of land-grant research contributions alone exceeds by many times the total amount expended on these colleges since they came into being.

This year our land-grant colleges are assessing and evaluating the accomplishments of their first century, not for the purpose of basking in the glow of praise for a job well done, but for the purpose of identifying more clearly their special responsibility to this country and the world in the future.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, 100 years ago today, an act of Congress which revolutionized higher education was signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln. The Morrill Land-Grant Act offered to every State 30,000 acres of Federal land, or land scrip, for each of its Members of Congress, to be sold to endow at least one college in each State, "where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life." I am glad today to help pay tribute to the 68 land-grant colleges, at least one in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico.

Being of the State of Iowa, land of colleges, I am particularly proud of Iowa's own land-grant institution, the deservedly famous and widely respected Iowa State University of Science and Technology, at Ames, Iowa.

A century ago, Americans dreamed of a new sort of education, tailored to the industrial revolution and to new problems of a great new nation. Where colleges and universities had confined themselves to classical studies and training for professions such as teaching, the ministry, medicine and law, it was now proposed that they meet more directly the practical needs of all citizens and at minimum cost to the individual. Americans particularly wanted emphasis on research and instruction which would increase agricultural production and improve rural living conditions, as well as research and instruction in technology and engineering.

Iowans believed in this new philosophy, and almost from the beginning of statehood in 1846 they discussed the establishment of an agricultural college. Three young and progressive Iowa farmers, Benjamin F. Gue, Robert A. Richardson, and Ed Wright, drafted a bill to create such a college, and the bill became law under the signature of Gov. Ralph P. Lowe on March 22, 1858—the birthdate of the institution which is now the Iowa State University of Science and Technology.

The Iowa General Assembly was the first to accept the terms of the Morrill Land-Grant Act—240,000 acres of land, on September 11, 1862. For the 100 years since, Iowa State University has been a leader in land-grant affairs. During that time it has become a great scientific and technological university, and holds many "firsts."

Iowa State University was the first land-grant institution to admit women from the beginning. It offered the first course in home economics, in the 1870's, and established the first experimental kitchen. It today has the largest program in the home economics area found anywhere in the world.

Iowa State was the first to establish a 2-year course in veterinary medicine, in 1879.

It has long since been increased to a 4-year veterinary school, and for a long time has been the leading veterinary school in the world.

In 1904, Iowa State was the first—with Illinois—to organize its engineering research into an engineering experiment station.

Iowa State took the lead in teaching and research in agriculture. Its faculty almost from the beginning worked with all Iowa through institutes and short courses in various parts of the State. It developed the first pattern of the extension service in agriculture and home economics now used nationwide.

It began early to work with farm youth in what later became the 4–H movement.

Iowa State has achieved wide fame in the physical and biological sciences. Iowa State scientists were among the keymen who solved the problems of producing uranium and developing the atomic bomb during World War II. A major laboratory of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission is now on the campus as part of the Iowa State Institute for Atomic Research, and the AEC is currently completing $6 million of new construction.

Near Ames, the Agricultural Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is creating a $16 million national animal disease laboratory which will work in close cooperation with the university. Location of the new laboratory at Ames comes in part as recognition of the excellent programs in animal husbandry, veterinary medicine and basic science at Iowa State University, as well as the extensive collections of scientific journals in its library.

In 1960, the university began operation of a technical institute within the college of engineering. The institute trains the type of highly skilled technician who is much in demand in Iowa's expanding industrial economy. Thus the Iowa State University of Science and Technology, which has grown to an enrollment of approximately 10,000 students, continues to expand and to develop new programs to meet the needs of Iowa and of the Nation.

Indeed, the horizons of this university do not stop with our shores—they expand to Peru, where Iowa State University assisted the Peruvian Government in a study of legal and economic aspects of land reform, to India, where the university cooperated with the Ford Foundation and Boroda University in putting the science of home economics to work more effectively for the Indian people, and to many other countries, where the phrase "I'm from Iowa" brings warmth to the host's smile and welcome.

As the land-grant institutions observe their 100th anniversary, they number less than 4 percent of the Nation's colleges. Yet they enroll 20 percent of the Nation's undergraduate students and grant nearly 40 percent of all doctoral degrees in every field of study. Still quality has not been sacrificed for the sake of quantity—of the 42 living Nobel Prize Winners who were educated in the United States, 25 received one or more degrees at a land-grant university.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, during some of the most trying days of the Civil War, the American Congress acted on a proposal of Representative Justin Morrill and established what became some of the most meaningful precedents in the history of our Union. Passage of the Morrill Act for land-grant colleges, and its signing by President Lincoln on July 2, 1862, were acts of faith. Even as an ideological chasm threatened to divide the Nation permanently, the President and the Congress demonstrated their faith in our federal system, and in the people in the several States to establish a type of popular higher education that would further the general welfare of the entire Nation.

The Morrill Act, by providing that Federal lands be conveyed to the States for the establishment and maintenance of colleges to promote "liberal and practical education in the several pursuits and professions in life," changed the mode of American higher education. Before the Morrill Act, only about 1 or 2 percent of college-age men were enrolled in institutions of higher education, and they were pursuing a narrow curriculum of classical languages, philosophy, theology, and mathematics in order to prepare for four basic professions: the ministry, teaching, law, and medicine. Land-grant colleges not only broadened curriculums to develop many kinds of human abilities, but brought a new emphasis on research and a more rigorous and productive approach to American academic life. The results are well known. Although the 68 land-grant colleges comprise only 4 percent of all the colleges and universities in the country, and 20 percent of the students, they grant nearly 40 percent of all the doctoral degrees awarded annually, and 25 of the 42 living American Nobel Prize winners who studied in this country earned degrees at land-grant institutions.

Land-grant colleges also led the way, along with other State universities and colleges, in breaking the tie between education and the church. In accordance with the Federal Constitution and the constitutions of the various States, the land-grant colleges scrupulously avoid sponsoring any particular sect or creed.

Through their agricultural experiment stations and extension divisions, land-grant colleges have brought the fruits of research and the opportunities of education to hundreds of thousands of American citizens who are not able to secure the benefit of on-campus training.

Aside from the precedents established in the pattern of American higher education, the Morrill Act established the precedent of cooperative federalism in being the first long-range Federal program to employ the grant-in-aid device. While individual States often find it difficult to build superhighways or schools or hospitals, there is a real national interest in their doing those things. That national interest is made concrete in the form of grants-in-aid. Although the first monetary grant-in-aid was not made until 1916, the grant-in-aid principle was clearly established with the Morrill Act 100 years ago.

In 1893 the land-grant institution in my own State, Montana State College, began operation in Bozeman. Today Montana State College offers work leading to bachelor's, master's, doctor of education, and doctor of philosophy degrees. It is composed of schools of agriculture, education, engineering, home economics, nursing, art, letters and science, and the graduate division. The college operates the agricultural experiment station and seven branch stations: the Western Montana Branch Station, Corvallis; the Central Montana Branch Station, Mocassin; the Huntley Branch Station, Huntley; the North Montana Branch Station, Havre; the U.S. Range Experiment Station, Miles City; the Eastern Montana Branch Station, Sidney; and the Northwestern Montana Branch Station, Creston. Montanans have always been justly proud of our State college; it represents the land-grant tradition well in our State.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, today we celebrate a milestone in higher education. One hundred years ago today, President Lincoln signed the Land-Grant College Act, better known as the Morrill Act, for its author, Representa-

tive—and later Senator—Justin Morrill, and ushered in a complete new concept of higher education. The accomplishments of a century are numerous and extraordinary, and certainly due our recognition.

The Morrill Act gave impetus to the real beginnings of badly needed higher education. Primarily, it broke the financial barriers and opened the doors to education for all those who had the will and the ability to learn—an unprecedented feat in world history. Because of this base-broadening, it has been an important factor as well in the evolution of American democracy and leadership. Furthermore, it opened wide the doors to research of all types; and among its fruits have been major contributions to our Nation's economic well-being.

The purpose of the Morrill Act, in its own words, was to provide for "the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college—in each State—where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanical arts in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

Under the terms of the act, each State received a grant of Federal land, apportioned on the basis of 30,000 acres for each Member of Congress at the time. The income from the sale of the land provided an endowment fund for the continuing support of the colleges. My State's share was 150,000 acres—an amount from which Californians have reaped manifold benefits.

I think the response to the Morrill Act was indicative of the need of the time. Within 9 years, 36 States, including California, had established Federal land-grant colleges. Today there are 68 such colleges and universities.

While the relative number of land-grant colleges is actually small—3.4 percent of all our American colleges and universities—they are educating 20 percent of our college population. The University of California, for example, of which we in California are mighty proud, has an enrollment on 7 campuses of more than 53,000—making it the largest university complex in the United States.

Land-grant colleges, in addition, award 40 percent of all doctorate degrees, including all those in agriculture and about one-half of all doctorates in the sciences, engineering, and in the health professions. The land-grant colleges also contribute significantly to the training of future Reserve and Regular officers of our armed services through ROTC programs.

This record of achievement is worthy of our attention. All our society, directly or indirectly, has been a beneficiary of the land-grant system. When the act was passed in 1862, only 1 out of 1,500 youngsters went to college. Today one out of three goes, and land-grant colleges have filled a gap. The Nation is up against vast educational demands again. College enrollments are expected to double in the next 10 years. Hopefully, this remarkable system can guide us to meet the vast challenges in bringing educational opportunities within the reach of still more of our capable youth.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, July 2 marks the 100th anniversary of President Lincoln's signing of the Morrill Land-Grant Act. A milestone in the history of public education, the act provided for the establishment of at least one college in each State by endowments obtained through the selling of Federal land. At present there 68 such institutions, located in all of the 50 States and in Puerto Rico.

Since the Presidential proclamation a year ago requesting the celebration of this significant centennial, the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges has sponsored a variety of programs aimed at assessing the evolution of land-grant colleges in particular, and the problems which higher education in general confronts today. The centennial program has occasioned conferences, lecture tours, publications, films, television series, opinions of foreign observers, and seminars of local citizens, all of which have helped to evaluate the three facets of the land-grant college effort—teaching, research, and public service.

Today it is fitting for us to join the 138 national organizations and the many individuals, both American and foreign, in commemorating the Morrill Land-Grant Act. Let us review the nature of the land-grant colleges.

We tend to take for granted our system of public education. But we cannot forget that this system is the result of a lengthy evolution. In the times when the Morrill Act was conceived, most American colleges had been founded by religious denominations and were exclusively concerned with teaching men the so-called professions, following the European tradition. The Morrill Act, then, was revolutionary in its emphasis on practical education, especially in the study of agriculture. The men who originated the act had an eye for the future.

Justin Morrill knew from personal experience the needs of the working American. He wrote—

> My sympathies are all for the working man. I was brought up on a farm and know how to plant corn, to pull flax, and to dig potatoes.

No longer strict imitators, Americans had launched their own ideas of education, of which they can be justly proud. As Andrew White, former Cornell University president, has said—

> It is, in my opinion, a service which deserves to be ranked with those of Hamilton in advocating the Constitution, of Jefferson in acquiring Louisiana, and of Clay in giving us a truly American policy. Mr. Morrill's service is the more noteworthy when we consider the time it was rendered, the darkest period of the Civil War.

The contributions of the land-grant colleges to agriculture through education and research have been immense, and it is interesting to note that the U.S. Department of Agriculture, with which these colleges have cooperated closely and fruitfully, is also celebrating its centennial this year.

The history of the land-grant system has proved the fallacy of the hypothesis that the quantity of students must decrease the quality of learning. Twenty-five of the 42 American Nobel Prize Winners who studied in this country earned their degrees in land-grant institutions. In 1862 one American in 1,500 went to college. Today one out of three high school graduates attends college and land-grant colleges graduate more than one-fifth of these students.

Thus far, I have spoken in general of the achievements of the land-grant system. But it is important to see in detail what they have accomplished, and I would like to cite as one example the accomplishments of Rutgers University, of which I am a graduate and former trustee.

In 1864 the New Jersey State legislature established the Rutgers Scientific School as the State's land-grant college. It was founded on the principle that no race, no religion, no economic background, could prohibit the prospective student's entry into the institution, and it has held to this principle. In the last century Rutgers has made many significant contributions to agricultural and technical knowledge.

Rutgers University is only one of the land-grant colleges, and if one multiplies its achievements by the nearly 70 land-grant colleges now in existence, one can appreciate the tremendous progress they have made in the past, and are still making, and will continue to make in the future. I should like to pay tribute to the land-grant colleges for their eager shouldering of responsibilities for education in a constantly changing society. Theirs has been a most effective method for insuring equality of opportunity in American education.

MORRILL ACT CENTENNIAL AND LAND-GRANT BENEFITS TO MISSOURI

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, today marks the centennial of one of the great events in American history—an event which ranks as one of the basic steps which the Congress has taken to assure that democracy would grow and flourish.

On July 2, 1862, President Lincoln signed the Morrill Act which made it possible for institutions throughout the country to provide education for all who had ability and the desire to learn.

The State of Missouri was an early beneficiary of this far-reaching and significant congressional action. The University of Missouri, which was created in 1839, was closed down for a while during 1862, when Federal troops occupied the university building. Under the act of that year, however, the university received 330,000 acres of land, the proceeds from which were to be used for the development of instructional facilities in agriculture and mechanical arts.

The importance of the Morrill Act to our university can be seen when it is realized that until 1867 there was no State appropriation for university operation. The College of Agriculture was established in 1870; and another immediate result of the Morrill Act was

the establishment of the now world-famous School of Mines and Metallurgy at Rolla, Mo., in 1871.

Under the second Morrill Act of 1890, Lincoln University at Jefferson City, Mo., became a land-grant college; and in the following year, industrial and agricultural courses were made part of the curriculum.

This institution—founded in 1866, as a school to serve the needs of the newly freed Negro—has grown and prospered to become one of the great educational institutions of our State.

The growth of both the University of Missouri and Lincoln University would not have been possible without the assistance and encouragement of the act which we are commemorating today. The same is true of schools throughout our country, and it is indeed fitting that as we view the history of the past 100 years, we also take encouragement from the ever more important role our land-grant colleges and universities will play in the future. For as the demands on all institutions of higher learning increase, the goal of providing education for all who have ability and who desire it becomes increasingly difficult.

Those who have worked closely with these universities know they will be able to fill this goal, and I am sure they will continue to give the training which provided our country with 25 of the 42 living American Nobel Prize winners.

I join in saluting our great land-grant institutions, and am particularly pleased that the State of Missouri has played a major role in the celebration of this event. Charles Guggenheim & Associates, a distinguished motion picture company from St. Louis, has made the half-hour centennial documentary film which will be used this year and in succeeding years to tell the land-grant story.

Dr. Elmer Ellis, president of the University of Missouri, has been one of the leading members of the Centennial Committee of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Mr. President, it is a great honor to join with my colleagues in commemorating one of the great events in American history.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 316 OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING LEASE TRANSFERRING TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on Senate Joint Resolution 201.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 201) to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed, which was, on page 1, line 9, strike out all after "(1)" over through and including "finds" on page 2, line 1, and insert "the Secretary finds that".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate passed this measure. The House has added a minor amendment which does not change the joint resolution at all, and is in accord with the views of my good friend, the Senator from Georgia, who introduced the joint resolution.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate Joint Resolution 201.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand that this came out by unanimous vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House? Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW INCORPORATING THE TEXAS & PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 3025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3025) to supplement certain provisions of Federal law incorporating the Texas and Pacific Railway Co. in order to give certain additional authority to such company, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in addition to the powers conferred by the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the Texas Pacific Railroad Company and to aid in the construction of its road, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1871 (16 Stat. 573), as supplemented by the Act of May 2, 1872 (17 Stat. 59), the Act of March 3, 1873 (17 Stat. 598), the Act of June 22, 1874 (18 Stat. 197), and the Act of February 9, 1923 (42 Stat. 1223). The Texas and Pacific Railway Company shall have the right and authority, subject to the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act and any Act supplemental thereto, to acquire securities or stock of, or property from, any other carrier.

SEC. 2. The capital stock of The Texas and Pacific Railway Company, heretofore fixed by its board of directors pursuant to the provisions of the Act of February 9, 1923, at $75,000,000 may be increased at any time in such amounts as do not result in more than $100,000,000 of such company's capital stock outstanding and as are agreed to by resolution of its board of directors duly adopted in accordance with such company's bylaws and with the consent of the holders of a majority in amount of its then outstanding capital stock, expressed by vote in person or by proxy at a meeting of said stockholders called for the purpose upon such notice as such bylaws require. The provisions of the Act of February 9, 1923, with respect to the additional capital stock authorized by such Act (except with respect to the aggregate amount thereof), shall be applicable to the additional capital stock authorized by this Act and, in addition thereto, the par value of the capital stock of said company and the number of shares thereof shall, subject to the limitations of this Act, be in such amount as may be determined from time to time by resolution of such company's board of directors duly adopted in accordance with such company's bylaws and with the consent of the holders of a majority in amount of its then outstanding capital stock, expressed by vote in person or by proxy at a meeting of said stockholders called for the purpose upon such notice as such bylaws require.

SEC. 3. All power and authority granted to The Texas and Pacific Railway Company by this Act, the Act incorporating such company, and Acts supplemental thereto, shall be subject to the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act and any Acts supplemental thereto.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the House has passed this bill with an amendment; and I ask that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The only point involved is the name of the company. The Senate version of the bill uses the words "the company"; and the word "The" is a part of the name of the company. By means of its amendment, the House has corrected the bill accordingly.

Therefore, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CHURCH AND STATE—PRAYER ISSUE NEEDS COOL HEADS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of our country, termed with affection "the Bill of Rights," were adopted on the demand of men who had won the Revolutionary War.

The very first amendment provides:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

America was settled by men and women in search of religious and political liberty. The makers of our Constitution provided three equal and coordinate branches of our Federal Government—legislative, executive, and judicial. Article I of our Bill of Rights provides complete separation of church and state.

It is important for Americans to maintain the constitutional principle that we support Supreme Court decisions, even when we may not agree with them. Our Supreme Court has the duty and responsibility to interpret the laws of our country.

Many letters and telegrams have come to me from my constituents critical of the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States prohibiting official prayers in public schools. Regarding this and any other decision of our Supreme Court, any person who urges disregard or violation of such decision is resisting law and order.

This decision held that State governments or our Federal Government are prohibited from prescribing by law "any particular form of prayer which is to be used as an official prayer in carrying on any program of governmentally sponsored religious activity." Specifically, the decision states that public authority—States and boards of education—may not compose prayers and require

them to be used in our public schools. As I read this decision, it does not prohibit groups of parents from proposing voluntary prayers in schools, nor does it prohibit an opportunity for a period of silent prayer and meditation. This would not be violative of the Court's decision.

The Supreme Court rejects the use of public authority to support religious programs. It does not reject private initiative.

It happens I am a chuch member. I fully agree with our President in his stated belief that people should pray more in their homes and teach their children to do the same. Individual citizens, organizations, and various churches should emphasize the importance of religion and belief in God.

Certainly, this recent decision is the law and must be obeyed, except in the remote event that the Constitution of our country is amended in the manner provided in the Constitution itself, or until and unless this decision is overruled by a decision of the Supreme Court in a future case.

Mr. President, in the Washington Post of July 1, under the caption "Church and State—Prayer Issue Needs Cool Heads." There was a fine, thoughtful, informative and convincing article written by Roscoe Drummond, one of America's foremost news analysts, whose column is widely read.

I ask unanimous consent that this article appear at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks, and I embody it as part of my remarks on this subject.

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

CHURCH AND STATE—PRAYER ISSUE NEEDS COOL HEADS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is no good alternative to accepting in good spirit and good faith the Supreme Court's decision that the Constitution prohibits official prayers in the public schools.

All of the alternatives seem to me dangerous, unwise, and undesirable.

In the first flush of emotional distaste for the Court's ruling—which I confess to sharing—some Members of Congress go so far as to imply that the best answer is refusal by the State and local governments to abide by the Supreme Court decision and rely on public support to discredit Federal enforcement.

Nothing could be worse; nothing could be more pernicious; nothing could do more to undermine the teachings of a religiously reverential nation. The duty of the President is to enforce the laws of the land—and he will do so. If State and local governments adopt the practice of deciding which laws they will obey, how can Government avoid the whirlwind which will come from teaching that citizens, too, can decide which laws they will obey and get away with it?

I am certain that Governors, mayors, school boards, and the public will reject nullification as unworthy, unworkable, and un-American.

Another facet of the response to the Court's decision affecting prayer in the public schools is the recurring proposal that, since some do not like the Court's rulings, something should be done about the Court itself; reduce the length of term (now lifetime) the Justices serve and reduce, if possible, its authority to determine what is constitutional and what is unconstitutional.

The consequence would be chaos—or something worse. To reduce the length of terms in any meaningful way would put into the hands of the President the ability to reshape the Court to suit his wishes. Franklin Roosevelt tried that once; his Court-packing plan was overwhelmingly defeated.

If Congress attempts to deny to the Supreme Court the right to decide constitutional questions, it simply means that there will be 50 State courts deciding constitutional questions every which way. There would, in effect, be 50 different versions of the Constitution and a long stride toward a dis-United States of America.

A legal and rational alternative to the ruling that voluntary, nondenominational prayer in the public schools is unconstitutional is an amendment to the Constitution making voluntary, nondenominational prayer constitutional.

We ought to be very slow and very deliberate before we do anything to tamper with one of the most vital, fundamental, and distinctive ingredients of the American system of government—the principle of separation of church and state.

As one who strongly supports the concept of separation of church and state as the happiest and best form of a free society—as does President Kennedy—I would counsel those who think they want to amend the first amendment (which erects the wall of separation between church and government) to ponder long and prayerfully.

At a time when the principle of separation of church and state is in danger of being compromised by those who favor Federal or State aid to religious-based schools, the Court's decision is the strongest possible security. It buttresses the President's position that such aid would be unconstitutional.

I find it difficult to conceive of any change in the first amendment which would not erode the principle and purpose for which it was put into the Constitution: to keep church out of the state, to keep the state out of the church to guarantee absolute freedom of religious worship without giving special favor to one religion or even equal favors to all religions.

HOUR OF DECISION FOR CARE FOR ELDERLY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, for years the ruling house of delegates of the American Medical Association and its powerful, big-spending lobby in Washington have been exerting every effort to block action on legislation to provide medical care for the elderly within our social security system.

The American Medical Association has compiled an infamous record of opposition to any and all legislation designed to provide better and cheaper medical facilities for the American people. The American Medical Association in the past resisted free diagnostic centers for tuberculosis and cancer, Red Cross blood banks, Federal aid to medical education, voluntary health insurance, school health services, and Federal aid to public health.

Mr. President, this small band of willful men who dictate the policy of the American Medical Association are using any and every tactic they can conceive of to deny hospital care to those Americans who need it the most.

In a recent speech before a Rotary Club audience, Dr. Edward M. Annis, head of the American Medical Association speakers bureau, stated that "the Health Secretary would become a 'czar of medicine' ruling over the health needs of 14 million 'wards of the state'."

Mr. President, the insidious distortion by an American Medical Association official is typical of the deceit employed by that organization to mislead the American people. The legislation which we are to consider would not make anyone a "ward of the state." It would do just the opposite, it would protect our elderly citizens from being reduced to pauperism by a prolonged illness. It would give these people an added measure of independence and security. Paticnts would be free to select their own doctors and doctors would be free to reject or accept professional employment and to determine details of medical treatment. American Medical Association propaganda notwithstanding, there would be no Government intrusion into the traditional doctor-patient relationship.

Mr. President, the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] have worked hard to provide the Senate with an opportunity to act on this needed legislation. I welcome this opportunity and shall give the proposed amendments my strong support. I feel that the amendments retain the basic features of the King-Anderson bill which has been supported by our President. These amendments provide for medical care for the elderly within the framework of our social security system. The social security—in other words, old-age and survivors and disability insurance system—is an actuarially sound insurance system. The amendments also would extend coverage to many persons who are not eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits. This will result in a net cost of $50 million in 1964 out of general revenue, but this annual cost will drop sharply in following years and eventually disappear. Those elderly men and women not presently enjoying coverage within our social security system number about 2,500,000. Their life expectancy is not projected into the far distant future.

Furthermore, it would permit hospitals to designate a private organization—Blue Cross or a similar voluntary organization experienced in dealing with hospitals—to handle the more sensitive administrative functions of the program. The designated organization would receive the bills for services and pay them. It would act as an intermediary between hospitals and the Social Security Administration.

Let us not be deceived by the smokescreen of fraudulent arguments and untenable claims made by the medical politicians who appear to rule the American Medical Association. Let us consider the welfare of 17 million Americans 65 years of age or older who live in fear that their economic well-being will be wiped out by a prolonged illness or serious accident, that they are likely to be dependent on the kindness and generosity of relatives, or upon State welfare agencies, unless we pass the bipartisan supported amendments offered by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico and cosponsored by many Senators on both sides of the aisle.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON SCHOOL PRAYER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, several days ago I placed in the RECORD an article by David Lawrence relating to the prayer issue. Today I wish to place in the RECORD two other very fine articles which I think clearly bring light into the picture. In the present situation there is a great deal of confusion as to the reading of the language of the decision. Perhaps the two articles I have in mind will add light if people are seeking light.

The first article is entitled "Prayer Issue Needs Cool Heads," and was written by Roscoe Drummond. It was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Sunday, July 1. The second article is entitled "Religious Battle an Old Story," and was written by Drew Pearson for the Washington Merry-Go-Round.

It is quite significant that many people do not have the historical background with respect to why the amendment in question became a part of the Constitution.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD.

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

CHURCH AND STATE—PRAYER ISSUE NEEDS COOL HEADS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is no good alternative to accepting in good spirit and good faith the Supreme Court's decision that the Constitution prohibits official prayers in the public schools.

All of the alternatives seem to me dangerous, unwise and undesirable.

In the first flush of emotional distaste for the Court's ruling—which I confess to sharing—some Members of Congress go so far as to imply that the best answer is refusal by the State and local governments to abide by the Supreme Court decision and rely on public support to discredit Federal enforcement.

Nothing could be worse; nothing could be more pernicious; nothing could do more to undermine the teachings of a religiously reverential nation. The duty of the President is to enforce the laws of the land—and he will do so. If State and local governments adopt the practice of deciding which laws they will obey, how can government avoid the whirlwind which will come from teaching that citizens, too, can decide which laws they will obey and get away with it?

I am certain that Governors, mayors, school boards and the public will reject nullification as unworthy, unworkable and un-American.

Another facet of the response to the Court's decision affecting prayer in the public schools is the recurring proposal that, since some do not like the Court's rulings, something should be done about the Court itself; reduce the length of term (now lifetime) the Justices serve and reduce, if possible, its authority to determine what is constitutional and what is unconstitutional.

The consequence would be chaos—or something worse. To reduce the length of terms in any meaningful way would put into the hands of the President the ability to reshape the Court to suit his wishes. Franklin Roosevelt tried that once; his Court-packing plan was overwhelmingly defeated.

If Congress attempts to deny to the Supreme Court the right to decide constitutional questions, it simply means that there will be 50 State courts deciding constitutional questions every which way. There would, in effect, be 50 different versions of the Constitution and a long stride toward a dis-United States of America.

A legal and rational alternative to the ruling that voluntary, nondenominational prayer in the public schools is unconstitutional is an amendment to the Constitution making voluntary, nondenominational prayer constitutional.

We ought to be very slow and very deliberate before we do anything to tamper with one of the most vital, fundamental and distinctive ingredients of the American system of government—the principle of separation of church and state.

As one who strongly supports the concept of separation of church and state as the happiest and best form of a free society—as does President Kennedy—I would counsel those who think they want to amend the first amendment (which erects the wall of separation between church and government) to ponder long and prayerfully.

At a time when the principle of separation of church and state is in danger of being compromised by those who favor Federal or State aid to religious-based schools, the Court's decision is the strongest possible security. It buttresses the President's position that such aid would be unconstitutional.

I find it difficult to conceive of any change in the first amendment which would not erode the principle and purpose for which it was put into the Constitution: to keep church out of the state, to keep the state out of the church to guarantee absolute freedom of religious worship without giving special favor to one religion or even equal favors to all religions.

RELIGIOUS BATTLE AN OLD STORY

(By Drew Pearson)

Near Orange, Va., just south of Washington, there is a grove of ancient oak trees under which was held a meeting 174 years ago which led to last week's Supreme Court decision banning state prayers in public schools.

It is quite a beautiful grove of oak trees, now made into a park by the junior chamber of commerce, and the American public has almost forgotten what went on there. The Supreme Court justices who wrote the opinion banning state prayer, however, had not.

It was near Orange, Va., that John Leland, a crusading Baptist minister, sat down with James Madison, later President of the United States, and worked out the first amendment to the Constitution which reads in part:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Behind this first amendment, or the first section of the Bill of Rights as it is called, has been a long struggle which many Americans, now inclined to take their current freedoms for granted, have forgotten.

John Leland, the Baptist who helped pioneer the first amendment, had migrated to Virginia from Grafton, Mass., not far from Salem Hill, scene of the hanging of witches. He knew how Baptist Roger Williams had been banished from the Massachusetts Bay Colony, and how Quakers had been hanged on Boston Common because they sought to worship in their own way. They were hanged and banished by the Puritans who had come to New England to seek religious freedom but failed to grant it to others.

In Massachusetts, Leland's marriage to Sally Devine was not officially recognized because it was performed by a Baptist preacher, and, if he had moved to Connecticut, he could not have been sure of owning property because the controlling Congregational Church sometimes seized the property of non-Congregationalists.

In Virginia, the Episcopal Church, then the State church, was not as fanatical, though it did ban Quakers and would not permit Baptists and other religions to conduct services. Virginia taxes, however, were collected for one State church, and no preacher could preach without a State license.

Before Leland arrived in Virginia, another Baptist, James Ireland, had been horsewhipped, jailed, threatened, pulled from pulpits, ducked in ponds, and driven out of town. Leland was a huge man and fared better. He preached 3,000 sermons throughout most of Virginia. And thanks in part to his zeal, partly to increased tolerance, partly to the foresight of Thomas Jefferson and Madison, Virginia passed a law in 1776 permitting anyone to preach.

Ten years later in 1785, Jefferson wrote a provision which became Virginia State law and which contained these stirring words:

"We, the General Assembly of Virginia, do enact that no man shall be compelled to frequent or suggest any religious worship, place or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested or burdened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge or effect their civil capacities."

But though the battle for religious freedom in Virginia was won, Massachusetts did not go nearly as far as Virginia and the Constitution for all the 13 Colonies had not been finally drafted or ratified.

It was at this point in 1788 that John Leland met with James Madison in the grove of oak trees near Orange, Va.

Leland insisted there must be a guarantee of religious freedom in the new Constitution. Madison feared Massachusetts would not ratify if it were inserted. Finally, the two reached a compromise. Madison was not sure he could become a delegate to the Constitutional Convention. Leland agreed to support him for nomination as a delegate if Madison would pledge that the first amendment to the Constitution would set up guarantees for religious liberty, freedom of speech and the press.

In Philadelphia later, Madison carried out his promise.

That was how the constitutional provision was adopted which caused the Supreme Court last week to rule, in effect, that to require Jewish children or nonbelievers to participate in a prayer drafted by the State of New York infringed upon the free exercise of their religion.

POLICY STATEMENT BY ADJUTANTS GENERAL ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the creation of an ever-stronger nuclear and conventional defense force is necessary for the security of the United States. Naturally, this involves a well-balanced fighting force.

Recently, I was privileged to receive from Maj. Gen. Ralph J. Olson a policy statement adopted by the Adjutants General Association of the United States.

As the Congress attempts to review—and provide the wherewithal to fully meet—our needs, the statement of policy, I believe, deserves the consideration of Members of Congress, and particularly of the Armed Services Committees.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF POLICY

(Adopted by the Adjutants General Association of the United States at its annual meeting April 30 to May 2, 1962, Summit Hotel, New York, N.Y.

The Adjutants General Association of the United States, recognizing the military threat to the peace and security of the United States and other countries of the free world, commends the President of the United States for determined, courageous and positive actions undertaken during the past year to strengthen the Nation's defenses. We fully support his statement that our country should have a choice other than holocaust or surrender. Such threats to freedom will continue so long as aggressive nations maintain massive conventional forces and nuclear attack capabilities. It is imperative, therefore, that the military buildup of the active military forces of the United States be sustained, for freedom in this period of severe international tension can be secured only by the maintenance of nuclear and conventional defense forces superior to those of any possible aggressor.

The Active Military Forces of the United States require the backup and support of effective Reserve Forces in partial mobilizations, such as we are now experiencing, or in general mobilization.

Special note is made of the President's desire to raise the level of mobilization readiness of National Guard and other Reserve Forces, and especially to develop a force of early ready National Guard divisions and supporting Army National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve nondivisional units. The early ready divisions and supporting units are to be placed in high priority status.

The attainment of the highest practicable levels of combat readiness in order that Reserve Forces might be deployed for combat or overseas training in the shortest time possible following mobilization is necessary. The division and nondivisional units of the Army National Guard are currently at the highest level of mobilization readiness ever attained. This level of readiness can be escalated by authorizing higher manning levels, increased issues of weapons and equipment and allocation of more training time for staff and other personnel.

There exists now in the Army National Guard a priority force of eight divisions. The National Guard is prepared to provide the Army the types of organization required for balanced Army force upon mobilization.

To carry out the President's proposal to raise the readiness of Reserve Forces, the Department of Defense proposed that the strength of the Army's Reserve components be substantially reduced, that more than 850 company size units be eliminated (approximately 500 Army National Guard) and 4 Army National Guard and 4 U.S. Army Reserve divisions be deactivated.

The Defense Department plan failed to gain approval of the Army General Staff Committee on National Guard and Army Reserve Policy and the Reserve Forces Policy Board of the Defense Department, the two Committees charged in law with responsibility for advising the Secretary of the Army and Secretary of Defense on National Guard and Reserve affairs.

The Defense Department plan, if implemented, would severely limit the capability of the Army National Guard to fulfill its Federal and State missions as the Nation's first line Reserve Force. The plan is deficient for these reasons:

(a) It is in fact a reduction of our conventional forces thereby placing increased reliance on nuclear weapons. This contradicts the need, so sadly lacking, for a flexible response to varying levels of aggression;

(b) Reduces the capability of the States to carry out vital recovery missions in a post thermo-nuclear attack period;

(c) Limits the opportunities for the youth of our country to participate voluntarily in part-time military training.

(d) Decreases the strengths of nonpriority force units to levels below those at which effective training can be conducted requiring an excessive number of "fillers" upon mobilization and greater postmobilization training time;

(e) Establishes strengths of priority force units at unrealistic levels (85 to 90 percent) requiring commanders thereof to devote the greater portion of their time to recruiting and administration and correspondingly less time to training; and

(f) Concentrates and freezes the liability and hazard for repeated recall to active service on a relatively small number of men, organizations, and communities designated as the "priority force" and precludes rotation of priority force designation among available units.

This association, being responsive to the President's desire to have the most effective Reserve Force possible, submits that the desired high-priority Reserve Force for the Army can best be achieved by certain actions to develop that force largely within the Army National Guard without reducing the number or effectiveness of nonpriority units now in being.

We strongly recommend and respectfully urge that these specific actions be taken:

1. Raise the strength level of the Army National Guard to 412,000 to provide the required additional strength for high-priority units.

2. Permit the rotation of required high-priority units based on capabilities.

3. The existing 27 divisions and other nondivisional units of the Army National Guard be retained and the necessary realinement of nondivisional units be accomplished by conversion of those existing units to types necessary to meet the Army's mobilization requirements.

4. Additional mobilization training for the headquarters and staffs of high-priority organizations be provided by restoring such staff training time as has been deleted in recent years.

5. Any reorganization or realinement be accomplished as a parallel action with the reorganization of the Active Army and Reserve components in accordance with the ROAD concept.

MISUSE OF TIMBER RESERVES POINTS UP NEED FOR WILDERNESS BILL

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Mr. Brooks Atkinson, former drama critic for the New York Times, now writes an interesting column called "Critic at Large."

I am particularly interested in the article written by Mr. Atkinson for June 29, 1962, wherein he states in his headline that the "Misuse of the National Timber Reserves Points Up Need for Wilderness Bill."

One paragraph of his fine column is especially interesting to me. He states:

Under existing law, mining prospectors who lease land to search for minerals in the Federal forests can cut the timber on their patents. The Comptroller General stated that 12 prospectors who paid less than $4,000 for rights to mining exploration on Government lands sold more than $500,000 worth of timber. In the Rogue River National Forest in Oregon, $150,000 worth of timber was sold on land leased for $2,375.

The reference which Mr. Atkinson makes is to the notorious Al Serena mine project in my State.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the entire article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MISUSE OF THE NATIONAL TIMBER RESERVES POINTS UP NEED FOR WILDERNESS BILL

(By Brooks Atkinson)

In discussing the wilderness bill on June 1, this column was too bland about one factor.

It surmised that the timber on Government lands is now more scupulously protected than it was a half century ago: "We are not that callous now—or, are we?" It appears that the disclaimer at the end of the sentence was justified. For the Comptroller General of the United States recently asked Congress "to halt large-scale exploitation of national timber reserves" on lands leased for mining exploration, according to a Washington dispatch to this newspaper.

Under existing law, mining prospectors who lease land to search for minerals in Federal forests can cut the timber on their patents. The Controller General stated that 12 prospectors who paid less than $4,000 for rights to mining exploration on Government lands sold more than $500,000 worth of timber. In the Rogue River National Forest in Oregon, $150,000 worth of timber was sold on land leased for $2,375. The General Accounting Office files show no mineral production on any of these leaseholds.

Government timber is not so securely locked up as most of us had assumed. But locking up national resources is the objection that the lumber industry, among others, has against the wilderness bill—now in committee in the House after having been passed by the Senate. Although the bill affects only 2 percent of the lands already owned by the Government, it proposes to withhold from commercial exploitation certain primitive areas that have special values in their natural state.

The American Forest Products Industries believes that if the citizens understand the bill, they will oppose it. Deprive the American housewife of "kitchen towels, newspapers, bath tissues, beautiful wood paneling for her home, books and thousands of other wood-derived products on which she depends—then, brother, you have started a commotion that will be heard around the world," according to a mimeographed bulletin released by the Forest Industries. That is a stupid threat, expressed in the vernacular of the street.

It need not be taken as representative of the entire lumber industry, which is not unaware of public responsibilities. Engaged in modern tree farming, it endeavors to operate on the principle of the multiple use of forests, not only to cut timber, but also to replant, conserve water sources, preserve wildlife and make forests available for public recreation. Lumber companies on occasion have gone further. A few years ago the Lee Tidewater Cypress Co. in Florida preserved the largest stand of native cypress in the Nation by giving some of it and selling the rest at bargain prices to the National Audubon Societies.

But the public interest in primitive lands goes beyond industry and recreation. It is directly related to the possibility of a calamitous situation. In a speech on conservation in New York recently, the Duke of Edinburgh made a startling assertion that represents a common conviction among conservationists: "Our descendants may be forced to live in a world in which man is the only living creature." Man, the greatest of predators, is capable of destroying all other forms of

life by exploitation and the use of poison sprays. He can also destroy himself.

Unless the various forms of plant and animal life can be kept in some sort of balance, Americans will make a fatal break in the chain of life that links human beings to their past in nature and to other forms of life today.

To preserve our status as human beings, we shall need these few wilderness areas as museums, which will preserve our natural heritage; laboratories, which will give scientists the raw materials for research into forms of life and the connection between forms of life; and as shrines, which will give us a sense of proportion in our relation to the universe. "What is man that thou art mindful of him?" is an ancient question that enlightened people will never stop trying to answer.

Two percent of the lands already owned by the Government is a small price to pay for the physical and spiritual health of future Americans.

THE MIRACLE OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was just 100 years ago this past May that Congress passed and President Lincoln signed two pieces of legislation of far-reaching significance to our entire country. The first was a bill which created a Department of Agriculture in the Federal Government and the second was the Homestead Act which opened half a continent of new lands to be converted into family farms, largely by the resourcefulness and labor of the families who settled on them.

It was exactly 100 years ago today—July 2, 1862—that President Lincoln signed the Land-Grant College Act which set aside portions of the federally owned lands to be sold for the endowment of at least one college in each State, "to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

These three acts of Congress in 1862, just 100 years ago, are the foundation on which were built many of the institutions supporting American family farming today, and, indeed, many of the institutions which sustain our democratic way of life.

At an even earlier period in history our beloved Thomas Jefferson observed:

> Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind * * * as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered and manners and opinions change, with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times.

This is precisely what has happened in rural America in the 100 years since Congress passed those historic acts. A Commissioner and nine staff members began functioning as a Department of Agriculture on July 1, 1862. It was 6 years later before the new Department had a building of its own. Twenty-seven years later the Department of Agriculture was raised to Cabinet status. By that time the number of employees had increased to 488.

Two years later the weather service was transferred from the Army Signal Corps to the Department of Agriculture and the number of employees increased to 1,577. Time and space do not permit the listing of all the significant growing points in the Department of Agriculture.

EARLY INTEREST IN THE CONSUMER

I do want to emphasize, however, that the Department of Agriculture soon became more than a technical and scientific agency for the education and assistance of farmers. By 1897 the work of the Department was organized into four bureaus: Plant Industry, Chemistry, Forestry, and Soils. Dr. Wiley, the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, recognized the need for regulations governing the preparation and processing of foods for human use to prevent their adulteration and contamination. He became a leader and a spokesman for consumers who desired legislation in this field. His laboratories disclosed substandard food products offered for sale in the markets. In response to these activities Congress passed the Pure Food and Drug Act in 1906 and entrusted the enforcement of it to the Bureau of Chemistry, under the direction of Dr. Wiley, in the Department of Agriculture. Later, home economists and research and education in the field of home economics, nutrition, clothing, and family living became a part of the growing Department of Agriculture.

REGULATORY WORK IN DISEASE CONTROL

Regulatory work in the field of animal and crop diseases was undertaken at an early date and has grown until it now forms an important part of the institutions serving family farming in America.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

"Tama Jim" Wilson, of Iowa, was appointed Secretary of Agriculture in 1897 and served 16 years under three Presidents, McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, and Taft. He did more than any other single individual, in those early years, to make the Department of Agriculture a vital part of the Federal Government. Gifford Pinchot became the first chief of a newly created Forest Service, in 1905, under Secretary Wilson, and made conservation of natural resources a national issue. His work in the field of forestry conservation was later supplemented in the field of soils by Dr. Marbut and Dr. Hugh Bennett. They directed the classification and mapping of the soils of America and developed national educational and technical assistance programs in the field of soil conservation.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO AGRICULTURE

Soon after the turn of the century farm leaders became concerned that industrial progress was outstripping improvements in farming and farm life. President Theodore Roosevelt, in 1908, was persuaded to appoint a Country Life Commission to look into ways and means of improving rural life. It concluded, among other things, that more adequate credit would be of help to farmers in their efforts to improve their farms and become farm owners.

It was 1916, however, before these recommendations were translated into a Federal Farm Credit Act setting up 12 cooperative regional land banks to make land mortgage loans to farmers. These banks in the first instance were independent of the Department of Agriculture, but in recent years they have been very closely associated with it.

When farm prices fell sharply after World War I, farm leaders proposed that the Government should give greater assistance to farmer marketing cooperatives. In order to clarify the position of large cooperatives and exempt their usual business activities from existing antitrust legislation, the Capper-Volstead Act was passed in 1922. Assistance to farm cooperatives has been an important activity of the Department of Agriculture since that time.

Farmers' financial distress continued in spite of the best efforts of cooperative marketing and cooperative farm supply associations. Agitation for Government farm relief measures finally resulted in the passage of an Agricultural Marketing Act in 1929, which was administered by a Federal Farm Board outside the Department of Agriculture. The history of its failure and its replacement by an Agricultural Adjustment Administration within the Department of Agriculture in 1933 is well known to most people today. Almost all of the economic assistance programs carried on by the Department of Agriculture today are an outgrowth of programs started in the 1930's.

HOMESTEAD ACT DISTINCTIVELY AMERICAN

Let me offer a few brief comments now on the Homestead Act and the results of it. The goal of most colonists in the earliest years of civilized life in this country was family farm ownership and operation.

Popular demand for a Homestead Act was a natural outgrowth of the basic drives of the earliest American colonists, their decendents and their associates. They believed that families who settled on new lands and developed family farms, should be permitted full ownership of the land. To a certain extent the Homestead Act merely eased prevailing current practices on the frontier.

HOMESTEADER FAMILIES WERE SELF-RELIANT

They asked only for land from which they might develop their own farms. The rest they could and would do for themselves.

Mr. Chickering's design for the commemorative homestead stamp, which was released recently, portrays the spirit of those who carved their homes from the prairies. The bleak sky and the treeless vista bespeak a lonely life in which the homesteader and his family struggled to develop a productive farm.

In the century since President Lincoln approved the Homestead Act, 1,622,107 homesteaders have claimed 270,216,874 acres. They have cultivated and improved their farms. They have built homes and raised families on them. Daniel Freeman was the first person to acquire a farm under the new act. He homesteaded 160 acres near Beatrice in Gage County, Nebr. The Homestead National Monument of America is now located on that land.

Although thousands of families took advantage of the Homestead Act in the first years of its operation, it was not until 1913 that homesteading reached its highest annual rate, with 11 million acres homesteaded in that year. As re-

cently as 1961 there were 438 claims filed under the Homestead Act of 1862 as amended, for 57,000 acres of Government-owned land.

America is the Nation she is today because of our tremendously efficient and productive agriculture based on family farming. And family farming is the backbone of American agriculture today because men and women in the past 100 years have had the personal courage to settle new lands under the Homestead Act of 1862.

COLLEGES PLAY MAJOR ROLE

Turning now to the land-grant colleges, we find that about three-fourths of 1 percent of the population enjoyed the opportunities of a higher education 100 years ago, when the land-grant college or Morrill Act was passed. Each State agreeing to the terms of the act was granted 30,000 acres of Federal lands for each of its Representatives and Senators in Congress. This acreage was to be sold to provide a capital fund on the investment of which the State would pay in perpetuity 5 percent annually to support the college.

Today, 100 years after the Land Grant Act, more than 2,000 colleges and universities are giving a higher education to between 2 and 3 percent of the population. Of these 2,000 colleges and universities, only 68 are land-grant institutions, yet their enrollment is 20 percent of the total college enrollment.

Today's land-grant colleges, with their closely geared research-teaching-extension programs, are being adapted to many phases of scientific research and development.

In 1850 not a single college in the United States was equipped for laboratory teaching. By 1870 only six colleges taught chemistry and physics by the laboratory method. The concept that scientific knowledge could be advanced through a combination of research and teaching was loudly debated in the formative years of the land-grant movement. It took a firm foothold as the agricultural experiment stations became a strong force in the land-grant movement as they did in the 1880's. Their insistence that the land-grant colleges should be institutions where scientific knowledge was sought as well as taught helped the land-grant colleges become scientific centers recognized throughout the world.

These land-grant institutions provide almost all the higher education provided in the field of agriculture and 40 percent of the undergraduate instruction in engineering. They grant 22 percent of all bachelor's degrees, 25 percent of all master's degrees, and 38 percent of doctorates of philosophy.

Resident instruction and research at the colleges, however, did not fully meet the needs of the rural people. So in 1906 the first county agent was appointed to do something about bollweevils, which were destroying cotton in Texas. Other agents were appointed in the South and elsewhere. The value of this extension work was so widely recognized by 1914 that Congress passed the Smith-Lever Act, which provided for cooperative financing of the county agent system operated in each State under the direction of the land-grant college.

MANY INFLUENCES HAVE MOLDED AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

While the legislative acts which created the land-grant college system, the Federal Department of Agriculture, and the opportunity to develop family farms from public lands had a great influence on the development of our present highly efficient family farming, many other influences must be given due recognition. Sons and daughters of farm families from every country of Europe, and from most parts of the world have made important contributions to this great development.

These people brought to America the skills and agricultural know-how of their home communities. They learned from each other and developed new techniques adapted to the new conditions and large acreage available in America.

They brought crops and animals from every part of the world to the United States and adapted and improved them. Hard Red Winter wheat was brought to the United States from the steppes of Russia. Merino sheep were introduced from Spain. Beef and dairy cattle were brought over from Great Britain and Western Europe.

Sugarbeets were introduced from Germany. Rice was introduced from Africa and Asia. Soybeans were more recently introduced from Manchuria. Melons were developed from Southern Asia and African seed strains. Peanuts originally came from South America, the tomato from tropical America, and barley perhaps from Egypt.

The poultry industry which has reached such a high state of productivity in the United States, is a development of species first found in Asia. Although Irish potatoes may have been introduced into the United States from Ireland, records indicate they originally came from the highland areas of South America. Every part of the world has made a contribution to the productivity of the U.S. agriculture.

Industrial development paralleled the growth of agriculture in America. Labor was scarce. Hired farmworkers never became a permanent class. Within a few years they operated their own farms or moved into industrial jobs. Machines were perfected to replace hand labor in producing and harvesting crops. The large acreages in the fields facilitated farming with machines. Unneeded workers on farms found jobs in industry.

With nonfarm jobs readily available for most of those not needed in farming, a scarcity of farmland for cultivation has not developed as in many of the older countries of the world. Because other jobs were available for some members of the family, inheritance laws have not required the subdivision of farms into uneconomical parcels of land as in many parts of the world. Farms and farming lands are bought, sold, and rented each year in every community in the United States. In this way individual farm families adjust their land holdings and their farming operations on a free interprise basis to fit their family labor situation, their health, their equipment, and their livestock.

Throughout the history of U.S. agriculture, every farm family has been free to make as much or as little of its economic opportunities as it wished. Farmers take pride in having attractive homes and farm buildings. High crop yields and well-kept livestock are important in achieving social status and leadership position in American rural communities. Weed-free fields, painted buildings, good fences, and good farm machinery are signs of a well-managed farm. Where these conditions exist, the farm family usually has a leadership role in the rural communities' activities.

Every farm family also shares the great American dream that there is no limit to the opportunities available to the children born on the farm. They may become the best farmers in the community if they desire. Or they may become doctors, lawyers, college professors, or high officials in the Government if they prefer. Every rural community in the United States can point to individuals in high positions in the professions, business, and government, who came from their homes and attended their schools.

HIGH VALUE PLACED ON EDUCATION

Many speak and write of the agricultural revolution or "explosion" of technology on American farms in recent years. But high productivity on American farms is the result of more than the substitution of machines for human labor. It involves more than the use of new pesticides, new fertilizers, and new feeds.

Throughout our entire history the citizens of the United States, both farm and nonfarm, have placed a high value on education. Increased educational training has been recognized as one of the best ways of increasing the productivity of young people. American farmers and farmworkers have more school training and are better educated than ever before. In every State in the United States school training is supplemented with up-to-date, publicly financed adult educational programs on improved techniques in agricultural production.

FEW COUNTRIES APPROACH AMERICAN AGRICULTURE'S PRODUCTIVITY

Several countries with 90 percent of their active male population engaged in agricultural production are unable to feed and clothe their population adequately. Forty percent of all the countries for which statistics are available, utilize 50 percent or more of their workers in agricultural production yet fail to meet the nutritional and clothing needs of their populations. In contrast, of 100 workers in the United States today, only 7 are at work on farms. Few countries in the world approach this record of agricultural productivity. For many years, farm population has been declining while total population was increasing. Only 8 out of each 100 people, including both workers and their families, are now found on farms in the United States.

The small proportion of the total population engaged in agriculture in the

United States is the more noteworthy since agricultural exports fully offset agricultural imports and account for a substantial part of our commercial exports. France, also, almost balances agricultural imports with exports but has about 25 percent of her population on farms. The Netherlands has 20, Italy has 30, and the U.S.S.R. has over 50 percent of her population engaged in farming.

In the past 20 years, agricultural production in the United States has increased more than half. Its rate of increase in recent years has been greater than for any similar period in history.

A farmworker in the United States now produces sufficient agricultural products to support himself and 24 others. In comparison, farmworkers in the U.S.S.R. produce enough for themselves and 4 others at the present time—less than half as much as farmworkers in the United States produced 20 years ago, and a fifth as much as they produce today.

MORE PROGRESS IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE IN PAST 100 YEARS THAN IN THE PREVIOUS 7,500 YEARS

Research and education on plant nutrient needs has resulted in great advances in mineral and synthetic fertilizer production and a doubling in its use in the past 10 years. The amount of cropland cultivated in the United States has remained relatively stable for 40 years, yet, increased use of improved fertilizers together with other technical advances have increased crop output 60 percent.

Antibiotics and other growth-stimulating substances added to hog-, poultry-, and cattle-fattening rations have speeded up rates of growth and fattening, and increased live weight gains per 100 pounds of feed consumed.

To summarize briefly, scientific developments relating to agriculture in the past 100 years, largely originating in the Government-supported agricultural colleges, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, have resulted in more progress in American agriculture during this period than any place else in the world in the previous 7,500 years.

In two decades the American farmer has nearly tripled his output per hour of work. Nothing like this has ever been known in the world before. It is one of the significant and important breakthroughs of human history.

As a result of this remarkable forward surge, one-third fewer U.S. farmers produce food and fiber for one-third more people than 20 years ago—and provide them with better diets for a smaller proportion of their income than can be found anywhere else in the world.

Madam President, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the centennial committee of the Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges for the fine work it has done in connection with the observance of the centennial anniversary of enactment of the Land Grant College Act.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD the names of the centennial committee members and consultants, and also the list of individuals and organizations which have been so generous in making financial contributions to the national centennial fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection?

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

CENTENNIAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman: President Richard A. Harvill, University of Arizona.

President J. D. Boyd, Alcorn A & M College.

President Elmer Ellis, University of Missouri.

President Novice G. Fawcett, Ohio State University.

President John T. Fey, University of Vermont.

President C. Clement French, Washington State University.

President John A. Hannah, Michigan State University.

Chancellor C. M. Hardin, University of Nebraska.

Chancellor M. T. Harrington, Texas A & M College System.

President David D. Henry, University of Illinois.

President J. H. Hilton, Iowa State University.

President F. L. Hovde, Purdue University.

President G. D. Humphrey, University of Wyoming.

President A. N. Jorgensen, University of Connecticut.

President Deane Malott, Cornell University.

President James A. McCain, Kansas State University.

President Eric A. Walker, Pennsylvania State University.

EX-OFFICIO

Chancellor John T. Cardwell, North Carolina State College.

President John A. Perkins, University of Delaware.

CONSULTANTS

President E. D. Eddy, Jr., Chatham College, Pa.

Dr. J. L. Morrill, President Emeritus, University of Minnesota.

Russell I. Thackrey, executive secretary, ASULGC.

Jay Richter, centennial director.

Frances Adams, assistant director.

Herman R. Allen, manager, centennial convocation.

THE NATIONAL CENTENNIAL FUND

Financial support for the centennial program has come from the land-grant institutions themselves, who contributed from their limited budgets a substantial part of the fund, and from organizations and individuals who appreciate the importance of the work that lies ahead for these institutions. The large number of these contributors, and the varied endeavors they represent, reflect the broad base of popular support enjoyed by this democratic system of higher education.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THE NATIONAL CENTENNIAL PROGRAM

Ackerman, Lee, Scottsdale, Ariz.

Adams Dairy, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.

Alabama Flour Mills, Decatur, Ala.

Albers Milling Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Allied Mills, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

Allyn, Stanley C., Dayton, Ohio.

Amburgo Co., Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.

American Agricultural Chemical Co., New York, N.Y.

American Brahman Breeders Association, Houston, Tex.

American Cyanamid Co., New York, N.Y.

American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill.

American Feed Manufacturers Association, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

American Hereford Association, Kansas City, Mo.

American Meat Institute, Chicago, Ill.

American Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.

Anderson, Guy, Safford, Ariz.

Arizona Cattle Feeders' Association, Phoenix, Ariz.

Arizona Cattle Growers Association, Phoenix, Ariz.

Arizona Grain & Seed Association, Mesa, Ariz.

Arizona Land Title & Trust Co., Tucson, Ariz.

Arizona Milling Co., Tucson, Ariz.

Arizona Republic and Phoenix Gazette, Phoenix, Ariz.

Armco Steel Corp., Middletown, Ohio.

Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa.

Atlantic Refining Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Atlas Powder Co., Wilmington, Del.

Avco Corp., New York, N.Y.

B and E Grain Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Baboquivari Cattle Co., Tucson, Ariz.

Baker, Michael, Jr., Inc., Rochester, Pa.

Bank of America, Los Angeles, Calif.

Bartlett & Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Bates Grain Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Beacon Milling Co., Cayuga, N.Y.

Louis D. Beaumont Foundation, Cleveland, Ohio.

Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa.

Boatmen's National Bank, St. Louis, Mo.

Bowman Feed Products, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Brown, Arthur T., Tucson, Ariz.

Brown, Keith S., Amado, Ariz.

The Brunswick Foundation, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

Burlington Industries Foundation, Greensboro, N.C.

Cargill, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.

Carnegie Corp., New York, N.Y.

Central Carolina Farmers Exchange, Inc., Durham, N.C.

Central Soya, Fort Wayne, Ind.

Central States Grain Co., Inc., Kansas City, Mo.

Cereal Institute, Chicago, Ill.

Challenge Feeds, Inc., Atlantic, Iowa.

Champion Spark Plug Co., Toledo, Ohio.

Checkerboard Grain Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Chemlek Laboratories, Inc., Worth, Ill.

Christopher & Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Chrysler Fund, Detroit, Mich.

CIBA Pharmaceutical Products, Inc., Summit, N.J.

Circle One Livestock Co., Inc., Phoenix, Ariz.

City National Bank & Trust Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Cloughly, O. J., St. Louis, Mo.

Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., Columbus, Ohio.

Commonwealth Edison, Chicago, Ill.

Communication Workers of America, Washington, D.C.

Connor Lumber & Land Co., Laona, Wis.

Consumers Cooperative Association, Kansas City, Mo.

Cooperative Grange League, Ithaca, N.Y.

Cooperative League of the USA, Chicago, Ill.

Cooperative Mills, Inc., Baltimore, Md.

Corneli Seed Co., St. Louis, Mo.

Corn Products Co., New York, N.Y.

Corn Products Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Cosby-Hodges Milling Co., Birmingham, Ala.

Cotton Producers Association, Atlanta, Ga.

Dairy Cooperative Association, Portland, Oreg.

Dannen Mills, Inc., St. Joseph, Mo.

Darling & Co., Chicago, Ill.

De Concini, Evo, Tucson, Ariz.

Desert Citrus Growers Co., Phoenix, Ariz.

Desert Gold Feed Co., Inc., Liberty, Mo.
The Detroit Edison Co., Detroit, Mich.
Diamond Alkali Co. Foundation, Cleveland, Ohio.
Diamond State Telephone Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
Distributors Feed & Grain Corp., Buffalo, N.Y.
Doane Agricultural Service, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.
Double Z–S Farms, Inc., Tucson, Ariz.
Doughboy Industries, Inc., New Richmond, Wis.
Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.
E. F. Drew & Co., Inc., Boonton, N.J.
Drey, Leo A., St. Louis, Mo.
Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., New York, N.Y.
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., Wilmington, Del.
Early & Daniel Co., The, Cincinnati, Ohio
Eastern Milk Producers Cooperative Association, Inc., Syracuse, N.Y.
Eastern States Farmers' Exchange, West Springfield, Mass.
El Rancho Milling Co., Clovis, N. Mex.
Equity Union Grain Co., Kansas City, Mo.
Ray Ewing Co., Pasadena, Calif.
Farm Belt Fertilizer & Chemical Co., Kansas City, Mo.
Farm Bureau Cooperative Association, Inc., Columbus, Ohio
Farm Bureau Milling Co., Hammond, Ind.
Farm Bureau Services, Inc., Lansing, Mich.
Farmers Cooperative Exchange, Raleigh, N.C.
Farmers Elevator Service Co., Inc., Fort Dodge, Iowa.
Farmers Investment Co., Tucson, Ariz.
Farmers Union Jobbing Association, Kansas City, Mo.
Farr Co., Greeley, Colo.
Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo.
Federal Land Bank, St. Louis, Mo.
Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
Ford Motor Co. Fund, Dearborn, Mich.
Freeman Foundation, Tucson, Ariz.
Gardner Advertising Co., St. Louis, Mo.
General Electric Foundation, Ossining, N.Y.
General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.
George Getz Corp., Chicago, Ill.
P. H. Glatfelter Co., Spring Grove, Pa.
Goodyear Farms, Litchfield Park, Ariz.
Grain Processing Corp., Muscatine, Iowa.
Grandon, Preston, Daily Gazette, Sterling, Ill.
Great Northern Railway Foundation, St. Paul, Minn.
Green Giant Foundation, Le Sueur, Minn.
Guilford Dairy, Greensboro, N.C.
Gutwein Milling Co., Inc., Francesville, Ind.
Hales & Hunter Co., Chicago, Ill.
Hallmark Cards, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.
Hanny's, Phoenix, Ariz.
Haver-Lockhart Laboratories, Kansas City, Mo.
Hayden Flour Mills, Inc., Tecumseh, Mich.
Hercules Powder Co., Wilmington, Del.
Hershey Chocolate Corp., Hershey, Pa.
Hess & Clark, Ashland, Ohio
Heterochemical Corp., Valley Stream, N.Y.
W. D. Hoard & Son, Fort Atkinson, Wis.
Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc., Nutley, N.J.
J. A. Hogle & Co., Tucson, Ariz.
Holland, Walter E., Tucson, Ariz.
Honeggers' & Co., Inc., Fairbury, Ill.
Hooker Chemical Corp., Marysville, Ohio.
Hubbard Milling Co., Mankato, Minn.
Illinois Central Railroad, Chicago, Ill.
Illinois Farm Supply Co., Bloomington, Ill.
Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperative Association, Indianapolis, Ind.
Inland-Steel-Ryerson Foundation, Inc., Chicago, Ill.
International Harvester Foundation, Chicago, Ill.
International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, New York, N.Y.
Jacome's Department Store, Tucson, Ariz.
John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.
K Lazy M Ranches, Holtville, Calif.
Kansas City Livestock Exchange, Kansas City, Mo.
Kansas City Stockyards Co. of Maine, Kansas City, Mo.
Kent Feeds, Inc., Muscatine, Iowa.
Kerr, Alfred F., Tucson, Ariz.
Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Inc., Oklahoma City, Okla.
Charles F. Kettering Foundation, Hinsdale, Ill.
Koppers Co., Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Krey Packing Co., St. Louis, Mo.
Kroger Co., St. Louis, Mo.
Lake to Lake Dairy Cooperative, Manitowac, Wis.
Land O'Lakes, Minneapolis, Minn.
Lauhoff Grain Co., Danville, Ill.
Leeds and Northrup Foundation, Philadelphia, Pa.
Lincoln Electric Co., Cleveland, Ohio.
Link-Belt Co., Chicago, Ill.
Livestock Industry Markets Association, Kansas City, Mo.
Livestock National Bank, Kansas City, Mo.
Lovejoy, Walter E., Tucson, Ariz.
Martin's Feed Mills, Inc., New Paris, Ind.
Oscar Mayer and Co., Chicago, Ill.
Oscar Mayer and Co., Madison, Wis.
Maytag Company Foundation, Inc., Newton, Iowa.
Metropolitan Cooperative Milk Producers Bargaining Agency, Inc., Syracuse, N.Y.
Michigan Bell Telephone Co., Detroit, Mich.
Midwest Dried Milk Co., Dundee, Ill.
Midwestern Grain Co., Kansas City, Mo.
Midwest Feed Manufacturers' Association, Kansas City, Mo.
Midwest Wool Marketing Cooperative, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.
Miller Publishing Co., Minneapolis, Minn.
Mine Safety Appliances Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Mississippi Chemical Corp., Yazoo City, Miss.
Mississippi Valley Stock Yards, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.
Missouri Farmers Association, Inc., Columbia, Mo.
Missouri Farmers Association Feed Mill, St. Joseph, Mo.
Missouri Farmers Association, Inc., Grain and Feed Division, St. Joseph, Mo.
Missouri Farmers Association Mutual Insurance Co., Columbia, Mo.
Missouri Farm Bureau Federation, Jefferson City, Mo.
Montana Flour Mills Co., Great Falls, Mont.
Moorman Manufacturing Co., Quincy, Ill.
Moore-Lowry Flour Mills, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.
Morton Salt Co., Chicago, Ill.
Morris, Samuel H., Globe, Ariz.
Murphey, John W., Tucson, Ariz.
Myers, Harold E., Tucson, Ariz.
National Cash Register Co., The, Dayton, Ohio
National Dairy Products Corp., New York, N.Y.
National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
National Educational Television & Radio Center, New York, N.Y.
National Limestone Institute, Inc., Washington, D.C.
National Live Stock Producers Association, Chicago, Ill.
National Molasses Co., Oreland, Pa.
National Oats Co., East St. Louis, Ill.
National Plant Food Institute, Washington, D.C.
National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington, D.C.
Nationwide Mutual Insurance Co., Columbus, Ohio
New Idea (Division AVCO Corp.), Coldwater, Ohio
Norris Grain Co., Kansas City, Mo.
Nutrena Mills, Minneapolis, Minn.
Ohio Bell Telephone Co., Cleveland, Ohio
Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., New York, N.Y.
Onstott, Herbert H., St. Louis, Mo.
Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp., Toledo, Ohio
Owens-Illinois Glass Co., Toledo, Ohio.
Pacific Supply Cooperative, Walla Walla, Wash.
Arline and Thomas Patton Foundation, Cleveland, Ohio.
Parker, Selby C., Tucson, Ariz.
Pay Way Feed Mills, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.
F. H. Peavey Group Foundation, Minneapolis, Minn.
Pfizer, Chas. & Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.
Phelps Dodge Corp., New York, N.Y.
Philadelphia Electric Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
Pillsbury Co., Kansas City, Mo.
Pillsbury Co., Minneapolis, Minn.
Pima Savings & Loan Association, Tucson, Ariz.
Pittsburgh Forgings Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Place & Place Architects, Tucson, Ariz.
Portland Cement Association, Chicago, Ill.
Prairie Farmer Publishing Co., Chicago, Ill.
Producers Grain Corp., Amarillo, Tex.
Producers Live Stock Marketing Association, National Stock Yards, Ill.
Progressive Farmer, Birmingham, Ala.
Pure Milk Association, Chicago, Ill.
Quaker Oats Foundation, Chicago, Ill.
Ralston Purina Co., St. Louis, Mo.
Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.
Research Corp., New York, N.Y.
Rickel, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.
Roxane, Inc., St. Joseph, Mo.
Rudy-Patrick Seed Co., Kansas City, Mo.
St. Louis Bank for Cooperatives, St. Louis, Mo.
St. Louis Live Stock Exchange, National Stock Yards, Ill.
St. Louis National Stockyards Co., National Stock Yards, Ill.
Salina Terminal Elevator Co., Kansas City, Mo.
Salt River Valley Water Users Association, Phoenix, Ariz.
Schreiber Mills, Inc., St. Joseph, Mo.
Scott County Milling Co., Sikeston, Mo.
Sears Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill.
Seitz Packing Co., Inc., St. Joseph, Mo.
Selby Motors, Tucson, Ariz.
Shellbuilder Co., Houston, Tex.
Murray J. Shiff Construction, Tucson, Ariz.
Simonds-Shields-Theis Grain Co., Kansas City, Mo.
Snell & Wilmer, Phoenix, Ariz.
Southern Farmers Association, North Little Rock, Ark.
Southern States Cooperative, Richmond, Va.
Spencer Chemical Co., Kansas City, Mo.
Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.
Staley, Thomas W., Kansas City, Mo.
Star-Kist Foods, Inc., Terminal Island, Calif.
Superior Feed Mills, Oklahoma City, Okla.
M. M. Sundt Construction Co., Tucson, Ariz.
Wayne Thornburg Ranches, Litchfield Park, Ariz.
Thurber, Harold B., Sonoita, Ariz.
Tidewater Oil Co., Delaware City, Del.
H. C. Tovrea Co., Tucson, Ariz.
Traders Livestock Exchange, Kansas City, Mo.
Tucson Gas, Electric Light & Power Co., Tucson, Ariz.
United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, Washington, D.C.
United Co-operative Farmers, Inc., Fitchburg, Mass.
United Milk Producers of New Jersey, Trenton, N.J.
United States Steel Foundation, New York, N.Y.

Upjohn Co., Kalamazoo, Mich.
Valley National Bank, Phoenix, Ariz.
Walgreen Drug Stores, Chicago, Ill.
Watt Publishing Co., Mount Morris, Ill.
H. K. Webster Co., Lawrence, Mass.
Western Farmers Association, Seattle, Wash.
Western Publishing Co. Foundation, Racine, Wis.
Westinghouse Air Brake Foundation, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Whitmoyer Laboratories, Inc., Myerstown, Pa.
Wirthmore Feeds, Inc., Waltham, Mass.
Wisconsin Farmco Service Cooperative, Madison, Wis.
Wolcott & Lincoln, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.
Woods, Sid, Yuma, Ariz.
L. M. White Contracting Co., Tucson, Ariz.
Zip Feed Mills, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

ADDENDA

McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.
Michigan Milk Producers Association, Detroit, Mich.
National Association of Educational Broadcasters, Washington, D.C.
National Canners Association, Washington, D.C.
National Dairy Products Corp., New York, N.Y.
Safeway Stores, Inc., Oakland, Calif.

EDUCATION PROBLEMS IN THE EMERGING COUNTRIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I call to the attention of the Senate excerpts from two reports by Gerald F. Winfield, Chief of the Communications Resources Division of the Agency for International Development. One report outlines the conclusions of his study conconcerning the difficulties of education in underdeveloped regions of the world. Education is at once the key to progress for less developed nations and a field where progress has been held up by a lack of capital and the very backwardness of the people. It has been the prodigious task of Mr. Winfield and his staff to find methods of educating at low cost millions of people under the most adverse conditions.

The principal barrier to educational progress was the lack of trained teachers, thus prohibiting the widespread use of the traditional verbal forms of instruction, while standard audiovisual techniques could not be used, as electricity is not available and equipment is too expensive. One imaginative solution to this dilemma developed by the Communications Resources Division is a cheap, simple, yet ingenious device by which filmstrips can be projected by sunlight through a homemade contraption constructed from tin cans, mirrors, and a lens. Mass-produced filmstrips shown to large classes can counteract the inadequacies of badly trained teachers while simultaneously educating the teachers themselves to instruct better the succeeding classes of children and adults. The sunlight filmstrip projector seems to be a child's toy in its simplicity yet it has the potential to educate a continent. This report of Mr. Winfield describes a startlingly new approach to education in less-developed nations.

Mr. Winfield's second report is a concrete proposal for the implementation of his plan in Latin America. It provides for the improvement of existing educational facilities, the opening of new schools, and the training of adults. His proposal includes the use of the Peace Corps and correlation with present educational research in this country in order to minimize costs.

Education is at once crucial to the interests of the United States in the less developed nations and to the hopes of these nations themselves. Gerald Winfield and the staff of the Communications Resources Division of AID have made a significant contribution to the education of humanity and are worthy of the highest praise. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks excerpts from these two reports.

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

PROTOTYPE LEARNING SYSTEMS: A NEW SET OF TOOLS FOR DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

INTRODUCTION

Social and economic development is dependent upon people. Those people must be able to use more advanced technical processes and greater ranges of knowledge. The fundamental need in developing people is expanded movement of knowledge to them in such ways that they act on that knowledge. The most fundamental characteristic of underdeveloped countries is that the average citizen controls or can use only a tiny capital plant and is able to apply only limited knowledge in his use of it.

The movement of knowledge to people in the underdeveloped societies is complicated by the following factors:

1. The level of literacy is low.

2. Modern channels of communication are poorly developed.

3. The "communication load" is many times greater than in advanced societies. This can be illustrated in agriculture. In the United States the average farm size is 250 acres. When the communication process gets one American farmer to change one practice for one crop, he can apply it to 50 to 250 acres. In the underdeveloped areas the average farm size is 2 to 20 acres. This means that if a practice change is to be applied to from 50 to 250 acres, it will be necessary to communicate with from 10 to 500 farmers to have the same economic effect as communicating with 1 American farmer.

4. People are dominated by status and tradition and are extremely cautious in accepting change.

New systems for communicating knowledge are urgently needed to move general knowledge to the public; to speed and improve education in the schools; to provide for more effective extension activities in health, agriculture and industry; and to provide better education and training for labor. Any system for the communication of knowledge must operate at low cost and have built into it the capacity to guide and develop both paid and volunteer teachers.

One of the most productive things that can be accomplished in the underdeveloped countries is to use a larger portion of the underemployed time of many people in the teaching-learning process.

THE LEARNING SYSTEMS CONCEPT

One of the major achievements of modern society has been the development of the systems concept. Systems have been widely applied to many industrial, military and other processes.

A system is a combination of people and things organized into an interacting flow of processes by which specific goals are reached.

A learning system is a combination of people, equipment, learning materials, and practice and use situations designed to work together to achieve a clearly defined educational or training objective. Such learning systems may consist of a wide range of combinations of people and things depending on the goal to be achieved. Inherent in the systems approach is the notion that every aspect of the system, human and nonhuman, is to be examined, developed, tested, evaluated and fitted together into an efficient, easily operated whole.

This systems concept contrasts with the more traditional approach which proceeds on the assumption that if the people are provided, they will independently and repeatedly invent the necessary things required for the most effective learning process.

In facing the need for educational breakthroughs in the underdeveloped world, the idea of developing learning systems is a sound one. This systems approach envisions the careful designing and testing of total systems to be carried out by highly qualified groups and checked out in a wide enough variety of situations to determine their efficiency and practicality. The systems can then be mass produced to obtain the greatest possible saving and be used by people who can be rapidly trained to do so.

Such systems, to meet real conditions, must usually employ inexpensive delivery equipment to present programed materials that are heavily visual in character, supported by carefully worked out verbal elements. They must be designed to support and guide poorly trained teachers so that they can do an effective teaching job and can upgrade their own knowledge and skill as they teach.

The physical materials in the carefully designed learning system is in the nature of a floor under the limitedly educated and trained teacher. It does not provide walls and a ceiling, but permits the teacher great room for continuing creativity and personal growth. But at the same time, provides a foundation which insures basic minimal effectiveness if the system itself is fully used.

One of the great advantages of learning systems is that they can substitute for the deficiencies in the general and specific learning environments that are characteristic of the underdeveloped areas. This is particularly true when learning systems make extensive use of pictorial materials. Through the projected picture, it is possible for a learning system to fully present the artifacts and processes common to the modern world, in areas where those artifacts and processes are still unknown. The learning systems will bring students more rapidly into an understanding of the world into which they will move as development takes place.

Learning systems can also provide, at very much lower cost, for the expensive apparatus and library materials which are still lacking for the conventional learning process in most parts of the underdeveloped world. Supplying skillful direction and guidance for using local materials and processes for observation, study, and experimentation, it is possible to design learning processes which will carry the individual far along the way to completely overcoming the disadvantages of the restricted general learning environment.

Learning systems can be designed that flexibly combine the iconic signal system carried in pictures, diagrams, and motion, with the digital signal system of the spoken and written word and mathematics, to communicate knowledge with a highly effective result. Learning systems so designed make it possible for images to clearly and effectively evoke words and words to evoke images. Such learning systems can be used to significantly lower the level of verbal difficulty involved in mastering many subjects. Such reduction in verbal difficulty level can play a significant part in solving educational breakthrough problems in the underdeveloped parts of the world.

NEW LOW-COST LEARNING SYSTEMS FOR THE ISOLATED RURAL SCHOOL

A new combination of projected and printed materials can supply effective self-help learning systems to primary schools at one-fourth to one-third the cost of equally good conventional textbooks.

These systems maximize the use of projected materials for group study, reducing printed materials to an experimentally determined necessary minimum. They guide the teacher in the combined use of several well-proved teaching methods including:

1. Effective student motivation and orientation;

2. Clear subject matter presentation in pictorial form with each learning point developed in a series of small steps which use the psychological principles of programed learning with as much immediate reinforcement as is feasible in a group-learning situation.

3. The systematic use of discussion, individual reading and study;

4. Student involvement through (a) experiments; (b) observations and surveys; (c) the making of useful things for everyday life; (d) the making of teaching materials; and (e) actually teaching parents and others what has been learned;

5. Effective means for reviewing and evaluating the student's work and learning.

Visual presentation has at least four fully demonstrated strengths: (1) Visually communicated material must be specific and concrete. If it is possible to "draw or take a picture of it," then there is no doubt that a specific idea is being dealt with concretely; (2) visual materials are less apt to be misinterpreted than are verbal materials; (3) pictures make it possible to enlarge or reduce the size of objects and see distant or unseeable things; (4) with pictured structures or processes before the student, the level of difficulty of the language used to describe or discuss them can be significantly lowered.

The wide use of such systems in preindustrial societies became possible with the development of the sunlight filmstrip projector. This projector provides an inexpensive way of delivering projected material in the classroom whenever and wherever the sun shines. It consists of three parts:

First, a swivel-mounted flat mirror to reflect sunlight into the projector in the classroom. The mirror can be located in a sunshiny area as far as 30 to 40 feet away. The light enters through a hole in the wall. As the sun moves the mirror must be adjusted every 20 to 30 minutes.

Second, a projector which is a simple arrangement to carry a 35-millimeter, single-frame filmstrip and a lens that can focus for short-thrown, rear-screen projection. The lens costs 25 to 30 cents and the whole projector can be mass produced in plastic for no more than $2 or $3.

Third, a shadowbox made with a 16- by 20-inch screen. The screen is a piece of plastic which costs about $1.25. The shadowbox which protects the back of the screen from extraneous light, can be made of wood, cloth, cardboard or almost any available opaque material.

It is not necessary to darken the schoolroom. The sun provides enough light to produce an image bigger and brighter than a television screen.

Until the sunlight projector was developed, it was impossible to use projected materials for teaching in rural schools: First, because there was no electricity and second, because in hot climates, darkening the room stifles the children. This piece of equipment can be made and installed for about $10 per classroom.

It will not be desirable to teach all subjects with the sunlight filmstrip projector for two reasons: First, all subjects are not equally susceptible to being taught with heavy pictorialization and second, the sun will not shine all the time. A number of subjects in each grade will be taught without using the projector so that on cloudy days or during cloudy hours on days when the sun shines, the teacher can teach subjects or carry on activities which do not require the projector, reserving the materials that are taught with the projector for those times when the sun is shining.

NEW LOW COST MASS LEARNING SYSTEMS FOR EFFECTIVE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Gerald F. Winfield)

I. GENERAL

The rapidly mounting influence in Latin America, of the Chinese formula for Communist revolution as expounded by Mao Tse-tung, has become an inescapable challenge to freedom in the Americas. Adapted to Latin America, tested and confirmed in Cuba, this formula stresses the use of drastic social change as the driving force for a revolution to be generated among the poor, disheartened rural population; to be spread to the urban masses still closely linked to their rural origins; and designed to attract into leadership educated, idealistic but dissatisfied young people who now lack opportunity to serve and to lead.

If Communist revolution is to be interdicted in Latin America, the needs of rural people must be met. Governments in Latin America must deliver hope and a sense of importance and dignity to their rapidly expanding, poverty-stricken rural people. Time is short.

Inadequate basic education for the rapidly expanding rural population is an integral part of the challenge. Low productivity in agriculture and industry is caused in significant measure by widespread illiteracy and by limited education and training for both children and adults. Ignorance makes itself felt in all fields, particularly in agriculture, industry, and health.

II. THE PROPOSAL

This is a proposal for a major effort to be made to improve and expand primary and adult education in Latin America with emphasis on rural areas. This improvement to be attained by equipping a large number of schools with new low-cost mass learning system to (a) improve the quality of teaching in existing schools, (b) increase the rate at which teachers are trained and new schools organized, (c) introduce a program of continuing adult education.

These objectives can be quickly achieved at reasonable cost if the effort is concentrated enough and of sufficient scope to stimulate widespread change in the educational process and involve large numbers of people.

This program would address itself to a number of sections of the Act of Botogá and therefore should find a place in the new program of social and economic development now under preparation.

III. THE PLAN

Implementation

The implementation of this program consists in first preparing basic prototypes of selected subjects. These prototypes will then be adapted in each cooperating country. This adaptation will be carried out through careful but rapid testing. One of the virtues of this method is that it is educationally, psychologically, and operationally sound enough to accept the risk of rapid and widespread application.

The subject matter selected will be suitable for the first six grades and include parallel materials for continuing adult education.

Emphasis is placed on the teaching of science, mathematics, writing, geography, and other subjects which will be valid in every country. As skill and experience with these new systems develops in the individual countries it will be possible for the countries to apply them to other subject areas, including history, social studies, and eventually language arts.

For adult education, these teaching systems can be applied effectively to literacy, agriculture, homemaking, health, mathematics, and many other subjects.

The degree of success of this plan will depend on the concentration of sufficient resources to develop, and implement these new systems of instruction.

Schedule

This program should be executed in two phases.

Phase A: Would be limited to eight or nine nations. For the purposes of this illustrative presentation, nine countries have been listed. They have about 4 million primary schoolchildren in a combined population of approximately 40 million. This new system to serve this school population would require about 100,000 filmstrip projectors in as many classrooms. This is believe to be the minimal effort to fully demonstrate this new technique.

Phase A would introduce the new method into most existing classrooms and would begin the expansion of primary education by facilitating the organization of new schools. From 2 to 3 years will be required.

Phase B: This phase would further expand this operation to (1) include additional subjects; (2) add the remaining countries of Latin America; and (3) expand the number of rural schools.

The entire program involves eight steps.

Step 1: Agreement on plan.

Step 2: The development and preliminary testing of prototype systems.

Step 3: Adaptation to each country.

Step 4: Installation of the system in selected schools.

Step 5: In-service training of teachers.

Step 6: Evaluation of results.

Step 7: Installation of the system in all grades.

Step 8: Implementation of phase B.

Administrative organization

This program should be carried out by ICA through bilateral arrangements with each country within the framework of the Act of Bogotá. Within ICA/W and the USOM's it should be set up as a joint responsibility of the communications media staff and the Office of Educational Services with close support from health, agriculture, and industry. It will have to be strongly staffed both quantitatively and qualitatively in Washington and in the field.

Use of Youth Corps

Both phase A and phase B of this program can make effective use of young educated nationals and U.S. college graduates. Logistic and teacher education needs are such that it would be possible to use several hundred young people to help introduce the new systems, to train teachers, and to provide a direct source of feedback information. Such involvement of youth in leadership and service is important both to the success of this program and as a means of giving constructive opportunity to young people.

Development of educational materials industries

This program would equip each cooperating nation with the industrial capacity to produce these new learning materials. The projectors, filmstrips, filmstrip cans, paper, ink, and printing needed for these teaching materials would be required in sufficient volume to stimulate the development of industries to supply them and would boost economic growth.

DETECTIVE SGT. JAMES ROCHE

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I am sure that all of us were distressed and sorrowed to learn of the death of Detective Sgt. Jim Roche. He performed his duties faithfully and courageously. He was skilled and dedicated in his work. He met his death through a heart attack which resulted from his efforts to overcome an apparently demented individual who was trying to force his way into the Senate.

I know about the outstanding courage of Detective Sergeant Roche from personal experience. About a year ago a mentally ill veteran from my State came to Washington for the purpose, as he stated, of putting an end to the junior Senator from New York. We all encounter such threats and experiences. Mr. Roche handled the case with which he was confronted with great ability. He took the man downstairs and took away from him a stiletto about a foot long, which the man had concealed on his person.

Many of us in the Senate owe a debt which perhaps we do not know about to this fine man who met his death in such an untimely and unfortunate way. I extend my sincere and heartfelt sympathy to his wife and his family.

STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, on the day Harry S. Truman left office as President and General Eisenhower became President, January 20, 1953, our national debt was $267 billion. The annual interest charge on this was less than $6 billion. Government bonds were selling at par. This was the very good fiscal situation of our Government at the time Harry S. Truman was President of the United States and at the termination of his outstanding service as Chief Executive.

On the day, January 20, 1961, that General Eisenhower left the White House and John F. Kennedy became our President after 8 years of that Republican administration, our national debt had grown from $267 billion to $293 billion. At that time the annual interest charge on our national debt was in excess of $9 billion.

Not only was our national debt at an alltime high up to that period, but on that day our money and bonds were selling at a discount in the marts of the world. Furthermore, there was a grave outflow of gold from this country. Under President Kennedy, the outflow of gold has been greatly lessened.

Congress has enacted, by practically unanimous vote of the membership of both Houses, measures sponsored by the administration to diminish the outflow of gold. It has not been completely stopped, but during the past 12 months it was less than half of the outflow of gold during President Eisenhower's last year in office. In 1960, the outflow of gold was $1,700 million. Last year it was $1,200 million. This year it will be not more than $800 million, being approximately $400 million to date. U.S. currencies and bonds are now selling at a premium.

SOVIET FISHING PENETRATION

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, the extent of Soviet fishing operations in the North Pacific is dramatically illustrated by the fact that a steamship passenger line has been established to transport fishermen to and from the waters which are being fished.

The June 7 issue of Water Transport, a Soviet daily newspaper for fishermen and merchant marine personnel, describes inauguration of this new service. The passenger-freighter vessel *Smolny* will be used on the run. The other day it left Vladivostok for the Bristol Bay region with about 300 fishermen to replace other fishermen going on vacation.

During recent years we Americans have been losing out in fishery competition. In the North Pacific close to the shores of Alaska, which has long been considered to be ours by historic right, there have been increasing inroads by both Japanese and Soviet competitors. Now they are coming south of the Aleutians even. The threat is grave. It has had not only a devastating effect on the livelihood of thousands of Alaska fishermen, and fishermen from other parts of the Pacific coast, but lacking any international controls at all for most species of fish and none at all so far as the Russians are concerned, there is always the grave possibility that these rich fishing banks which properly utilized could provide valuable protein food for man forever will become exhausted.

The time to act is now.

It is not only in the North Pacific that the Russians have been active. Off the northeast Atlantic coast there are huge Russian fishing fleets.

The perils that confront us, our lack of attention to this really important problem, the failure of our Government to give the fisheries the high rating they deserve, was called to the attention of the Senate and the Nation only recently by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH]. In a splendid speech on this subject, which I recommend to the attention not only of those having a primary interest in the commercial fisheries but to all who want to see the position of the United States maintained, Senator SMITH gave perhaps the most detailed accounting of the past, the present, and the seemingly gloomy prospects for the future in the most detailed analysis of this subject which has ever been assembled and delivered.

SENATOR GRUENING, OF ALASKA, SPEAKS TO METEOROLOGISTS

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, if you do not know what meteoromythology is, here is your opportunity to learn.

If you do not know what mythometeorology is, the explanation is at hand.

And still another word—climythology—was added to the language last week by our colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], when he spoke at the banquet of the 203d national meeting of the American Meteorological Society at the University of Alaska, on June 27.

What the Senator said was so delightful, so informative and so appropriate to the occasion that I am convinced the speech deserves even a wider audience than heard it at our farthest north university, which, by the way, is a land-grant university.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Senator's address printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING AT BANQUET OF 203D NATIONAL MEETING OF AMERICAN METEOROLOGICAL SOCIETY, UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA, JUNE 27, 1962

Mr. Emerson, members of the American Meteorological Society, and guests, in extending the invitation, some 6 months ago, to address this meeting, your toastmaster, who is the regional administrative officer of the U.S. Weather Bureau for Alaska, wrote me:

"As a longtime Alaskan dedicated to the growth and development of Alaska you have a comprehensive understanding of the role that meteorology and climatology play in the scheme of things."

I was and am flattered by that, I fear, undeserved assumption of my comprehensive understanding of so vast, spacious, and expanding a pair of related sciences. However, I am delighted to take advantage of this encomium to discuss the influence that these twin disciplines have had, have and may have on the past, present, and future of the State of the Union in which we are now assembled.

It is an interesting phenomenon that as the field of human knowledge expands, not only are new sciences and subsciences born, but by becoming correlated and interrelated, established sciences give birth to new ones. Thus, physics and geology are the happy progenitors of geophysics—already a lusty adolescent pretty well on its own. Physics and astronomy gave birth to astrophysics. I need not prolong the listing of such offspring of scientific matings. As science expands, new hyphenated sciences are generated.

Geopolitics, a relatively new science created incidental to Pan-Germanic aspirations for domination of the earth by Hitler's presumed master race, may soon, as men land on the moon, become selenopolitics. This will be succeeded, no doubt, by astropolitics or cosmopolitics as the invasion by earthians of our planetary neighbors becomes imminent.

I venture to suggest that a hitherto undesignated child of meteorology and climatology—illegitimate, I regret to state, in this respectable company—has played an important part in the history of Alaska; has seriously affected its past and present, and is still to be reckoned with in the future. I could call this offspring meteoromythology or mythometeorology, or climythology. I should probably leave the determination of nomenclature to the philologists with historians and meteorologists as consultants.

For the time being, as its proponent, I shall call it climythology. Meteoromythology has a good alliterative and onomatopoeic sound, but climythology is simpler and easier to enunciate. This science, or pseudoscience, which perhaps should be classed with alchemy, astrology, phrenology or palmistry, has nevertheless had, and still has, its numerous followers, and has had a marked effect in shaping, or misshaping Alaska's destiny. I will now trace briefly its origin and effects.

Climythology, as far as Alaska is concerned, came into existence sometime between March 30, 1867, when William Henry Seward consummated the purchase of Alaska, and 1868, when the Congress was called upon to pay the bill.

That bill, for $7,200,000, or approximately 2 cents an acre, loosed a storm in the House of Representatives. I shall not attempt to say whether it was a hurricane or a tornado, but it was accompanied by a lot of wind, by a great flood—a flood of oratory and some verbal thunder. The sum and substance of it was that while Seward had taken Alaska, he and the United States had been "taken," in the contemporary colloquial sense.

Alaska was pictured on the floor of the House of Representatives and in a substantial section of the press as a frozen waste with a savage climate, where little or nothing could grow, and where few could or would live.

Typical of the statements of climythologists was that of Representative Benjamin F. Loan, of St. Louis, who declared: "* * * the acquisition of this inhospitable and barren waste will never add a dollar to the wealth of our country or furnish any homes to our people. It is utterly worthless. * * * To suppose that anyone would leave the United States * * * to seek a home * * * in the regions of perpetual snow is simply to suppose such a person insane."

Another climythologist was Representative Orange Ferris, of Glens Falls, N.Y., who asserted that Alaska "is a barren, unproductive region covered with ice and snow" and "will never be populated by an enterprising people."

Another Representative from New York, Dennis McCarthy, of Syracuse, cited "reports that every foot of the soil of Alaska is frozen from 5 to 6 feet in depth" and ventured that his colleagues would soon hear that Greenland was on the market.

And the minority report of the House Committee on Foreign Relations, in a scathing denunciation, declared that Alaska "had no capacity as an agricultural country * * * no value as a mineral country * * * its timber generally of poor quality and growing upon inaccessible mountains * * * its fur trade * * * of insignificant value, and, will speedily come to an end * * * the fisheries of doubtful value * * * in a climate unfit for the habitation of civilized men."

I hope I will not be misunderstood when I point out that these "climythologists" were all Members of the House of Representatives, and not of the Senate. However, lest I seem to be imputing a greater wisdom and prescience to the Senate membership of that day than that of what is referred to in the Senate as "the other body," I must, in deference to historical accuracy, point out that except for Senator Charles Sumner's address to the Senate urging the purchase, there is no record of what questions his senatorial colleagues asked him and what comments they made, since the treaty was voted on in an executive session, which, but for the result, is not reported. That even Sumner's eloquence barely sufficed to achieve ratification of the Treaty of Cession is shown by the fact that there was just one vote more than the two-thirds majority required by the Constitution.

And so a lot of denigrating epithets were fastened on Alaska, such as "Icebergia," "Polaria," "Walrussia," "Seward's Polar Bear Garden," "Seward's Icebox," and the one coined by the press, which has endured the longest, "Seward's Folly."

It is a well-known axiom of social psychology that error accepted as verity can be as potent as truth.

The consequences of this Alaskan "climythology" were soon evident. Having established and propagated the concept of Alaska as a worthless waste with a savage climate, Congress proceeded to act accordingly. It immediately forgot its new acquisition. In the next 17 years, it provided no government for what was not even dignified as other American areas had been with the title of "Territory." Alaska was merely the "District of Alaska."

During those 17 years, Congress enacted just two laws relating to Alaska. One, applied to Alaska the navigation laws and created Alaska a customs district, which merely meant that imported foreign goods, of which there would be virtually none, would pay the same duties as elsewhere in the Union; and, two, a law turning over the fur seal fisheries of the Pribilof Islands to the Secretary of the Treasury, who promptly leased them as a monoply to a firm in San Francisco, the Alaska Commercial Co.

Seventeen years may not seem like a long time in the pageant of history, but it is four Presidential administrations plus 1 year. More pertinent, it is 8½ Congresses. In those days, each Congress usually assembled for three sessions instead of two, as nowadays. To be sure, some 25 bills providing civil government for Alaska were introduced. Yet, in the first 24 sessions of Congress after the purchase, not one of these bills ever got out of committee and never was vouchsafed a comment on the floor of either house. The prevailing "climythology" prevented that.

During that unique period, no pioneer who had come hopefully to Alaska could acquire title to the log cabin he had hewn from the forest wilderness nor to the land on which he had settled. No prospector could stake a mining claim with security for his enterprise and toil. Property could not be deeded or transferred. No will was valid. No injured party could secure redress for grievances except through his own acts. Crime could not be punished. Finally, marriage could not be celebrated—a cruel and unusual circumstance—though somehow life went on.

So, for 17 years the "climythology" which proclaimed Alaska a frozen waste with a savage climate, had in fact frozen the Congress into immobility and placed Alaska in a political and economic deep-freeze.

During these years, such authority as there was was exercised de facto and without any legal authority by the commanding general stationed at Sitka. And when, in 1877—10 years after the cession—he and his troops were called back to the States to put down an uprising of Nez Perce Indians, there was not even that semblance of government.

The fear of an Indian uprising was contagious. It haunted all the area west of the Mississippi through that decade. Reverberations of the massacre of General Custer by Sitting Bull and his braves a year earlier traveled far and wide.

The settlers in Alaska shared this alarm and requested their distant government to send some war vessel, a gunboat, perhaps, to overawe any possible uprisers and to help preserve peace, law, and order. This request, repeated with growing urgency and trepidation, was totally ignored. This was before the days of cable and telegraph. Finally, in great alarm, the whites who had settled in Sitka appealed to their neighbors, the Canadians, who promptly responded, and one of Her Majesty's ships performed the service that one of Uncle Sam's naval vessels should have.

When a U.S. sloop-o'-war finally arrived in 1879, the captain of that vessel stationed at Sitka and his successors were, for 5 years, without legal authority, but de facto, the rulers of Alaska.

During all this time a stream of complaints flowed from the settlers to Washington. They were ignored. In 1881, representatives elected from various Alaska communities, including Sitka, Juneau, and Wrangell, met in convention in Juneau and drafted a memorial to the President and Congress requesting the creation of the Office of Delegate in the House of Representatives. Every territory had been granted this voteless representation. A contest at the convention for that post simmered down to a race between the highest Federal officials stationed in Alaska, the collector of customs and his predecessor. The winner, Collector Mottram D. Ball, carried his plea to Washington, asking that he be seated. He was not, and Alaska had to wait 25 more years before the enormous concession of a voteless delegate was granted.

Climythology was unabated.

Finally, in 1884, in response to the proddings of three Presidents, Congress gave Alaska its first body of law, the Organic Act of that year. However, it proved unworkable and worthless. It provided a Presidentially appointed Governor, but forbade the establishment of a legislature and of a delegate in Congress. It forbade the application of the general land laws. It made impossible a legal jury system.

For the next 14 years, the messages and communications of five successive Governors to the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Congress were urgent pleas to pay some attention to Alaska, to give it some workable body of law. No heed was paid to any of these requests. Congress was still obsessed with the Alaska climythology of the late 1860's.

When, however, in the late 1890's, gold was discovered in the Klondike and some 60,000 gold seekers rushed to Alaska and found their legitimate desires unattainable for lack of suitable laws, Congress was slightly moved by the caustic communications of these constituents and, at the turn of the century, enacted some legislation. But, being drafted by men thousands of miles from the scene and totally unfamiliar with it, this legislation was again inappropriate and unworkable. So the cry for someone who could speak officially for Alaskans—a voteless delegate such as every Territory had had from the very beginning—gathered new force. However, even this slight concession was not granted until 1906. By then, the Alaskans had raised their sights and demanded a legislature, such as every Territory had had. Finally, in 1912, this was conceded. It had taken 45 years—from 1867 to 1912—to give Alaskans that minimum of self-government to which all Americans feel themselves entitled.

Climythology played an important part in that 45-year delay, as it would continue to delay and frustrate the aspirations of Alaskans.

It played its part in making the Organic Act of 1912, though an improvement over its unworkable predecessor, the most restrictive act imposed by the United States on one of its outlying areas. It was notable chiefly for the things it forbade Alaskans to do.

They were still not permitted to make any basic land laws—a vital omission in an area virtually 100 percent public domain and crying for settlement.

They were not permitted to manage their natural resources—their fish and wildlife—as had other territories.

They were not allowed to have their own judiciary.

There were many other restrictions.

So, when the first legislature convened in 1913, after passing what legislation it could, it memorialized Congress to do for the Territory what its legislators were forbidden to do.

These requests, all reasonable and scarcely controversial, were totally ignored by the Congress for 40 years, one result of which was the steady depletion, almost to extinction, of Alaska's greatest natural resource, the salmon fishery.

In addition to neglect, downright discrimination followed. Congress excluded Alaska from the provisions of Federal highway aid,

although Alaska was paying all Federal taxes—victims of the "taxation without representation" which our forefathers declared to be tyranny in the 18th century.

Congress further placed Alaska in the straitjacket of a steamship monopoly, with the resulting burden of ever-increasing astronomical freight rates.

Climythology had never ceased to function against the aspirations of the people of Alaska.

As a matter of fact, climythology has manifested itself like a hardy perennial in virtually every major congressional debate on Alaska.

It appeared during the struggle to give Alaska its limited Territorial government in 1912.

It emerged during the debate on the building of the Alaska Railroad in 1913. Said Representative Martin Dies, of Texas (father of another Martin Dies), in opposing the bill:

"We have owned this colossal chunk of frozen earth for more than 50 years and with great labor and expense have succeeded in thawing out only 2,000 or 3,000 acres."

Representative Thomas W. Hardwell, of Georgia, likewise an opponent, asked: "Why spend this money at the North Pole?" introducing a touch of mythogeography.

Representative Walter Elder, of Louisiana, stated that in the region to be served by the railroad there was "a killing frost every month of the year."

Representative William J. Fields, of Kentucky, said that "before going to Alaska to break the "ice trust" by building a railroad through it," Congress could better be spending the money in the continental United States.

The next 40 years under the restrictions and discriminations imposed by a distant and uninterested Government and by absentee industry were to lead Alaskans to the conviction that statehood was their only way out.

Indeed, the almost forgotten provision of the Treaty of Cession which had admitted the inhabitants "to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States," constituted, Alaskans believed, a pledge for statehood.

They had had fine verbal support for their aspirations. In 1912, President Taft, in a message to Congress, declared:

"There is nothing in the history of the United States which affords such just reason for criticism as the failure of the Federal Government to extend the benefit of its fostering care to the Territory of Alaska."

And, 5 years later, in 1917, Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane asserted:

"The statement that the people of Alaska have borne more handicaps than any other people who have pioneered new, undeveloped territory, at least on the North American Continent, has been made so often that it has become trite. Nevertheless it is true."

These were fine words. But nothing was done by the Federal authorities to materialize them. In fact, matters became worse until Alaskans finally, in the 1940's, moved boldly toward statehood.

Inevitably "climythology" appeared in the statehood debates. One of its leading opponents—in the Senate this time—declared that statehood offered no solution, since Alaska's difficulties were "due to the extreme climate and hazardous living conditions. Congress cannot change the climate," he continued.

To support his case, this Senator quoted from an article in the New York Times written by Hanson W. Baldwin, its military expert, who had been reporting the winter military maneuvers north of the Arctic Circle. "It is," Baldwin had written, "a land * * * of relentless winters. * * * Brief exposure can mean death."

No change in laws would relieve Alaska, the Senator continued. Its fate and future were all summed up "in that short sentence * * * 'Brief exposure can mean death'."

The Senate defeated the statehood bill by one vote—45 to 44. Climythology had done it. This was 1952. The people of Alaska had to wait 6 more years and to make more vigorous and audacious efforts before statehood became a reality. And they did it.

We now have statehood for Alaska—but the heritage and sequelae of 90-odd years of climythology and colonialism remain to be liquidated. That legacy is with us and its dispersal is the challenging task and duty of those whom the people of Alaska have elected to public office.

For climythology concerning Alaska is still widespread among our fellow-citizens in the lower States.

When I used to go back east to Washington during my years in the governorship, the question most frequently put to me was: "What is the weather in Alaska like?"

When asked by my friends, I could generally detect overtones of solicitude. Although not overtly expressed, I could sense the questioner's sympathy with the hardships the Gruenings must have to endure. Could we stand the cold?

So, I would explain, and after awhile it became routine, that it was no more possible to answer in one sentence what the climate of Alaska was like than it would be to answer in one sentence what the climate of the United States—the older 48—was like; that Alaska was as wide and deep as the United States and had several very different climates in its diverse and farflung regions.

And when I would compare or contrast the winter and summer temperatures in Juneau, where we lived, with temperatures in various parts of the lower 48 States, I suspect that only those who really trusted me believed that I was not giving a chamber of commerce version.

This would therefore seem an appropriate time and occasion to set the record straight and replace climythology with comparative climatology, dispelling the climyths of the "hazardous living and savage climate" of Alaska.

For surprising as it may be to some, the truth is that—from a climatic standpoint—living is less hazardous in Alaska than in any other State of the Union.

Climate—weather—accounts annually for scores of deaths in the other 49 States from causes which do not exist in Alaska.

Consider, first, tornadoes. They occur every year in the other States and only a few of the lower 49 are exempt.

In the 46 years beginning in 1916, since the Weather Bureau began recording the casualties from tornadoes, it has recorded 1,217 deaths, an average of over 26 a year. In only four of those 46 years were no deaths recorded, although bodily injuries and property damage were. In 1953 the death toll from tornadoes reached the tragic figure of 244. The number of injured each year is, of course, far greater than the fatalities, and the property damage over the same period is about a quarter of a billion dollars.

Tornadoes occur in every State of the Union except Alaska. No tornado has ever taken a life in Alaska.

Hurricanes annually take a varying toll of lives in the 48 lower continental States, ravaging the Atlantic and Gulf coasts in the process. In 1947 they took 53 lives, one in Texas, one in South Carolina, 12 in Louisiana, 22 in Mississippi.

Hurricanes took 4 lives in 1948, 3 in 1949, 19 in 1950, none in 1951, 3 in 1952, 2 in 1953. In 1954, four hurricanes took the tragic total of 193 lives. Hurricane Carol, in that year, killed 60 in New England, and Hurricane Hazel took 95 in the Atlantic States north from South Carolina.

The next year, 1955, was even more disastrous, with Hurricane Connie killing 25 in Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and New England, and Hurricane Diane killing 184 in Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island.

In 1956, the hurricane deaths dipped to 21—all in Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, and Florida.

But 1957 was the worst on record, with 395 dead, of which Hurricane Audrey took 371 in Louisiana. In 1959, there were 24; in 1960, 65, and in 1961, 46.

Despite the fact that Alaska's coastline is longer than the combined Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific coastlines of the 48 lower continental States, no hurricane has ever taken its toll of an Alaskan life.

In the decade 1948 to 1957, according to the Weather Bureau, a total of 2,054 persons in the lower continental 48 States were killed by lightning, an average of 205 a year. Only one State besides Alaska suffered no death from lightning in that decade. Texas led with 150 deaths from lightning; Alabama was next, with 112; Georgia third, with 110; North Carolina had 101; Mississippi, 98; South Carolina, 95.

Thunderstorms are not common in Alaska. Lightning is seen here rarely and no one was ever killed by lightning in our State.

Even our volcanoes, of which some 50 are active, seem to be uniquely benign. Writing on the explosion of Mount Katmai, which took place on June 6, 1912, just 50 years ago this month, George C. Martin, geologist with the U.S. Geological Survey, rendering the first full account in the February 1913 issue of the National Geographic magazine, declared that the eruption was undoubtedly one of the most violent of historic times, adding:

"In the violence of the explosion, in the quantity of material thrown out, and in the distance to which the ejected material and sound waves were carried, this was certainly among the greatest eruptions witnessed by man. It differs, however, from almost all other known great eruptions in that the immediate damage to property was almost nothing, and that, as far as known, it was not the direct and sole cause of the loss of a single human life."

As contrasted with the weather fatalities in the lower States from hurricanes, tornadoes, and lightning, averaging hundreds of deaths annually, Alaska can record from natural disasters, in comparable periods of record, only less than a dozen deaths from the two seismic waves which swept the Scotch Cap lighthouse and its personnel into the sea in 1946, and the similar occurrence in the Yakutat area 4 years ago, where five perished. Both of these were due to earthquakes beneath the ocean floor off the Alaska coast.

It is for us the living—the living in Alaska, who have experienced neither tornado, nor hurricane, nor been struck by lightning—to oppose longstanding "climythology" with facts.

They will reveal that while the 49th State has the widest range of temperatures under the flag—from 100° above to 76° below zero at Fort Yukon—life, as far as climatic vicissitudes are concerned, is the least hazardous of any State of the Union.

I could and should, no doubt, rest my case there, but I cannot forbear to add a word about Alaska's spaciousness and its grandeur.

Henry Gannett, for many years the chief geographer of the U.S. Geological Survey, gave this "one word of caution to those intending to visit Alaska. * * * 'If you are old, go by all means; but if you are young, wait. The scenery of Alaska is much grander than anything else of the kind in the world, and it is not well to dull one's capacity for enjoyment by seeing the finest first.'"

What distinguishes life in Alaska from life in the other States? For one thing, the unspoiled wilderness, with all its abundance,

beauty, and mystery is always nearby. Our mountains, rising either from the sea or from a base only a few hundred feet above sea level, exhibit perhaps as great visible altitude as any mountains found anywhere on earth.

This entrancing land displays both the celestial fireworks of the Aurora Borealis and the midnight sun—though I will have to admit that even we cannot exhibit both at the same time.

But perhaps most important, the last frontier is inhabited by the friendliest people. There is neither caste nor class in Alaska. Here are no status seekers.

Being both Americans and Alaskans is status enough.

STATE-FEDERAL SAN LUIS CONTRACT REVIEW

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, the contract relating to the San Luis, Calif., reclamation project has become effective, following the failure of any objection to be made to the contract by Congress following the hearings before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The contract was considered, and inasmuch as there were no objections from the members of the committee, it was permitted to go into effect.

Notwithstanding that, I believe it to be fitting and proper that the RECORD show the position taken on this project by the National Farmers Organization. I ask unanimous consent that a statement relating to the contract for this project, which has been furnished to me by Albert E. Casper, vice president and legislative representative of the National Farmers Organization, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NINETY-DAY COUNT-DOWN: THE STATE-FEDERAL SAN LUIS CONTRACT REVIEW

The administrations of Presidents Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Dwight Eisenhower resisted the attempts of large landholders to destroy the antiwater monopoly provisions of national reclamation law. Under the present administration it appears that a half century of efforts described by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS on the Senate floor as "one of the greatest land steals that has ever been attempted in the history of this Nation" are now succeeding.

While President John F. Kennedy was presenting land titles to campesinos at La Morita, Solicitor Frank Barry, of Interior, was denying that Congress applied acreage limitation to the State service area on San Luis project in California. He was mistaken. The facts are, Congress declared in the San Luis Act itself that reclamation law shall govern the Secretary of the Interior; Congress refused to exempt the State service area; and Congress refused to permit any exceptions to reclamation law at all.

Acreage limitation, Solicitor Barry argues, is not applicable to the State service area because application could "precipitate a conflict with legitimate State authority which Congress was careful to avoid." But neither the U.S. Supreme Court in 1959 nor the California Supreme Court in 1960, when acreage limitation was before them, found conflict between acreage limitation and State authority. In these same years the Legislature and people of California both repeated earlier authorizations to the State executive to accept Federal acreage limitation. Solicitor Barry's conclusion is unsupportable. There is no conflict.

Solicitor Barry not only saw conflict where there is no conflict. Further, he failed to see Federal investment where there is vast investment. His opinion appears to say that acreage limitation should follow Federal investment. Yet he appears to overlook Federal flood control contributions to the State project, overlook Federal investment in 107 miles of San Luis Canal and Reservoir, overlook Federal maintenance of Sacramento River channel as a conduit for the State project, and overlook proposals to Congress of Federal loans to the State at low rates of interest, or even at no interest at all. These are large errors.

The Justice Department is uneasy about Solicitor Barry's view of the law, although concurring in elimination of acreage limitation from the San Luis contract. The Attorney General says, "Strong arguments can be made to the effect that (Congress) did not intend to abandon the policy even within the area to be serviced by the State." The Justice Department covers its reluctance with hopes for "congressional reexamination" and "positive action." But review of contract by two committees is not the way to determine the intent of the whole Congress.

The Constitution provides for determination of congressional intent by the judiciary. In the courts the scales of justice are evenly balanced; in contract review they are not. Congress made sure before authorizing the San Luis project that there would be no exemption from, nor exception to, reclamation law. Congress considered exemption of the State service area and rejected it. Now the committees that were denied the exemption they sought, with authorization already in hand, are the very ones to say whether or not there is to be exemption. In contract review they need only remain silent to gain what the whole Congress refused them. The procedure for contract review is inappropriate, both judicially and politically, to the function ascribed to it by the Justice Department.

It is common knowledge that holders of large tracts of irrigable land have worked persistently to escape the acreage limitation. Acreage limitation is the instrument of the public policy against water monopoly and land speculation that furnishes cardinal justification for opening the Public Treasury to help bring water to private lands. Holders of large tracts of land have worked for two generations to throttle the policy without closing the doors of the Treasury to themselves. In 1944 a blueprint of their tactics appeared, disclosing an intention to use the State of California as an instrument of escape. Apparently they have succeeded in maneuvering the State at least momentarily into position; a State administration elected on a promise to support Federal acreage limitation and empowered by law to accept it, nevertheless now combats it.

Another blueprint appeared last year, one drawn for these final stages of escape. Legal counsel, experienced in opposing reclamation law, advised the State how to proceed step by step to nullify acreage limitation. The advice was given on an expressed assumption that neither the State administration nor the Federal Bureau of Reclamation desires to apply acreage limitation to the State service area. Events in Washington and California appear to fit this blueprint. Acreage limitation is omitted from the State-Federal contract. The Department of Justice is making no challenge in the courts. People injured by abandonment of public policy are too scattered, too ill-informed and ill-equipped to take the case to the courts themselves, or perhaps they assume that their Government will go before the courts to represent them there, if necessary to protect the public interest. The contract is in the hands of committees with no desire to apply acreage limitation and the 90-day countdown has begun. All this follows the blueprint.

Should the executive branch of the Federal Government respond to plans made in California to avoid enforcement of Federal law, and particularly nonenforcement of this law? Some answer "Yes," among them the San Francisco Chronicle in a recent editorial: "* * * the decision may be shaky legally but * * * it is sound and practical * * *. It has never seemed to us that (the Federal 160-acre limitation) could practically be applied to the highly developed, large-scale, corporation-dominated farming ventures of the lower Central Valley." Others would answer: the administration's first responsibilities are to the interests of the many for whom reclamation law was enacted, the many who need not live in the shadow of corporation-dominated farming communities if the law is enforced.

The resistance of excess landholders to acreage limitation is not hard to understand. About 34 owners of irrigable land in the southern San Joaquin Valley, none of them with less than 5,000 acres, hold three-quarters of a million acres. A conservative estimate of public subsidy on earlier projects to irrigate private land in proximity to the State service area is $600 per acre. The law permits subsidization of water for 160 acres per individual, or 320 acres for man and wife, viz, $96,000 and $192,000 respectively; acreage limitation forbids more. In addition, the law affords the valuable privilege of operating one's entire holdings with subsidized water for a decade prior to sale of excess lands at a fair appraised price. The complaint, apparently, is that this public generosity to individuals is too little.

Many examples of large holdings of excess land could be cited from public sources. One can serve as illustration. In southern California it appears that the 90,000-acre Irvine Ranch in Orange County will need more water, and is likely to obtain it as part of the State service area. Like managers of other large properties who are reluctant to sell their excess holdings to obtain water under reclamation law, the management of Irvine Ranch prefers to retain ownership of its lands. According to the Los Angeles Times the ranch plans a "new city" with "55-year leases with reappraisal every 25 years." The world has looked upon mortmain with distrust since the Middle Ages.

In sum it appears after defeat in Congress, after defeat before the Supreme Court, after repeated defeats by votes of the people of California, that interests desirous of participating in public financial generosity for water development free of the controls of acreage limitation, have turned now to the National administration to nullify the law.

It will take courage to reject their program. Should the President now order inclusion of acreage limitation in the San Luis contract, however, President Kennedy can be sure of his own legal ground. State law gives the Governor of California authority to accept acreage limitation, so he can be sure of his legal ground, too. Moreover the Governor, if he wishes, can then proclaim both the triumph of his State water program and his adherence to the policy and specific platform on which he won by a million votes in 1958. This course offers solid ground for future hopes of popular support in California; abandonment of principle on a question never far from the surface in California for three generations offers none.

The Department of Justice should take this question to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Solicitor of the Interior Department apparently is willing to consider cooperating in a court test of his Kings and Kern opinion to which excess landholders object. Should there be any less willingness on the part of

this administration to go into court to test the San Luis opinion, one so shattering to the prospect for creating modest landholdings and well-balanced communities through reclamation?

The Secretary of the Interior warned recently that future national financial support for reclamation depends on preservation of acreage limitation by the West itself. He said: "I can't think of a worse time for us to abandon the traditional policy that has governed reclamation policy in the past." (Sacramento Bee, Oct. 20, 1961, p. a–10.) Failure to attach to the proposal in the current budget to grant $66 million for flood control on Feather River to the State of California, a condition that reclamation law shall apply to the State service area, would belie emphatic assurances that there "will not be a plugged nickel of Federal money in the State project" given by California spokesmen to Congress in support of their demand for exemption of the State service area. Strict adherence to national policy now will strengthen western prospects for Federal help for future reclamation and assure as well, in the words of the Supreme Court, that reclamation shall "benefit people, not land," and shall distribute these benefits "in accordance with the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals."

In May 1959 Senators PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois, and WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, defeated the attempt to remove acreage limitation from the State service area. During debate Senator DOUGLAS asked: "Is it not true that the wide distribution of the land and property has furnished the basis for economic democracy in the Middle West, and that out of the economic democracy in many States have come movements for political democracy; notably the La Follette movement and, as well, the support which the great Senator NORRIS and others have received?"

This is the centennial year of the homestead law signed by Abraham Lincoln in 1862. This is the 60th anniversary of the national reclamation law signed by Theodore Roosevelt in 1902. Are we to celebrate these anniversaries with funeral pyres? And in what name would the fires be ignited? Not law. Politics? Surely not heads-up politics, good for the long pull. Surely not public policy. Surely not conservation. Surely not preservation of the American heritage.

FEBRUARY 10, 1962.

BIGGEST LOBBY IN WASHINGTON

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, I find, quite often, that the general public does not have a correct concept of the lobbying process in Congress. The public seems to think that the lobbying groups are confined to the AFL–CIO, the Farm Bureau, the American Legion, the national headquarters of various trade groups, and other organizations.

I think it should be made very clear that the most powerful lobbying group in Washington is the White House, which has almost unlimited resources at its disposal to try to affect legislation by having it either passed or defeated. A good example of this practice is what happened in the case of the farm bill. An article entitled "Freeman's Lobbying for Kennedy Farm Bill Reaches High Pitch," written by Paul Duke, and published in the Wall Street Journal of June 21, 1962, describes the lobbying activities of the White House and the Department of Agriculture with respect to the farm bill. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FREEMAN'S LOBBYING FOR KENNEDY FARM BILL REACHES HIGH PITCH—HE CAMPS NEAR HOUSE DEBATE TO WOO LAWMAKERS—AIDS' HOPES HIGH FOR TODAY'S VOTE

(By Paul Duke)

WASHINGTON.—Agriculture Secretary Freeman, employing the flair of a carnival pitchman, is championing the administration's farm bill with a display of salesmanship that has left even seasoned politicians slightly popeyed.

Yesterday, President Kennedy's farm boss capped 3 weeks of frenzied effort with a stellar performance. Settling into Speaker MCCORMACK's office hard by the entranceway to the House debate over the bill, Mr. Freeman bombarded a parade of uncertain legislators with a sales spiel that would have aroused envy in the best of sideshow barkers.

Whether this campaign results in success or failure will be decided today when the House begins final voting. And, as the decision time drew closer, Freeman forces were increasingly optimistic that they would win approval of at least a modified version of their plan, if farmers approve, to impose the tightest production and marketing controls ever placed on wheat, corn, and other crops. "Orville figures he needs at least 210 votes, taking into account normal absences," says one aid. "And we think he's got 'em." If all Representatives voted, it would take 217 votes to carry the 432-Member House.

Mr. Freeman's lobbying already has paid off in the Senate which several weeks ago granted its approval by a four-vote margin. But the House has loomed as an even more difficult hurdle because of the opposition of conservative southern Democrats and of Republicans who look with disfavor on moves toward greater Federal controls of agriculture.

WINNING OVER OPPONENTS

However, the optimism emanating from the Freeman camp seems to have more than a little justification. Talk to one veteran Democrat who once was opposed to the administration bill but now is tottering on the fence.

"This man is a snake charmer," he declares, "I was all set to speak against this bill until Freeman started coming around to see me and he's almost got me convinced I should vote for it."

A wavering Southerner seconds the endorsement. "He's the most persuasive man I've ever listened to," this legislator attests. "He not only sells himself, but he sells his cause." A House Democratic leader sums up the administration's hopes with this comment: "If anybody is going to pull the bill out for us, it's Orville."

And, the farm bill strategists are confident they'll corral some surprising support. One possible backer: Representative SMITH of Virginia, chairman of the powerful Rules Committee and leader of the conservative Southern bloc. Already, there is solid evidence that Southern opposition is beginning to crumble; all of the 10 Georgia Members are now supporting the bill, and legislators from other States of the Old Confederacy show signs of shifting.

In contrast, Republican opponents late yesterday were displaying a deepening gloom about their chances for sidetracking the bill. "The administration has had too many soldiers in this battle and they're twisting too many arms and making too many deals for us to win," a western Republican remarked sadly.

If this sentiment proves prophetic, the credit seems sure to accrue to Mr. Freeman's never-say-die diligence. Before setting up shop in Speaker MCCORMACK's office yesterday, the Agriculture Secretary hustled out of bed to appear on the National Broadcasting Co.'s "Today" television program at 7:45 a.m. After his pitchman's performance, he spent the day on Capitol Hill collaring Congressmen wherever they could be found.

PERSONAL APPROACH TYPICAL

This personal approach is typical. Since Mr. Freeman stepped up his campaign several weeks ago, it's estimated he's visited with upwards of 100 legislators. Take Tuesday, for example. After an 8 a.m. strategy conference in his office, the Agriculture Secretary talked with 6 Congressmen during the morning. He lunched with reporters from a variety of newspapers and then took on four more lawmakers during the afternoon in addition to his regular chores.

Today, as the crucial House voting begins, the administration farm general plans a telephone campaign directed primarily at undecided Representatives. His pitch will take the form of a willingness to perform service. "Do you have any questions, or need any information about this bill?" he'll ask. If any inquiries are posed, a battery of aids will leap for the answers.

Though much of the Freeman lobbying is directed at uncertain fellow Democrats, Republicans are not neglected. This week the Agriculture Secretary mailed letters to each of 30 GOP House Members considered vulnerable to appeal—mostly from urban areas such as in New Jersey and Michigan, Congressmen redistricted out of office by their legislatures back home, and well-known mavericks.

In the notes, Mr. Freeman took advantage of a recently disclosed strategic windfall: A letter from an aid to former President Eisenhower's Agriculture Secretary, Ezra Benson, purporting to describe a decision by Republican leaders last fall—now denied by GOP chieftains—not to propose solutions to farm problems but to simply criticize the administration.

"It is a well known fact that the Republican leadership is opposing (the bill) just for opposition's sake," Mr. Freeman wrote, "and I know you are under great pressure to follow this course." But, he urged, "the farm proposals were designed in the national interest, and I hope you will consider it in this relation as well as in the interest of all the people in your district."

In essence, the Freeman spiel, whether to Democrats or Republicans, is quite simple. First, he rattles off facts and figures showing the billions Uncle Sam is now paying to subsidize American agriculture. Then he tells the Congressman that there is no hope for reducing costs under the current program. Unless something is done to discourage excess plantings, he declares, the outlook promises only continued overproduction, massive payments in price supports, and additional Billie Sol Estes scandals.

Despite the encouraging signs, the battle has not been all smooth going for the former Minnesota Governor. Not only have farm groups such as the American Farm Bureau Federation been opposing the bill, but the administration has encountered other troubles within the Democratic ranks such as:

Woman's wiles: Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, normally a major backer for administration measures, isn't certain she'll vote for this year's bill because she doesn't see much good in any farm bill.

Election thorns: Mr. Freeman has failed to land the vote of Representative PIKE, whose Long Island, N.Y., district is now Republican leaning; he's fearful his support would lead voters to turn against him in the fall elections.

Counterlobbying: The power swung by the Farm Bureau in Illinois is making Representatives MACK and YATES think twice about

backing the bill. Mr. MACK faces a tough reelection battle with Representative FINDLEY in a merged district, and Mr. YATES is seeking to unseat Senate Republican Leader DIRKSEN.

Civil rights: Some southerners say they can't vote for the bill because of a provision that would permit farm land to be turned into recreation areas, which they fear would have to be racially integrated. However, the House yesterday rejected Republican amendments to specify that such facilities must be integrated.

Still Mr. Freeman apparently has won the endorsement of the heretofore reluctant National Grange, a farm organization with its biggest membership in the Northeast, Midwest, and Far West. Herschel D. Newson, master of the Grange, in a letter to Congressmen from areas where the Grange is strongest, backed Mr. Freeman's most controversial proposal: Mandatory planting limits on feed grain acreages, if farmers approve in a referendum. Previously, the Grange had approved the administration's farm bill only "in principle." Thus the Grange apparently joins the Farmers Union, another farm organization, in supporting the measure.

But, more than anything, the Democrats are encouraged by the solid backbone of support for the bill from the party's city brethren, who in recent years had found it convenient to vote against some farm bills because of consumer complaints about food costs. This time, though, the Democratic delegations from Boston, Chicago, New York, and Philadelphia are united behind the bill.

The administration's farm bill would extend to wheat and feed grains the same planting and marketing curbs now in effect for cotton, rice, and tobacco. It also provides for pilot projects that could lead eventually to shifting about 51 million acres of land into uses other than for crops. Today, Republicans plan to offer their own catchall bill that would continue most of the existing governmental programs for another year.

In yesterday's preliminary sparring the House adopted several relatively noncontroversial amendments, including a GOP-backed proposal to give the President authority to provide surplus commodities to feed refugees from Communist China who flee to Hong Kong.

But the Chamber turned down another Republican-supported motion to permit funds received from the sale of farm surpluses to be sent to Yugoslavia and Poland to help build up private farms in those Communist-controlled countries. It also voted to permit a controversial provision that would have prohibited the Agriculture Department from issuing marketing orders to control the supply of potatoes for use in making dehydrated potato flakes and potato chips.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE 186TH ANNIVERSARY OF SIGNING OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, on this July 4, 1962, 186 years since the signing of the Declaration of Independence by dedicated men who had the most vivid vision and reasoning power, we should pause a moment and reflect. There are two questions on my mind which we should ask ourselves.

First. Have we, in this 20th century, shown equal vigor, courage, foresight, and determination to the pilgrims and the pioneers, who shed blood, suffered and withstood unmeasured hardships, that this Nation under a republican form of government might be a land of the free and a home of the brave?

Second. Have we the proper concern, the desire, and the wisdom to carry on, maintaining the basic principles as set forth by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, as devised by our forefathers, that liberty and justice can continue to reign in our United States of America?

These are serious questions. Each generation must consider its responsibilities as well as its benefits. We have been blessed and have lived in a country rich in produce, skills, and manpower. Every man, woman, and child must share the responsibility of keeping America great with freedom for all.

Our country must come before self. May each one feel as Lewis Morris, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence felt, when he said, "There are plenty of homes, but only one country," when he was about to place his signature on the revered document and was told that the enemies were at the gates of his Long Island home, but that his property would be spared if he would withhold his vote for liberty.

Mr. Lewis Morris lost his home, but saved his country. Let us never let such thinking and loyalty die. There is no other country like our United States of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "Our Lives, Fortunes, Honor," as published in the official Boy Scouts magazine, May issue, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OUR LIVES, FORTUNES, HONOR

July 4, 1776, in Philadelphia was an unusually fine day: A comfortable 76° in mid-afternoon—pleasant indeed for July.

The atmosphere was anything but pleasant in the brick Statehouse on Chestnut Street. The Continental Congress had been in session for long, tiring days, in dispute over a document they called "A Declaration of Independence."

The speechmaking had ended. The last stage of the historic conference had come. There was no joy, for each man was faced with the most difficult decision of his life.

It was a time for heartbreak for South Carolina's Thomas Hayward, whose family was divided on loyalty to the King or the colonies.

It was a time for decision for the Quakers and Moravians, who opposed bloodshed yet loved their country as much as the others. Men searched their souls as discussion droned on in the flickering candlelight.

What manner of men were these 56 patriots who, by signing their names, risked everything, including their lives? As a consequence, some suffered imprisonment, exile, slander, and broken health. Others lost their fortunes, and their homes were sacked and burned. Yet, few Americans today can name even 10 of this band of men who put together the document that signaled the birth of the greatest nation on earth.

Every man in the room clearly understood the dangers of signing the document they were painstakingly reworking, paragraph by paragraph.

There were men of wealth—Charles Carroll, of Maryland; John Hancock, of Massachusetts; and Robert Morris, of Pennsylvania. A stroke of the pen might make them paupers.

Sam Huntington, of Connecticut, had risen from a humble barrelmaker by studying law at night to become a Justice of the Supreme Court and a member of the Governor's council, appointed by King George III. He stood to lose more than even the wealthy men.

The afternoon wore on without agreement. Delegates argued about the content of the paper, the timing, even the wisdom of the step it proposed. If they could have foreseen the future, what might their decision have been?

What if New York's Francis Lewis had foreseen his home burned and his wife held for months in a filthy prison? General Washington finally secured her release due to her failing health, but she died 2 years later because of her confinement.

What if Richard Stockton of New Jersey had known he would die in poverty because the British seized all his property?

There was little doubt in the minds of the leaders that the declaration would finally be signed. As John Adams said, "the real revolution occurred in the minds of people" before this Congress convened. The session was nearing the end, and the delegates would scatter. For some, tragic fates lay ahead.

Some were the biggest financial backers of the Revolution and lost every cent they had. Carter Braxton of Virginia, richest of them all, died in debt, brokenhearted. His fortune was in ships, all captured by the English.

The wife of John Hart, a New Jersey farmer, was dying when the Hessians reached his farm a few months after he signed the document. Hart escaped into the woods, but his property was ruined, and his 13 children scattered. Hart lived in a cave until he could return home a year later only to find his wife dead. Almost 70, he joined Washington's army as a private.

When Lewis Morris was about to sign, he received word the enemy was at the gates of his Long Island home, but that his property would be spared if he would withhold his vote for liberty. "There are plenty of homes, but only one country," he answered and signed. He lost everything he possessed and his family was exiled.

The candles in the statehouse were flickering out as a final reading of the declaration began:

"When in the course of human events."

A small boy ran to the steeple of the building where an old bellman had waited patiently since early morning. "Ring, ring," the boy cried.

The old man pulled the rope and the great bell began pealing its crucial message. The inscription on the bell read: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY ON UKRAINE AND OTHER NON-RUSSIAN NATIONS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, it has become a truism in the field of international relations that peace with justice is solidly furthered through a broader knowledge and deeper understanding of other nations and peoples. Yet, strangely enough, in these perilous times we have scarcely observed this basic axiom in relation to Ukraine and

many other captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.

The serious lag and lacunae in our appreciative understanding of these particular nations are compounded by two essential facts. The first fact is that Ukraine, with a population of over 40 million, is the largest captive non-Russian nation not only in the Soviet Union but also behind the Iron Curtain. Long the Achilles heel of the Soviet Russian Empire, Ukraine is one of our most formidable allies for freedom in Moscow's colonial system. The second essential fact is that the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.—from the Baltic to the Caucasus and into central Asia—constitute a tier of fundamental weakness and vulnerability in the imperial structure of Moscow's empire. This was clearly demonstrated when in July 1959 Khrushchev erupted violently over the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution by the U.S. Congress. He has been erupting ever since over the mention of these occupied non-Russian nations.

Madam President, I believe it is most fitting on the eve of the third anniversary of our Captive Nations Week observance to introduce into the RECORD this "Select Bibliography on Ukraine" and other non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. This is the first compact and essential bibliography on this vital subject. Its value and usefulness to our libraries, educational institutions, and public agencies will be enormous. Its value to the interests of our Nation is immeasurable.

Under the far-seeing auspices of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, this select bibliography was compiled by Dr. Alexander Sokolyshyn, a professional librarian in the New York City system. It was edited by Mr. Walter Dushnyck, managing editor of the Ukrainian Quarterly. Its final presentation was arranged by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University and national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

This special project in the interests of American public enlightenment and knowledgeable directions for the expansion of freedom was made possible by a beneficent contribution of Mr. Nicholas Dutchak, of Detroit, Mich. The good that he made possible will, I know, be warmly appreciated by every institution profiting from its use.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that this valuable bibliography be printed in full in the RECORD.

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

A

"Alexander Koshetz in Ukrainian Music," by G. W. Simpson, Ukrainian Cultural and Educational Center, Winnipeg, 1945, 32 pages.

"An Appeal of the Independent Ukraine to the Civilized World," by Michael Hrushevsky; Geneva-Paris, January 15, 1920, 5 pages.

"Ancient Russia," by George Vernadsky, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1947, 384 pages.

"Application of the Ukrainian Republic for Admission to the League of Nations," League of Nations Secretariat, Association Ukrainienne pour la Societe des Nations, Paris, 1930, 25 pages.

"Arms of Valour," by Pavlo Shandruk, Robert Speller & Sons, New York, with an introduction by Roman Smal-Stocki, 1959, 320 pages.

"Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation," by Raphael Lemkin, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D.C., 1944, 674 pages.

B

"Bard of Ukraine: An Introduction to the Life and Work of Taras Shevchenko, by John Weir, the National Jubilee Committee of the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians, Toronto, June 1951, 64 pages, illustrated, portraits, facsimiles.

"Bibliography of Ukraine," prepared by University of Chicago Human Relations Area File, Inc., Behavior Science Bibliographies, New Haven, 1956, 20 pages.

"Black Deeds of the Kremlin, The, a White Book, Book of Testimonies," Ukrainian Association of Victims of Russian Communist Terror, Toronto, 1953. Volume I, page 545, illustrated; volume 2, published by Dobrus, Detroit, 1955, 712 pages, illustrated.

"Boa Constrictor and Other Stories," by Ivan Franko, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 195?, 293 pages, illustrated.

"Bohdan: Hetman of Ukraine," by George Vernadsky, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1941, 150 pages, illustrated, plates.

"Bolshevik Misrule in Ukraine," by Marie Gambal, the American Ukrainian Committee, Detroit, 1933, 81 pages.

"Brest-Litovsk, Peace Conference, 1917–18. (Proceedings of the Brest-Litovsk peace conference. The peace negotiations between Russia and the Central Powers, Nov. 21, 1917, to Mar. 3, 1918). Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1918, 187 pages.

"Brief Outline of Ukrainian History," by Joseph Bilous, Corona Publishers, Detroit, 1955, 24 pages, illustrated.

"Brief Survey of Ukrainian Literature," by Arthur Prudden Coleman, the Ukrainian University Society, New York, 1936, 23 pages.

"British View on the Ukrainian Question," by Arnold Jos. Toynbee, the Ukrainian Federation of the U.S.A., New York, 1916, 16 pages.

C

"Canadian Cossack Essays, Articles and Stories on Ukrainian Canadian Life," by William Paluk, Canadian Ukrainian Review Publishing Co., Winnipeg, 1943, 103 pages.

"Captive Nations, The: Nationalism of the Non-Russian Nations in the Soviet Union," by Roman Smal-Stocki, with a preface by Lev E. Dobriansky, Bookman Associates, New York, 1960, 118 pages.

"Captive Nations Week, July 17–23, 1960," by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman, published by Captive Nations Committee, Washington, D.C., 1960, 16 pages.

"Case for the Independence of Eastern Galicia, The," published under the authority of the President of the Ukrainian National Council, London, 1922, 71 pages.

"Case of the New Republics of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Ukraine, The," by the League of Estonians, Letts, Lithuanians and Ukrainians of America. Published by the First Congress of the League, New York, 1919, 15 pages.

"Case Study of the Ukrainian Apparatus, A," by John Alexander Armstrong, Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1959, 174 pages.

"Catalogue of the First Exhibition: Painting, Prints, Sculpture," by Association of Ukrainian Artists in New York, the Ukrainian Art and Literary Club, New York, 1952.

"Catalogue of the Third Art Exhibition: Painting, Prints, Sculpture," by Ukrainian Artists Association in the U.S.A., the Ukrainian Art and Literary Club, New York, 1955, 22 pages, illustrations.

"Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev, The," by Olexa Povstenko, published by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.A., New York, 1954, 466 pages, illustrations.

"Catholics of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite and Their Divine Liturgy," by Ambrose Senyshyn, published by the Ukrainian Catholic Seminary, Stamford, Conn., 1946, 44 pages, illustrations.

"Celebration of 43d Anniversary of Ukraine's Independence in U.S. Congress," compiled by L. E. Dobriansky, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1961, 52 pages.

"Collection of Voyages and Travels, A: 'A Description of Ukraine,' " by Guillaume le Vasseur Sieur de Beauplan. London, volume I, pages 445–481, 1744; second edition: London, 1752; third edition: London, Churchill, 1764.

"Colonial Disfranchisement and Exploitation of Ukraine by Moscow," by Konstantyn Kononenko, published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, New York, 1958, 30 pages.

"Coming Defeat of Communism, The," by James Burnham, John Day Co., New York, 195–, 378 pages.

"Communism in Reality," by Nicholas Prychodko, New Canada Publishing Co., Toronto, 1950, 64 pages.

"Communist Takeover and Occupation of Ukraine," special report No. 4, of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 2d session, December 31, 1954, House Report No. 2684, part 7. Union Calendar No. 929. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1955, 36 pages.

"Concentration Camps in the U.S.S.R.," by the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council (UHVR) in Ukraine. The Prolog Research and Publishing Association and Association of Friends for the Liberation Movement in Ukraine, New York-Philadelphia, 1952, 23 pages, illustrated map.

"Control of the Arts in the Communist Empire." Consultation with the Committee on Un-American Activities. By Ivan P. Bahriany. House of Representatives, 86th Congress, 1st session. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1959, 24 pages.

"Conversational Ukrainian," by Yar Slavutych, Gateway Press, Edmonton, 1959, 368 pages.

"Cossack Fairy Tales and Folk Tales," by Robert Nisbet Bain, A. H. Bullen, London, 1902, 390 pages, illustrated.

"Crimes of Khrushchev, The, Part II," Committee on Un-American Activities, Consultations, September 9–11, 1959, compiled and edited by L. E. Dobriansky, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1959, 69 pages.

"Crimes of Moscow in Vinnytsia, The," by John F. Stewart, published by the Scottish League for European Freedom, Edinburgh, 1952, 30 pages.

"Dance of Death," by Erich Kern, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1951, 255 pages.

"Death and Devastation on the Curzon Line," by Walter Dushnyck, published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, 1948, 32 pages.

"Demographic Problems of Ukrainians in Exile," by Volodymyr Kubiyuvych, the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Munich, 1949, 16 pages.

"Destruction of Ukrainian Monuments of Art and Culture Under the Soviet Russian Administration, 1917–57," by Volodymyr Sichynsky, published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, New York, 1958, 122 pages, illustrated.

"Development of Research of Fauna of Vertebratae of West Ukraine," by Edward Zarsky, the Ukrainian Technical Institute, New York, 1958, 16 pages.

"Documents of Ukrainian Foreign Policy," by the Ukrainian National Council, published by the Information Service of the Executive Committee of the Ukrainian National Council, Augsburg, 1949, 16 pages.

"Documents on British Foreign Policy, 1914–39," published by H.M. Stationery Office, 1949 (see pp. 308–909, vol. III).

"The Dying Ukrainian," by Patrick Horwat, Bodley Head, London, 1953, 207 pages.

E

"East and East Central Europe Periodicals in English and Other West European Languages," by U.S. Library of Congress, Slavic and Central European Division; compiled by Paul L. Horecky, assisted by Janina Wojcicka; Washington, D.C., 1958.

"Ecological Crop Genography of the Ukraine and the Ukrainian Agroclimate Analogs in North America," by M. Y. Nuttson, published by the American Institute of Crop Ecology, Washington, D.C., 1947, 24 pages, map, tables.

"Economic Factors in the Growth of Russia," by Nicholas L. Chirocsky, Philosophical Library, New York, 1957, 178 pages.

"Economic Rehabilitation in the Ukraine," by United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, European Regional Office, Division of Operational Analysis, London, 1947, 79 pages.

"English-Ukrainian Dictionary," by M. L. Podvesko, New York, 1954, 792 pages (reprint of the Kiev edition of 1948).

"Europe's Freedom Fighter: Taras Shevchenko, 1814–61, U.S. 86th Congress, 2d session; a documentary biography of Ukraine's poet laureate and national hero; published as House Document No. 445, with foreword by Lev E. Dobriansky; Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1960; 44 pages.

"Experience With Russia," by Vasyl Hryshko, published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, New York, 1956, 176 pages.

"Extirpation of Ukrainians in Poland," published by the Central Executive Committee of the Representatives of Ukrainian Refugee Organizations in Czechoslovakia, Prague, 1930, 26 pages, illustrated.

F

"Facts About Ukraine," published by the Pan-American Ukrainian Conference, New York, 1950, 21 pages, map.

"Fall of Postyshev, The," by Hryhory Kostiuk, the Research Program on the U.S.S.R., New York, 1954, 25 pages.

"Famine in Ukraine," published by the United Ukrainian Organization in New York. New York, 1934, 32 pages.

"Famine in the Ukraine, The," published by the Executive Committee of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party, Berlin, 1923, 23 pages.

"Few Reflections on Ukrainian Music Under Soviet Rule, A," by Hryhory Kytasty, East European Fund, New York, 1954.

"First Victims of Communism, White Book on the Religious Persecution in Ukraine." Published by Analecta O.S.B.M., Rome, 1953, 114 pages, illustrated, map.

"500 Ukrainian Martyred Women," by Stephania Halychyn. The United Ukrainian Women's Organizations of America, Inc., illustrated, map. New York, 1956, 1,959 pages.

"Folk Art of Carpatho-Ukraine," by Emilie Ostapchuk (ed.), published by Philip Ostapchuk, Toronto, 1957, 152 pages, illustrated, part in color, 42 plates.

"Foreign Relations of the United States. Diplomatic Papers, the Conference of Yalta, 1945," U.S. Department of State. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1955.

"Foreign Relations of the United States. Diplomatic Papers, the Soviet Union, 1933–39," U.S. Department of State, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1952.

"Forgotten Nation, The," by M. A. Biggs, London, 1886, 29 pages.

"Forgotten Peace—Brest Litovsk, The," by John W. Wheeler-Bennet, William Morrow, New York, 1939, 478 pages, illustrated.

"Free Press of the Suppressed Nations, The," by Roman Ilnytzkyj, published by the Association of the Free Press of Central and Eastern Europe, Augsburg, 1950, 87 pages, illustrated.

"Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy," hearings, Senate Committee on the Judiciary. (Statement by Lev E. Dobriansky), Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1959, 181 pages.

"From a Political Diary: Russia, the Ukraine and America, 1905–45," by Arnold D. Margolin, Columbia University Press, New York, 1946, 250 pages.

"From Florence to Brest, 1439–1596," by Oscar Halecki, Fordham University Press, New York, 1960, 444 pages.

G

"Genetic Relationship and Classification of Ukrainian Ritual Songs," by Alexander Koshetz, published by the Ukrainian Cultural and Educational Center, Winnipeg, 1943, 13 pages, illustrations.

"Genocide Convention, The," hearings, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations (testimony by Lev E. Dobriansky), Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1950, 555 pages.

"German Policy and Occupation of the Soviet Union, 1941–44," by Alexander Dallin, Columbia University (doctoral dissertation), New York, 1954, 1,351 pages.

"German Rule in Russia," 1914–45, by Alexander Dallin, St. Matthew's Press, New York, 1957, 685 pages.

"German Treaties, 1918: Treaty of Peace Signed at Brest-Litovsk Between the Central Powers and the Ukrainian People's Republic." H.M. Stationery Office (British Foreign Office, miscellaneous, 1918, No. 13), London, 1918, 13 pages.

"Golgotha of Ukraine, The," by Dmytro Soloviy, published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, New York, 1953, 43 pages, illustrations.

"Golgotha of Ukraine, The. Eyewitness Accounts of the Famine in Ukraine, 1932–33," published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, New York, 1954, 43 pages, illustrated.

"Great Prince Saint Vladimir, The, His Life and Work," by Nicholas Fedorovich, published by the Ukrainian Church of the U.S.A., New York, 1957, 16 pages.

"Great Pretense, The," a symposium on anti-Stalinism (contributions by Lev E. Dobriansky, Clarence A. Manning, John S. Reshetar), House Committee on Un-American Activities, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1956, 173 pages.

"Growth and Productivity in Ukrainian Agriculture and Industry, 1928–55," by Andrew Gunder Frank, published by the Department of Photoduplication, University of Chicago Library, Chicago, 1957, microfilm.

"Guide to Ukrainian-American Institutions, Professionals and Business," by Wasyl Weresh, Carpathian Star Publishing Co., New York, 1955, 336 pages, illustrations.

H

"Hapsburg Monarchy, The," by H. W. Steed, Constable, London, 1914, 307 pages.

"Hetman of Ukraine: Ivan Mazepa," by Clarence A. Manning, Bookman Associates, Inc., New York, 1957, 234 pages.

"Historical Evolution of the Ukrainian Problem, The," by Michael S. Hrushevsky, Garden City Press, London, 1915. Translated by George Raffalovich. English edition for the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine, 58 pages.

"History of Charles XII, King of Sweden," by Voltaire, London, 1807. English translation by John Stockdale.

"History of Slavic Studies in the United States," by Clarence A. Manning. Marquette University Press, Milwaukee, 1957, 118 pages.

"History of the Ukraine," by Dmytro Doroshenko. The Institute Press. Edmonton, 1941, second edition. 702 pages, maps, tables.

"History of Ukraine, A," by Michael Hrushevsky. Yale University Press. New Haven, 1941. 629 pages, tables, maps.

"Hitler's Occupation of Ukraine, 1941–44. A Study of Totalitarian Imperialism," by Ihor Kamenetsky. Marquette University Press. Milwaukee, 1956, 101 pages, illustrations.

House concurrent resolution, July 15, 1953, favoring extension of diplomatic relations with the Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia. Hearings. U.S. Congress, 83d, 1st session. Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives. Special subcommittee. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1953, 112 pages.

House Joint Resolution 311. U.S. Congress, 86th, 1st session. House of Representatives, March 17, 1959. (Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko on public grounds in the District of Columbia. Authored by L. E. Dobriansky, sponsored by Hon. Alvin M. Bentley, and enacted as Public Law 86–749, September 1960.)

House Joint Resolution 369. U.S. Congress, 65th, 3d session (Congressman Hamill on December 13, 1918, introduced this joint resolution calling for the recognition of Ukraine's independence).

"Hunters and the Hunted, The," by Ivan Bahriany. Burns & MacEachern, Toronto, 1954, 270 pages.

I

"Industrial Output of the Ukraine, 1913–56, The: A Statistical Analysis," by Vsevolow Holubnychy. The Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., Munich, 1957, 63 pages.

"Inhuman Blockade Strangling a Nation: Pestilence and Famine Threaten Existence of 45,000,000 Souls, the Nation of Ukraine." Published by Friends of Ukraine. Washington, D.C., 1920, 24 pages.

"Introduction to the Study of the Ukrainian Language and Culture," by Nestor P. Novovirsky. New York, 1949, two volumes, maps.

"In Quest of Freedom," by Walter Dushnyck, published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, New York, 1958, 94 pages, illustrations.

"Island of Death," by Semen Pidhainy, Burns & MacEachern, Toronto, 1953, 240 pages.

"Ivan Franko," by Clarence A. Manning, The Ukrainian University Society, New York, 1937, 28 pages, 2d edition, 1938, 38 pages.

"Ivan Franko, Poems and Stories," by John Weir, Ukrainska Knyha, Toronto, 1956, 341 pages.

"Ivan Franko, the Poet of Western Ukraine," selected poems, by Percival Cundy (translation), Philosophical Library, New York, 1948, 265 pages.

"Investigation of Communist Takeover and Occupation of the Non-Russian Nations of the U.S.S.R.," eight interim reports of hearings before Select Committee on Communist Aggression, House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 2d session, H. Res. 346 and 438, Munich, New York, Chicago, 1954, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1954, 370 pages.

J

"Jewish Pogroms in Ukraine, The," authoritative statement by Julian Bachynskyj, Dr. Arnold Margolin, Dr. Mark Vishnitzer, Israel Zangwill, and others, Friends of Ukraine, Washington, D.C., 1919, 24 pages, map.

"Journey for Our Time," the Journals of the Marquis de Custine, edited and translated by Phyllis Penn Kohler. Introduction by Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, Pellegrini & Cudahy, New York, 1951, 338 pages.

"Jubilee Book of the Ukrainian National Association," Ukrainian National Association (in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of its existence), Jersey City, N.J., 1935, 752 pages.

K

"Kobzar of the Ukraine, The," by Taras Shevchenko, A. J. Hunter, translated by Alexander Jardin Hunter, Manitoba, 1922, 144 pages.

"Kostomarov's Book of Genesis of the Ukrainian People," by B. Yaniwskyj, research program on the U.S.S.R. (its series No. 60), New York, 1954, 54 pages.

"Kremlin on a Volcano, The: Coexistence or Liberation Policy?" by Jaroslav Stetzko, American Friends of Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, New York, 1959, 56 pages.

L

"Leap to Freedom," by Oksana S. Kasenkina, J. B. Lippincott, New York, 1949.

"Life of St. Josephat," by Theodosia Boresky, Press Co., New York, 1955, 382 pages.

"List of Ukrainian Terminological Dictionaries Available in the United States and Canada," by Mykhailo Pezhansky, New York, 1955, 66 pages.

"Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917–34," by George S. N. Luckyj, Columbia University Press, New York, 1956, 323 pages.

"Love Ukraine," by Volodymyr Sosiura, with introduction by Ivan Bahriany, Ukraina, Neu Ulm, 1952, 29 pages, portrait. Text in Ukrainian and English.

M

"Map of Ukraine, The," League of Americans of Ukrainian Descent, Chicago, 1955, 1 fold map.

"Martyrdom in Ukraine: Russia Denies Religious Freedom," by Walter Dushnyck, the America Press, New York, 1946, 45 pages.

"Marya of Clark Avenue," by Marie Holun Bloch, Coward-McCann, New York, 1957.

"Masks of Moscow: A History of Russian Behavior Patterns," by John M. Radzinski, Regent House, Chicago, 1960, 268 pages.

"Massacre in Vinnitsa," the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, New York, 1953, 15 pages, illustrations.

"Mass Murders and Tortures of Innocent Ukrainian People by Communists," extension of remarks by Thaddeus M. Machrowicz in House of Representatives, March 27, 1956, U.S. 84th Congress, 2d session, daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2638, March 27, 1956.

"Material Concerning Ukrainian-Jewish Relations During the Years of Revolution, 1917–21" (collection of documents and testimonies by the Ukrainian Information Bureau), Munich, 1956, 102 pages.

"Mazeppa," a poem, by Lord Byron, Murray, London, 1818, 69 pages.

"Memorandum Concerning the Situation of the West Ukrainian Provinces Under Foreign Occupation" (addressed to the Sixth Plenary Meeting of the League of Nations by the president of the Ukrainian National Council); Geneva, 1925, 10 pages.

"Memorandum of the Government of the United States on the Recognition of the Ukrainian People's Republic," Friends of Ukraine, Washington, D.C., 1920, 19 pages, illustrations, map.

"Memorial Addressed to His Excellency the President of the United States and to the Senators of the United States and Representatives in Congress," the Ukrainian National Committee of the United States. (Very Rev. Peter Poniatyshin, chairman; Simon Yadlovsky, vice chairman; Vladimir B. Lototsky, secretary; Rev. Nicholas Pidhorecky, treasurer; Constantine Kirczow, executive member.) Washington, D.C., 1919.

"Memorial and Petition for Liberty." Presented to the President of the United States by delegates of the Ukrainian Convention of the State of Connecticut, 1919.

"Men in Sheepskin Coats: A Study in Assimilation," by Vera Lysenko, Ryerson Press, Toronto, 1947, 303 pages.

"Message of the Ukrainian National Council to President Wilson. Horizons, volume III, Nos. 1–2 (3–4), pages 13–14. New York, fall-spring, 1958–59.

"Modern Ukrainian Grammar, A." By George S. N. Luckyj. University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis, 1949. 186 pages.

"Modern Ukrainian Grammar, A." By George S. N. Luckyj and Jaroslaw B. Rudnyckyj. University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis, 1958. Third printing: Winnipeg, UVAN, 1958, 184 pages.

"Mocow and the Ukraine, 1918–53; A Study of Russian Bolshevik Nationality Policy," by Basil Dmytryshyn. Bookman Associates. New York, 1956, 310 pages.

"Moscow's Drive for World Domination." By Nicholas Prychodko, Free World Publication Co., Toronto, 1951, 72 pages.

"Mus in Prison, The." By Yar Slavutych. Svoboda Printing Co., Jersey City, N.J., 1956, 62 pages, illustrations.

"Music Under the Soviets: the Agony of an Art." By Andrey V. Olkhovsky. Frederick A. Praeger. New York, 1955, pages 243–261. (For Research Program of the U.S.S.R., No. 11.)

"My Songs. A Selection of Ukrainian Folksongs in English Translations." By J. Dziobko. Ukrainian Canadian Pioneer's Library. Winnipeg, 1958, 102 pages. Portfolio (series No. 2).

N

"Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union and Russian Communist Imperialism, The." By Roman Smal-Stocki. With a preface by Lev E. Dobriansky. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1952, 474 pages.

"National Problems in the U.S.S.R.," by Oleh R. Martovych, published by the Scottish League for European Freedoms, Edinburgh, 1953, 58 pages, map and tables.

"Non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R., Focal Points in American Policy of National Liberation," by Lev E. Dobriansky. In extension of remarks of Hon. Brian McMahon, of Connecticut, in the Senate of the United States, May 15, 1952, 82d Congress, 2d session, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1952, 8 pages.

O

"Oasis, Selected Poems," by Yar Slavutych, the Vantage Press, New York, 1959, 63 pages.

"One of the Fifteen Million." By Nicholas Prychodko. Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1952, 236 pages.

"Outline of Ukrainian History." By Clarence A. Manning. Published by the Ukrainian Canadian Committee. Winnipeg, 1949, 59 pages. Illustrated.

"Our Ukrainian Background." By Marie S. Gambal. Published by the Ukrainian Workingmen's Association, Scranton, Pa., 1936, 31 pages. Illustrated, map.

P

"Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918. Russia." By U.S. Department of State. Government Printing Office, 1932, 3 volumes.

"Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1919. Russia." By U.S. Department of State. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1937, 3 volumes.

"Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918. The World War." By U.S. Department of State. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1933, 2 volumes.

"Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1919. The Paris Peace Conference." By U.S. Department of State. Government Printing Office. Washington, D.C., 1942, 11 volumes.

"Peasant Europe." By Hessell H. Tiltman. Published by Harolds. London, 1934.

"Permanent Missions to the United Nations." By the United Nations. New York, June 1960, 143 pages.

"Persecution and Destruction of the Ukrainian Church by the Russian Bolsheviks," by Gregory Luznycky, Ph. D., published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, 1960, New York, 64 pages.

"Petition of Minorities in Poland," petition to the League of Nations concerning the Ukrainian minority in Poland and the question of the establishment of an autonomous regime in the territory known as Eastern Galicia; submitted by Members of the British Parliament and other persons, October 1932, London, 1932.

"Pocket Dictionary of the Ukranian-English and English-Ukrainian Languages, A," by James N. Krett. 1931, 446 pages.

"Poland: Key to Europe." By Raymond Leslie Buell. Alfred A. Knopf. New York, 1939, 364 pages.

"Polish Atrocities in the Western Ukraine," an appeal to the League of Nations for the rights of man and citizen, by Wladimir Kushnir. Gerald & Co., Vienna, 1931, 72 pages, illustrations and map.

"Polish Atrocities in Ukraine," by Emil Reviuk, published by the United Ukrainian Organizations, New York, 1931, 512 pages, illustrations and map.

"Polish Terror in the Province of Eastern Galicia-Western Ukraine," by Yaroslav Chemerensky, published by the United American-Ukrainian Citizens' Organizations of Philadelphia. Philadelphia, 1930, 8 pages.

"Policy of Liberation as a Prerequisite for the Preservation of the Free World Aims, Formulation and Method of Implementation," by Mykola Lebed, published by the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council, New York, 1953, 21 pages.

"Political Policy of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., The," by Lev E. Dobriansky, published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, New York, 1950, 15 pages.

"Population of the Soviet Ukraine, The: History and Prospects," by Frank Lorimer, published by the League of Nations, Geneva, 1946, 289 pages, illustrations.

"Problem of Modern Ukrainian Historiography, The," by Mykola D. Chubatyj, New York, 1944, 16 pages.

"Problems of the Ukraine, The," by Alexander Shulgin, translation from the French, the Ukrainian Press Bureau, London, 1919, 32 pages, frontispiece, portrait, folded map.

"Prohibition and Destruction of the Ukrainian Scientific Terminology by Soviet Moscow, The," by Roman Smal-Stocki, introduction to "A List of Dictionaries," 1918–1933, the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev, compiled by Alexander Gregorovich, Toronto, 1957.

"Protection of Minorities in Poland," petition to the League of Nations concerning the Ukrainian minority in Poland and the question of the establishment of an autonomous regime in the territory known as Eastern Galicia; submitted by members of British Parliament and others in October 1932, London, 1933.

"Protest of the Ukrainian Republic to the United States Against the Delivery of Eastern Galicia to Polish Domination," by Friends of Ukraine, Washington, D.C., 1919, 16 pages.

R

"Recognition of Ukrainians in the U.S. Census." Published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, New York, 1960, 7 pages.

"Readings in Ukrainian Authors," by C. H. Andrusyshen. Published by the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, Winnipeg, 1949, 240 pages.

"Red Assassins: A Factual Story Revealing How the Ukraine Lost Its Freedom," by Theodosy Oshmachka. T. S. Denison & Co., Minneapolis, 1959, 375 pages.

"Red Book of the Persecuted Church, The," by Albert Galter. Newman Press, Westminster, Md., 1958, 391 pages.

"Refugees Are People," by Walter Dushnyck and William J. Gibbons, the American Press, New York, 1947, 96 pages.

"Religion Behind the Iron Curtain," by George N. Shuster, Macmillan, New York, 1954, 231 pages.

"Report on the Polish-Ukrainian Conflict in Eastern Galicia," by James Barr and Rheys J. Davies, House of Commons, London, September 1931. Published by the United Ukrainian Organizations of Chicago and vicinity, 1931, 29 pages.

"Republic of Ukraine, The," by Simon Litman. Published by the War Committee of the University of Illinois, Urbana, 1919, 8 pages, illustrated, map.

"Resolution To Express House Disapproval of Anti-Christian Terror and Persecution by Communists of the Ukrainian Christians," introduced by Hon. THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, in U.S. Congress, 84th, 2d session, April 23, 1955, House Resolution 482, Washington, D.C.

"Resolution To Express Senate Disapproval of Anti-Christian Terror and Persecution by Communists of the Ukrainian Christians." Introduced by Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY in U.S. Senate (84th Cong., 2d sess.), Senate Resolution 189, on January 20, 1956, Washington, D.C.

"Russia and Her Colonies," by Walter Kolarz. Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1952, 335 pages.

"Russian Communist Party and the Sovietization of Ukraine, The: A Study in the Communist Doctrine of the Self-Determination of Nations," by Jurij Borys, published by Kungl. Boktryckeriet P. A. Norstedt & Soner, Stockholm, 1960, 374 pages.

"Russian Frenzy," by W. E. R. Piddington, Elek Books, London, 1955, 261 pages.

"Russia, Poland, and Ukraine," by Gustaf Frederik Steffen, published by the Ukrainian National Council, Jersey City, N.J., 1915, 36 pages.

"Russian Provisional Government and the Ukrainian National Movement, The," by Walter Dushnyck. Reprint from the Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. II, No. 4, and vol. III, No. 3, summer-autumn, 1946, New York, 28 pages.

"Russian, Ukrainian, and Byelorussian Newspapers, 1917–53," by U.S. Library of Congress, Slavic and East European Division, compiled by Paul L. Horecky, Washington, D.C., 1953, 218 pages. A union list.

"Rus, Ukraine, Moscovy, Russia," by Marie Strutinsky Gambal, published by the Ukrainian Workingmen's Association, Scranton, Pa., 1937, 23 pages, illustrations and map.

S

"Saga of Ukraine, The: An Outline of History," vol. I: "The Age of Royalty," by Myron B. Kuropas, Chicago, 1960, 63 pages.

"Selected List of Books on the Ukraine Published in English, French, German, and Italian," U.S. Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., 1941, 13 pages, compiled by Sergius Jacobson and Francis J. Whitfield.

S. bill 2177. U.S. Senate, 71st Congress, 1st session. (Senator Copeland on October 30, 1929, proposed and on November 20, 1929, introduced this bill providing for the appointment of a diplomatic representative to the Ukrainian Democratic Republic), two pages.

S.J. Res. 20. U.S. 86th Congress, 1st session. (Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day. Senator BUSH and Senator JAVITS, January 20, 1959.)

S.J. Res. 111. U.S. 86th Congress, 1st session. (Captive Nations Week resolution, a joint resolution designating 3d week of July as Captive Nations Week. Authored by Lev E. Dobriansky, originally cosponsored by Hon. Paul H. Douglas and Hon. Jacob K. Javits, and enacted into Public Law 86–90, July 1959.)

"Shevchenko, Taras, 1814–61, the Kobzar of the Ukraine," by Alexander Jardine Hunter, selected poems translated into English with biographical fragments, published by A. J. Hunter, Teulon, 1922, 145 pages, illustrations, port.

"Shevchenko and the Jews," by Roman Smal-Stocki, published by the Shevchenko Scientific Society Study Center, Chicago, 1959, 11 pages, Shevchenko Scientific Society, Inc., New York, paper No. 8.

"Shevchenko and Women: Women in the Life and Works of Taras Shevchenko," by Luke Myshuha, published by the Ukrainian Press, Jersey City, N.J., 1940, 94 pages, illustrations.

"Six Lyrics From Ruthenian (Ukrainian) by Taras Shevchenko," by Ethel Lilian Voynich, translated by E. L. Voynich, published by E. Matthew, London, 1911, 64 pages.

"Slavic Europe," by Robert Joseph Kerner. A selected bibliography in Western European languages and literature, Harvard University Press. Cambridge, 1918, 402 pages.

"Slavonic Encyclopedia," by Joseph S. Roucek, Philosophical Library, New York, 1949, 1445 pages. Editors of Ukrainian Section: Nicholas D. Chubaty and Walter Dushnyck. (See pp. 1325–1334, etc.).

"Songs of the Zaporozhsky Cossacks," by National Ukrainian Folk Ensemble of Kiev, 1958.

"Songs of Ukraine," by F. R. Livesay, E. P. Dutton & Co., New York, 1916, 175 pages.

"Songs of Ukraine, With Ruthenian Poems," by Florence R. Livesay, J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., London, 1916, 175 pages.

"Soviet Deportation of Nationalities, The," by R. Conquest, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1960.

"Soviet Empire, The: Prison House of Nations and Races; A Study in Genocide, Discrimination, and Abuse of Power." Prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1958, 85th Congress, 2d session, Senate Document 122, 72 pages, map.

"Soviet Ukrainian Literature: A Study in Literary Politics, 1917–19," by George S. N. Luckyj, Columbia University Press. New York, 1954, and University Microfilm, Ann Arbor, 1954, 336 leaves.

"Soviet Union, The: A New Despotic Empire," by Dmytro Soloviy, published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, New York, 1958.

"Spirit of Flame: A collection of the Works of Lesya Ukrainka," by Percival Cundy (translation), Bookman Associates, New York, 1950, 320 pages, portrait.

"Spirit of Independence, The: America and Ukraine," by Oscar L. Chapman, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1952.

"Spirit of Ukraine," by D. Snowyd, published by United Ukrainian Organizations of the United States, New York, 1935, 152 pages, illustrations, portraits, maps.

"Story of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, 1940–51, The," published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc. New York, 1951, 64 pages, illustrations.

"Story of Ukraine, The," by Clarence A. Manning, Philosophical Library, New York, 1947, 326 pages, maps.

"Story of Ukraine, The," by Marie Strutinsky Gambal, published by the Ukrainian Workingmen's Association, Scranton, Pa., 1932, 102 pages, illustrations, map.

T

"Tale of Prince Ihor's Campaign, The; Ukrainian Epic of the 12th Century," published by "Kyiw," Philadelphia, Pa., 1950, 91 pages, illustrations, map.

"Taras Shevchenko and West European Literature," by Jurij Bojko, by the Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain, London, 1956, 64 pages, illustrations.

"Taras Shevchenko, Bard of Ukraine," by Dmytro Doroshenko, published by the United Ukrainian Organizations of the United States, New York, 1936, 59 pages, portrait.

"Taras Shevchenko, the Man and the Symbol," by W. K. Matthews, published by the Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain, London, 1951, 16 pages.

"Taras Shevchenko, the Poet of Ukraine," selected poems, by Clarence A. Manning, published by Ukrainian National Association, Jersey City, N.J., 1945, 217 pages.

"Text of the Ukraine 'Peace'" with maps, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1918, 160 pages, maps.

"Their Brothers' Keepers," by Philip Friedman, Crown Publishers, Inc., New York, 1957, 224 pages.

"Time of the Assassins," by Godfrey Blunden, J.B. Lippincott, Philadelphia, New York, 1954, 375 pages.

"Three Centuries of Struggle," addresses on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the Treaty of Pereyaslav Between Ukraine and Russia, 1654–1954, published by the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, Winnipeg, 1954, 47 pages, illustrations, map.

"To the Civilized Nations of the World," by the Committee of Independent Ukraine (signed by President M. Hrushevsky; Secretary D. M. Lozynsky, at Paris, January 15, 1920).

"Trade With Ukraine," by Emil Reviuk, published by Friends of Ukraine, Washington, D.C., 1920, 24 pages, illustrations, charts, map.

"Traditional Ukrainian Cookery," by Savella Stechishin, Trident Press, Ltd., Winnipeg, 1957, 498 pages, illustrations.

"Travels Through Holland, Flanders, Russia, the Ukraine, and Poland, in the Years 1769–70," by Joseph Marshall, London, 1763; second edition, 1772; third edition, 1773, fourth edition, 1774.

"Treaty of Pereyaslav, The: The Ukrainians' 300-Year Fight Against the Perfidious Moscow Ally," by John F. Stewart, published by the Scottish League for European Freedom, Edinburgh, 1954.

"Treaty of Peace Signed at Brest-Litovsk Between the Central Powers and the Ukrainian People's Republic With the Supplementary Treaty Thereto," H.M. Stationery Office, London, 1918, Cd. 9105/XXVI, 763, London, 1918, 31 pages.

"Truth About Poland, The," by V. Soborny and W. Bukata. Published by Committee of Protest Against Persecution of Ukrainians in Poland. New York, 1938, 15 pages, illustrations, map.

"Turkism and the Soviets," by Charles Warren Hostler. Frederick A. Praeger. New York, 1957, 244 pages.

"Twentieth Century Ukraine," by Clarence A. Manning. Bookman Associates, New York, 1951, 243 pages, map.

"Twenty Years of Devotion to Freedom," Survey of purposes and activities of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on the 20th anniversary of its existence, published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, New York, 1960, 104 pages.

"201 Ukrainian Folk Songs," published by the Ukrainian Music Publishing Co., Paris, New York, 1943, 136 pages.

U

"Ucrainica in the Library of Congress," a preliminary survey by Jaroslav B. Rudnyckyj, Washington: Library of Congress, Reference Department, Slavic and Central European Division, June, 1956, 94 pages.

"Ucrainica," selected bibliography on Ukraine in Western European languages, by Eugene J. Pelenskyj, published by "Bystrytsia." Munich, 1948, 111 pages. (Memoirs of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, vol. CLVIII.)

"Ukraine," by John F. Stewart, published by the Scottish League for European Freedom, Edinburgh, 1950, 12 pages, map.

"Ukraine," by Roman Weres. Thesis presented at Western Michigan University, 1958, 239 pages.

"Ukraine, The," by O. J. Frederiksen, in Strakhovsky, L.I., ed. "Handbook of Slavic Studies," Harvard University Press, 1949, 346–366 pages.

"Ukraine, The," by George Raffailovich, F. Griffiths, London, 1914, 71 pages, illustrations, maps.

"Ukraine, The," by Bedwin Sands, F. Griffiths, London, 1914, 71 pages, illustrations, maps.

"Ukraine, The," handbook prepared under the direction of the Historical Section of the

British Foreign Office. No. 52, London, H.M. Stationery, 1920.

"Ukraine, The: A History," by W. E. D. Allen, University Press, Cambridge, England, 1940, 390 pages, maps.

"Ukraine," a series of maps and explorations indicating the historic and contemporary geographical position of the Ukrainian people, by George W. Simpson, Oxford University Press, London, 1941, 48 pages, maps. Reprinted June 1942. New edition: "Augsburg, Ukrainska Knyha," 1946.

"Ukraine: A Series of Seven Addresses," by George W. Simpson, published by the Ukrainian National Federation of Canada, Saskatoon, 1939.

"Ukraine, The: A Submerged Nation," by William Henry Chamberlin, Macmillan, New York, 1944, 91 pages.

"Ukraine and American Democracy," by Luke Myshuha, published by Ukrainian Organizations of the United States, New York, 1939, 32 pages.

"Ukraine and Its People," by Hugh Pembroke Vowels, W. & R. Chambers, London and Edinburgh, 1939, 224 pages.

"Ukraine and Its People," a handbook, by Ivan Mirchuk, Ukrainian University Press, Munich, 1949, 380 pages, illustrations, maps, tables.

"Ukraine and Poland," a memorandum of the Ukrainian National Council to Dean Acheson, by Ukrainian National Council, published by the Ukrainian Information Bureau, Augsburg, 1951, 14 pages.

"Ukraine and Russia," by Nicholas Prychodko, published by the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, Winnipeg, 1953, 22 pages.

"Ukraine and Russia," a history of the economic relations between Ukraine and Russia, 1654–1947, by Konstantin Kononenko, Marquette University Press, Milwaukee, 1958, 257 pages.

"Ukraine and Russia: A Survey of Soviet Russia's 20-Year Occupation of Eastern Ukraine," by Mykola Sciborsky, published by the Organization for the Rebirth of Ukraine, New York, 1940, 98 pages, illustrations, maps.

"Ukraine and Russia: A Survey of Their Economic Relations," by Waldemar Timoshenko, published by Friends of Ukraine, Washington, D.C., 1919, 16 pages.

"Ukraine and the Ukrainians," by Emil Reviuk, published by Friends of Ukraine, Washington, D.C., 1920, 20 pages, map.

"Ukraine and the Ukrainians, The," by Stepan Rudnitksy, published by the Ukrainian National Council, Jersey City, N.J., 1915, 36 pages, map.

"Ukraine and the XVI Olympic Games," by Ukrainian World Committee for Sports Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1956, 22 pages.

"Ukraine, Her Struggle for Freedom," by Panas Fedenko, published by Free Ukraine, Augsburg, 1951, 80 pages, map.

"Ukraine, The: Handbook," H.M. Stationery Office, Foreign Office, Historical Section, No. 52, Handbook, vol. IX, London, 1920, 110 pages.

"Ukraine: Historical and Geographical Atlas," by George W. Simpson, published by Ukrainska Knyha, Augsburg, 1946, 48 pages, maps.

"Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions from the 6th to the 20th Century," by Volodymyr Sichynsky, published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, New York, 1953, 235 pages, illustrations, maps.

"Ukraine," Letter from the Delegate of the Ukraine submitting observations with regard to the Ukraine's request for admission to the League (of Nations). League of Nations Official No.: 20/48/234, Geneva, 1920, 3 pages.

"Ukraine on the Road to Freedom," published by the Ukrainian National Committee of the United States, New York, 1919, 80 pages, map.

"Ukraine, Poland and Russia, and the Right of the Free Disposition of the Peoples," by Serhiy Shelukhin, published by Friends of Ukraine, Washington, D.C., 1919, 21 pages, illustrations, double map.

"Ukraine: The Land and Its People," an introduction to its geography, by Stepan Rudnitsky, Rand McNally & Co., New York, 1918, 369 pages, 6 maps.

"Ukraine: The Pressing Problem in European Politics," by G. W. Simpson, published by Ukrainian Self-Reliance League, Edmonton, 1931.

"Ukraine Under the Bolshevik Occupation, The," by F. Pigido, published by the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., Munich, 1956, 140 pages.

"Ukraine Under the Soviets," by Clarence A Manning, Bookman Associates, New York, 1953, 223 pages.

"Ukraine's Call to America," by Honore Ewach, published by the Ukrainian Cultural Society, Detroit, 1947, 173 pages.

"Ukraine's Claim to Freedom," by Edwin August Bjorkman and others, published by Ukrainian National Association, New York, 1916, 125 pages, map.

"Ukraine's Claim to Freedom: An Appeal for Justice on Behalf of 35 Million," published by Ukrainian National Association and Ruthenian National Union, New York, 1915, 125 pages, map.

"Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, The (A Historical Outline), part I, 1918–30," by Natalia Wasylenko-Polonska, published by the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., Munich, 1956, 74 pages.

"Ukrainian-American Cook Book," by Junior Women's League. Published by SS. Peter and Paul Church. Cleveland.

"Ukrainian Arts," compiled and edited by Olya Dmytrow and Ann Mitz. Published by the Ukrainian Youth League of North America. New York, 1952, 212 pages. Illustrations, part in color, map. Revised edition of 1955, 217 pages.

"Ukrainian," a basic course, pronounciation and writing system. By U.S. Army Language School (Monterey, Calif.). Published by Presidio of Monterey, 1956.

"Ukrainian Bibliography in the English Language," by Alexander Sokolyshyn. New York, 1958, 150 pages (typescript).

"Ukrainian Canadians, The," a study in assimilation. By Charles H. Young. T. Nelson & Sons. Toronto. 1931, 327 pages. Tables, maps, plates.

"Ukrainian Cause, The," by Walter Bukata. Published by National Manifestation for Independence of Ukraine. New York, 1938, 23 pages.

"Ukrainian Communism and Soviet Russian Policy Toward the Ukraine," an annotated bibliography, 1917–53. By Jurj Lawrynenko. Published by the Research Program of the U.S.S.R. New York, 1953, 454 pages.

"Ukrainian Cross Stitch Designs, Ukrainian Embroidery Designs and Stitches," by Rose Dragan. Published by the Ukrainian Women's Association of Canada. 1956, 12 parts. Illustrations.

"Ukrainian Dances," by A. Hnatyshyn. Published by Josef Dorr. Vienna, 1956, 10 pages.

"Ukrainian Decorative Design," by V. Nahai. The State Publishing Co., Kiev, 10 pages, 26 colored plates.

"Ukrainian Easter Eggs," by Gloria Surmach. Published by the Ukrainian Youth League of North America, Inc. New York. 1937, 37 pages. Illustrations.

"Ukrainian-English Dictionary," by C. H. Andrusyshen and J. N. Krett, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1957, 1,163 pages.

"Ukrainian-English Dictionary," by M. L. Podvesko, published by Radyanska Shkola, Kiev, 1954, 2d edition, 1957, 1,018 pages.

"Ukrainian Folk Costume," by Katerena Antonovych, published by Ukrainian Women's Organizations of Canada, Winnipeg, 1954, 23 pages, illustrations.

"Ukrainian Folk Embroidery," by Ludmela Demydenko, published by Arka, Toronto, 1953, 16 plates.

"Ukrainian Folk Songs," sung by Ira Malaniuk with St. Barbara's Church Choir and Tonkistler Orchestra of Vienna, conducted and directed by Andriy Hnatyshyn, 14 songs.

"Ukrainian Foreign Policy," by Jaroslav Stetzko, published by the Scottish League for European Freedom, Edinburgh, 1953, 32 pages.

"Ukrainian Historical Science Under the Soviets, 1920–50," by Borys Krupnytsky, published by the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., Munich, 1951.

"Ukrainian Historiography, 1917–56," by Alexander Ohloblyn, published by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, Inc., New York, 1957, vol. V, VI.

"Ukrainian-Jewish Relations During the Nazi Occupation," by Philip Friedman, reprint from Yivo Institute for Jewish Research-Yivo Annual of Jewish Social Science, 1958–59, vol. XII, pages 259–296.

"Ukrainian Liberation Movement in Modern Times," by Oleh Martovych, published by the Scottish League for European Freedom, Edinburgh, 1952, 176 pages, illustrations.

"Ukrainian Literature: Studies of the Leading Authors," by Clarence A. Manning, published by the Ukrainian National Association, Jersey City, N.J., 1944, 126 pages.

"Ukrainian National Movement," by Stephen Shumeyko, published by United Ukrainian Organizations of the United States, New York, 1939, 46 pages.

"Ukrainian National Women's Costume," published by the Ukrainian Branch 360, Canadian Legion, Besl., Toronto, 1953, 71 pages.

"Ukrainian Nationalism, 1939–45," by John Alexander Armstrong, Columbia University Press, New York, 1955, 322 pages, maps.

"Ukrainian Poet in the Soviet Union, A," by Oksana Asher, New York, 1959, 49 pages, illustrated.

"Ukrainian Policy of Liberation," by the Ukrainian National Council (declaration of the representatives of the executive committee of the Ukrainian National Council, at the press conference in Augsburg of Sept. 6, 1951), published by the Ukrainian Information Bureau, Augsburg, 1951, 15 pages.

"Ukrainian Problems, The, A Collection of Notes and Memoirs," published by Ukrainian Press Bureau, London, 1919, 64 pages.

"Ukrainian Question, The," by M. P. Mandryka. Published by the Canadian Ukrainian Educational Association, Winnipeg, Manitoba, 1940, 57 pages illustrated, map.

"Ukrainian Question, The: A Peace Problem," published by publication and propaganda branch of the Ukrainian Nationalists, Geneva, 1928, 40 pages.

"Ukrainian Question and Its Importance to Great Britain, The," by Lancelot Lawton. Published by Anglo-Ukrainian Association. London, 1935, 36 pages.

"Ukrainian Question and Present Crisis, The," by G. W. Simpson, Saskatoon, 1939, 14 pages illustrated.

"Ukrainian Records," by "Arka," New York, 1958, 68 pages.

"Ukrainian Resistance," published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., New York, 1949, 142 pages, illustrated.

"Ukrainian Revolution, The," by John S. Reshetar, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1952, 363 pages.

"Ukrainian Self-Educator for the Beginners. Ukrainian Grammar Simplified," by Honore Ewach, published by Ukrainian Cooperative "Kalyna," 1953 (first edition, 1946), 96 pages.

"Ukrainian SSR: National Economy of the Ukrainian SSR: A Statistical Compilation," published by U.S. Joint Publishing Research Service, Washington, D.C., 1958, 537 pages, tables.

"Ukrainian Songs and Lyrics. A Short Anthology of Ukrainian Poetry," by Honore

Ewach, published by Ukrainian Publishing Co., Winnipeg, 1934, 80 pages.

"Ukrainian Underground Art," album of woodcuts made in Ukraine 1917–50 by artists of the Ukrainian underground, Nil Khasevych, "Bye-Zot" and his disciples, published by "Prolog," 1952, 69 pages, illustrated.

"Ukrainian Yearbook and Ukrainians of Distinction," by F. A. Machrough, published by Ukrainian Yearbook, Winnipeg, 1952, 144 pages, illustrated, map.

"Ukrainian Yearbook: The Ukrainian Business Directory," by Ukrainian Business Directory, Winnipeg, 1956, 78 pages, maps, tables.

"Ukrainian Youth in the Free World in Photo Album of the Ukrainian Youth Association Abroad" (describes the sum activities in the free world), London, 1954, 236 pages, illustrations, part in color.

"Ukrainian Youthful Melodies for School, Camp, Home," by Mykola Fomenko, published by the Ukrainian Institute of America, New York, 1951, 90 pages.

"Ukrainians Accuse the Government of Soviet Russia, The," published by Ukrainian Organizations of Greater New York, New York, 1933, 4 pages.

"Ukrainians and the European War, The," by the Ukrainian National Council, published by the Ukrainian National Association, Jersey City, N.J., 1915, 64 pages, illustrations, map.

"Ukrainians in Manitoba, The," a social study, by Paul Yuzyk, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1953, 232 pages, illustrations, maps.

"Ukrainians in the United States," by Wasyl Halich, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1937, 174 pages, illustrations.

"Ukrainians, The—Our Most Pressing Problem," by W. L. Scott, Toronto, 1931, 64 pages.

Unknown Revolution, The: Ukraine, 1918–21, Kronstadt, 1921," by V. M. Eichenbaum, published by Libertarian Book Club, New York, 1956, 270 pages.

"United Nations Charter, Review of," hearings, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, part 12. (Testimony of Lev E. Dobriansky), Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1955, 2,032 pages.

"U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Proceedings and Debates of the 86th Congress, 1st Session," volume 105, part 1, Washington, D.C., January 22, 1959. (Contains remarks in the House of Representatives concerning January 22, 1918 and 1919 in Ukraine, when the Ukrainian national independent state was proclaimed and consolidated.)

"U.S. Envoys to Ukraine and Byelorussia," by Georgetown University Forum, published by Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., January 10, 1954, 9 pages.

"U.S. H.J. Res. 334" (Representative WALTER H. JUDD of Minnesota introduced a resolution on April 8, 1959, in the House of Representatives calling for a proclamation by the President designating January 22 of each year as "Ukrainian Independence Day": Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.)

"UPA: The Story of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and the Ukrainian Red Cross," by the Scottish League for European Freedom, Edinburgh, 1951, 24 pages, illustrations.

V

"Voice From Ukraine, A," by Percival Cundy, biographical sketch and translations from the works of Ivan Franko, Buffy & Co., Manitoba, 1932, 74 pages.

W

"War and Ukrainian Democracy, The: A Compilation of Documents From the Past and Present," by Nikifor Hryhoriev, Industrial & Educational Publishing Co., Ltd., Toronto, 1945, 206 pages.

"Western Psychological Strategy Toward U.S.S.R.: The Weapon of Enlightened Nationalism," by Lev E. Dobriansky. Remarks of Hon. John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, in the Senate of the United States, August 3, 1953, 83d Congress, 1st session, Washington, D.C.

"Why They Behave Like Russians," by John Fisher, Harper & Bros., New York, 1947, 262 pages.

"Women of Ukraine"; women's role on the scene of history, in literature, arts, and struggle for freedom; by Ukrainian National Women's League of America, Philadelphia, 1955, 48 pages.

Y

"Yellow Boots," by Vera Lysenko, Ryerson Press, Toronto, 1954, 314 pages.

Z

"Zakhar Berkut," by Ivan Franko, translated by Theodosia Boresky, Theo. Gans' Sons, New York, 1944, 230 pages.

ADDITIONAL LISTINGS

B

"Bolshevist Persecution of Church and Religion in Ukraine, 1917–57, Informative Outline," by Dr. Lev W. Mydlowsky, Ukrainian Publishers, Ltd., London, 1958, 34 pages.

C

"Celebration of 42d Anniversary of Ukraine's Independence in U.S. Congress," speeches of Hon. THOMAS J. DODD and Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1960, 61 pages.

"Cold War and Liberation: A Challenge of Aid to the Subject Peoples," by John F. O'Conor, Vantage Press, New York, 1961.

G

"God's Underground," by Father George as told to Greta Palmer, foreword by Fulton H. Sheen. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1949, 296 pages.

I

"Ivan Mazepa: Hetman of Ukraine. On the 250th Anniversary of His Rising Against Russia" (collection of articles and essays which appeared in Nos. 2, 3, and 4, 1959, of the Ukrainian Quarterly).

M

"Mazepa In the Light of Contemporary English and American Sources," by Theodore Mackiw, reprint, the Ukrainian Quarterly, volume XV, No. 4, December 1959, New York.

P

"Poland and Her National Minorities, 1919–39, a Case Study," by Stephan Horak, Ph. D., Vantage Press, 1961.

"Political Struggle of Mazepa and Charles XII for Ukrainian Independence, The," by Bohdan Kentrschynskyj, reprint, the Ukrainian Quarterly, volume XV, No. 3, September 1959, New York, 23 pages.

"Politics of Totalitarianism, The: The Communist Party of the Soviet Union From 1934 to the Present," by John A. Armstrong, Random House, New York, 1961.

S

"Soviet Bureaucratic Elite: A Case Study of the Ukrainian Apparatus," by John A. Armstrong, Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., New York, 1959.

"Stalinist Rule in the Ukraine: A Study of the Decade of Mass Terror (1929–39)," by Hryhory Kostiuk, Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., New York, 1960.

T

"Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Great Famine in Ukraine, The," by Mykola Haliy. Reprint, the Ukrainian Quarterly, volume XIV, No. 3, September 1958, 11 pages.

U

"Ukraine, The: Selected References in the English Language, With Brief Introduction About the Ukraine, and the Ukrainians," by Roman Weres, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Mich., 1961.

"U.S. Information Agency Operations, Review of," hearings, House Committee on Foreign Affairs (testimony of Lev E. Dobriansky), Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1959, 206 pages.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], delivered a significant address to the 49th national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress recently, and I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

GREETINGS FROM THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE 49TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

Senator WILEY. Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished ladies, and gentlemen, I, too, welcome the opportunity to be here, welcome the opportunity to say a few words, and to extend my warmest greetings to all of you. Wisely and diplomatically you have elicited greetings from both sides of the political fence. I happen to be just a Republican, you understand, and my good friend, the Speaker, well he belongs to the majority party, for the present, I believe. Well, anyway, it's a good thing that we don't let partisanship enter here. What we need is cooperation as in our natural resources development program we must have. With a fast increasing population, as suggested, the United States is confronted with building effective and improved water resource programs. In addition, we face the well-recognized challenge of further improving flood control, rivers and harbors development, reflecting my long-time interest in adequately developing our water resources. I was one of the cosponsors of Public Law 358, the 83d Congress, which gave us the St. Lawrence Seaway. The Seaway, a magnificent engineering and constructive feat, unparalleled in American history, promises great things for the utilization of the Great Lakes, the greatest inland water system in the world, and also for its contiguous rivers. Regionally and nationally, the Seaway, I believe, will create new economic life for America. I talked to a man the other day who had taken it from one of the ports in my own State, told about the wonderful adventure he had, what it meant to him to have that great tourist—that's the phrase he used—the great tourist opportunity. Across the country as reflected in this nationwide representation here at your 49th meeting, however, there is a growing need to assure ever better utilization of our invaluable resource—water. This includes projects of flood control, river and harbor improvements, irrigation, reclamation, carrying on conservation practices. For more than 60 years, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress have contributed in a splendid way toward attainment of such goals by inspiring greater public concern and interest in our Nation's urgently needed water development program, acting effectively to convert plans into reality and strengthen cooperative efforts between Federal, State, and local agencies, working in land and water use.

In establishing realistic criteria for determining our support of development programs, we have been a tremendous help to our national legislature in providing the necessary Federal support for such programs. As you will appreciate, Members of Congress cannot always get on-the-spot information for flood control, but this very organization is doing a great job in getting the facts to us. As you know, the omnibus rivers and harbors flood control bill, on which hearings have recently been held in the House, may

be expected to be considered shortly by the Public Works Committee. In addition, in the Senate, it will soon consider the public works appropriation bill. The measure contains many significant projects including several in my own State. I'm hopeful that Congress will pass a realistic bill, one that will help us to progress at a proper pace, and will not invite a veto. Within this framework, some might call it a handicap, I believe that the Congress should move forward as expeditiously as possible toward approval of this piece of legislation.

Like all of you, I'm well aware that there are other projects all over the country, which if further developed, would better serve not only local, but the national interest. As constructively exemplified in your work, however, there is need to establish a priority system for such projects. Although we, by natural inclination, would like to accomplish the job all at once. Consequently, I am hopeful that as soon as possible, the many meritorious projects still being held in abeyance, will also be considered.

As we face the future, I want to again commend you and express appreciation for the spendid work you are doing in this significant field. Moreover, I shall look forward to what I know will be the constructive results of this convention. In your efforts, I am confident you will write another significant page in a history of the Nation's rivers and harbors development program.

Now just let me suggest this one word in conclusion. These are perilous times. We are thinking about water. We are thinking about our harbors. We must not forget the real challenges that are confronting us—peace or war, communism and its impact upon the world and America, and three, can we preserve the economic integrity of this country. These are the three challenges. These we must ever bear in mind and see to it that we are adequate to meet head-on these challenges that we face.

Thank you.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin will state it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning hour is still in effect.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PUBLIC WELFARE AMENDMENTS OF 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, under the unanimous-consent agreement of Friday, June 29, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated, by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10606) to extend and improve the public assistance and child welfare services programs of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

TIGHT CREDIT MAY BLOCK ANY ECONOMIC EXPANSION FROM TAX CUT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, in the last few weeks, especially the last few days, there has been more talk about tax cuts than the Nation has heard in a long time. These tax reduction proposals have been designed to develop a fiscal policy to expand the economy. At the same time, the Federal Reserve System has slammed the tight-credit brakes on the economy more decisively in June than in any other month in recent years.

Late last month, the chamber of commerce joined with the AFL–CIO and a panel of 21 top-ranking economists, led by Harvard Prof. Seymour Harris, in calling for a big tax cut now, designed to expand the economy. Over the weekend distinguished Senators have joined in that position, and the Governors of three of the largest States of the country—California, New York, and Ohio—have also supported that position.

Even if these powerful advocates should persuade Congress to follow their prescription, any expansionary effect of a tax cut would run smack into the contracting impact of the Federal Reserve Board's action. The result might be to create a standoff effect in the economy with the only certainty that interest rates would be high, credit scarce, the budget more unbalanced, and the national debt higher than ever. The fact is that the second biggest cost of our Federal Government today—second only to defense—is the servicing of the national debt—the cost of the interest on the national debt.

Obviously, the Federal Reserve Board's policy results in higher interest charges on the national debt, thus imposing a greater burden upon the American people.

Federal Reserve action during June, slashed free reserves of member banks by a whopping 40 percent, or from $517 to $306 million. Even that $306 million is a gross overstatement of free reserves on the Reserve basis in effect until recently. Congress last year passed legislation to enable the Federal Reserve to count cash vault or till cash as part of their reserves. If an adjustment is made for this, we can see that the reserves now in our banking system are exceedingly low. This is the reason why, during the month of June, borrowing at the Federal Reserve bank increased 100 percent, because the rates climbed sharply.

I call attention to the fact that for the week ending June 13 the Federal Reserve sold $321 million of Federal securities; in the week ending June 20, $54 million; and in the week ending June 27, $191 million. Of course, this selling of securities by the Federal Reserve has a tendency to drive up interest rates and to soak up available reserves of cash.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for his statement. The sale of Government securities in the amount of well over half a billion dollars diminishes the lending capacity of the banking system; does it not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. I understand this is the most significant way in which the Federal Reserve accomplished its apparent objective of reducing free reserves and tightening credit, with their consequences.

Incidentally, I understand the Federal Reserve has purchased no securities with more than 5 years maturity since April. In the week of June 29, it sold $28 million worth of securities with maturities between 5 and 10 years, and $52 million worth of securities with maturities of more than 10 years—and the Federal Reserve has had a very small portfolio of long-range obligations.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS DOES NOT REQUIRE HIGH INTEREST RATES

I stress this point because the argument by Wall Street leaders and Wall Street experts is that the Federal Reserve has to do this in order to protect our balance-of-payments position. They argue that this is necessary because if interest rates go lower, there will be an exodus of capital; the theory is that then Americans will sell their securities and buy foreign securities, and thus we will lose capital, and this contributes directly to our adverse balance of payments.

However, there are several difficulties with that theory. One is that no study to show that that is true has been made, although again and again we have asked that such a study be made. In other words the tight credit interest hike is based on a theory that has not been supported by any study.

In the second place, we have pleaded with the Federal Reserve to follow a policy of keeping short-term interest rates high, but of doing its best to reduce long-term interest rates, for of course the long-term rates have the most significant effect on stimulating the economy, particularly in the homebuilding area, which is especially sensitive to high interest rates.

Madam President, I wish to state for the RECORD at this time the fact that between May 30 and June 27, net free reserves declined from $517 to $306 million; but during the same period, borrowings at Federal Reserve banks increased from $86 to $168 million; and, at the same time, interest rates increased right along the line.

I ask unanimous consent that a table which I have prepared, showing bond yields at the end of May and early June, as contrasted with the latest yields, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Bond yields

	June 1 or earlier		Latest	
	Percent	Date	Percent	Date
Corporate Aaa	4.27	May 25	4.29	June 22
U.S. Government long term (due or call 10 years plus)	3.85	May 11	3.90	Do.
Short and long Governments Aaa	2.92	May 3	3.05	Do.
Corporate Baa	4.98	June 1	5.02	Do.
Short and long Baa	3.52	May 17	3.62	Do.
3-month Treasury bills	2.65	June 8	2.73	Do.
6-month Treasury bills	2.74	do	2.80	Do.
3- to 5-year issues	3.43	Apr. 6	3.50	Do.
Finance company paper, 90 to 179 days	2.88	June 1	3.04	Do.
Federal funds	1.30	Jan. 26	2.95	Do.

HOW HOME BUYER IS HIT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, it would be hard to conceive of monetary action by the Federal Reserve which would have a more restraining effect on the economy. This sudden contraction of free reserves not only drives up interest rates drastically, discouraging businessmen and home buyers from borrowing and buying or building, it actually shuts down the availability of any credit for thousands of borrowers. It especially hits home buyers. They are particularly sensitive to increases in long-term interest rates. For example, consider a home buyer, Mr. Jones, who, on the basis of proposals which have been before the Senate, will receive a tax cut. Under those proposals, if he has a reasonably substantial income, he will receive a tax cut of $1,000 or $1,500. It is hoped that when he receives a tax cut in that amount, he will proceed to purchase a home or an automobile, or to engage in some other kind of economic activity which will stimulate the economy. But at the same time the Federal Reserve Board is following a policy of increasing interest rates. So if Mr. Jones decides to buy a house, he will find that his monthly payments will be substantially higher. Furthermore, in some cases he will find that he cannot get any credit, because the Federal Reserve Board will have so greatly tightened credit that less credit will be available.

HOW BUSINESSMAN IS HIT

Next, Madam President, let us consider corporation A. On the basis of proposed tax-cut legislation, this corporation would enjoy a cut in its taxes, and thus would have more funds available for reinventment. But, at the same time, if the corporation expected to obtain at least some of the funds it would use by borrowing them, it would have to pay more in interest, and in some cases it would find that the funds it needed were not available because the banks would not have enough funds, because they would have to ration the funds which were available.

CONTRADICTORY ECONOMY POLICY NONSENSICAL

It may be that despite the stock market plunge during June and the continuation of high levels of unemployment and idle plant capacity, the economy is moving into a period of such rapid expansion in coming months that the Federal Reserve must tighten credit sharply to protect the economy from inflation. If this is true, however, it certainly makes no sense for Congress to consider making a heavy tax cut. A tax cut would not only have an inflationary effect; it would also unbalance the budget even further in a period of expansion, when, if ever, the Federal Government should run a surplus.

I predict that if the Federal Reserve Board follows a policy of tightening credit and making less credit available to American businessmen and consumers and borrowers, and if the President recommends, and Congress passes, a tax cut bill, we shall have an incredibly stupid economic policy—truly contradictory; and in that event, we would, I think, for the first time in our history, follow a policy completely contradictory, and one which would not seem to have any sensible basis at all. If the economy needs to be stimulated, perhaps it makes sense to have a tax cut and also to have an easier monetary policy, reduce interest rates, and make credit more freely available. On the other hand, if we face an inflationary period and if the economy can be expected to expand too readily, there should not be a tax cut, and perhaps under those circumstances a tight credit policy could be justified. But as the situation now stands, our policy planners should get together, because what they are now doing is completely contradictory and cannot be justified. All of us feel that our economy can and should grow, and I am sure that all of us feel that it should grow as rapidly as possible without inflation. Certainly it has to grow if the millions of persons now unemployed are to have opportunities to find the jobs they seek. At the same time, I believe we should recognize that if we are going to follow a compensatory fiscal policy, we should be honest enough with ourselves to recognize what this fiscal policy of reducing taxes does in deliberately running an unbalanced budget and a deficit at this time, a time of economic expansion.

TIMING ESSENTIAL TO EFFECTIVE FISCAL POLICY

The essence of compensatory fiscal policy is timing. I wonder, in view of what has happened to the labor force and in view of what has happened to business generally, if we should follow that policy now.

Unemployment statistics which I have before me for March, April, and May indicate the following status of the labor force and unemployment: The number who have been unemployed for 15 weeks or more in March was 2 percent of the total labor force. In April it was 2 percent. In May it went down to 1.7 percent, which is a significant improvement. It will be interesting to see what the June statistics show.

If we are going to reduce taxes, it seems to me we ought to have basic information and statistics of this kind before us.

Even more encouraging is what has happened to the number of married males who are unemployed. There, of course, is the greatest burden on persons in our economy, in terms of the most serious tragedy of unemployment. The percentage of the labor force of married males who were unemployed in March was 2.7 percent. The percentage decreased to 2.3 percent in April and went down to 1.9 percent in May.

These are encouraging statistics. If they continue to improve in June, once again they will indicate that unemployment, which is the area of our economy which has been most troublesome and which has deeply concerned our economic experts, is improving and gives promise of perhaps improving further.

Furthermore, it has been said, with at least some degree of wisdom, that we should be extremely careful about accepting a tax cut because it is probably going to be a one-shot cut. If taxes are reduced by $7½ billion or $10 billion, it is very improbable that there will be another tax cut, short of a very serious economic situation indeed.

FORTUNE ANALYSIS INDICATES ECONOMY WILL CONTINUE TO EXPAND

In conclusion, I invite the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to the latest analysis in Fortune magazine of the status of the economy, because it seems to me it is very, very encouraging, and those who favor a tax cut should be in a position to meet the analysis, which is based on competent and careful economic study.

The July issue of Fortune magazine has this to say: In the first place, Fortune magazine predicts that, with respect to the gross national product, which increased 7 percent in the past 12 months, will gain 6 percent in the coming 12 months.

As one examines these assumptions and conclusions, he can see that this is a quite conservative analysis. It allows for difficulties, including the recent difficulty in the stock market.

The article states that the stability of U.S. prices is quickening demand not only at home but also from abroad, and further:

> While a feeling of boom is today lacking in the behavior of prices and unemployment, it is in one sense for the happiest possible reasons. Productivity has performed sensationally, up 8 percent in 5 quarters, better than in a dozen years or than anyone counted on. Nothing could be more salubrious for potential returns on investment or growth of output, and ordinarily the only question now would be how far beyond next year the economy's internal forces would carry its expansion.
>
> These are, however, not ordinary times, owing to the steel crackdown and the market break and Roundup has allowed for these dampeners on demand. As the result of the market break in particular, consumers will spend somewhat less than Roundup previously forecast. As for business investment, in January Roundup forecast a rise of $3.5 billion for the next two quarters, but now the rise may be on the order of only $1 billion per quarter till the end of this year.
>
> Thereafter, however, there should be an upturn, particularly marked in the second half of 1963.

Fortune further points out in defense that—

> Outlays have risen by $6 billion in the past year. But expenditures will go up about half as fast from now on: by a bit more than $3 billion per annum right through fiscal 1963 and well into 1964. These added expenditures include the swelling costs of the space program, small increases for the AEC and military aid overseas, and some increases for the Defense Department. The latter are going up across the board, for limited war as well as Polaris equipment.

Fortune's article proceeds to point out that—

> Contrary to some published impressions the national accounts budget was in deficit by a rate of $1 billion this spring.

This is important, and I stress it because many persons argue that, although we ran a deficit in the administrative budget, if we consider the real impact on the economy—which is not accurately reported in the administrative budget—the Government was having a deflationary, a retarding, a restraining effect on the economy last year. Fortune

points out that this is not true, that there was a deficit by rate of $1 billion, in the national accounts budget which most accurately reflects the effect of the Federal budget on the economy.

There has been an argument on the part of some persons that, whereas the restraining effect was slight in the past, it is going to be substantial in the coming months unless there is a substantial tax cut. That is one of the main arguments made for a tax cut. Fortune says that is not true. It says that there will be only a small surplus of receipts over outlays 12 months from now in the national accounts budget, and it is based on assumptions which are quite conservative.

The article continues:

The inherent strength in investment, which led Roundup in January to forecast a $7 billion annual advance, is still great. It precludes any real recession in capital goods, and on the contrary suggests a speedup sometime in 1963. * * *

In short, strength in the capital sector flows from the fact that spending has been comparatively moderate, or based on real market growth.

The article then goes into the very crucial area of inventories, as to whether they will be built up or reduced. The article states:

The big point about inventories is that they are definitely on the low rather than the high side, and so is the rate of accumulation. In the second quarter of 1962 accumulation ran to only $3 billion per year, principally because steel users, who had accumulated inventories as a hedge against a possible midyear stoppage, were running off stocks. This runoff will soon stop, and Roundup expects that the rate of accumulation will increase in the third quarter and run at over $6 billion per year in 1963.

The article continues to comment on dealer stocks of cars and states:

Dealer stocks of cars are the lowest in 3 years despite near-record sales, and stocks of other retail and wholesale merchants of hard goods are also low. Business has in the past year been pursuing the most conservative policy ever recorded by Fortune's quarterly surveys. Stocks have grown only half as much in the past 2 years as sales of goods to final users, which are up 8 percent over mid-1960. All in all, inventories, which now come to more than $100 billion, should grow at least in pace with final sales of goods. Roundup projects this rate at a bit over 6 percent a year through 1963.

The article indicates that the construction business looks good and promising, on the basis of what has happened, the demand, and the needs.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from Fortune entitled "Business Roundup," in the July issue, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

IT ADDS UP

Against the backdrop of an economy that was producing $560 billion worth of goods and services while the stock market fell precipitously, men debated last month the possibilities of continued growth, a slowdown, and even an outright recession. One task of the discipline of economic analysis and forecasting is to define some limits of the effects of swings in confidence such as the country is now experiencing.

In Roundup's judgment a real recession in the U.S. market economy—defined as a sharp turndown in production—is not in the cards during the next 12 months. As argued last month, the recent drop in the stock market in a period of monetary ease cannot be viewed as the harbinger of recession in the light of past experience. The condition of inventories, the structure of capital demands, the surge in Government spending, the strength in housing, the incomes, and savings of consumers, are all extraordinarily favorable and imply a large momentum. The worst immediate consequence Roundup can see issuing from today's loss of confidence would be that the economy would now simply level out for a time. It is barely conceivable that 6 months from now there could be a mild dip on the order of 1960–61, but only if the economy had risen meanwhile with confidence still impaired. By then, however, it is far likelier that the fabric of confidence would be restored, given the stakes that both business and Government have in economic growth.

The above are the outside pessimistic possibilities. In fact, Roundup's own forecast of the future remains basically optimistic. On this forecast GNP will rise from its present $560 billion to around $593 billion next spring, in today's prices. This is as far as it appears sensible now to forecast specific sectors of the economy charted on page 40. The logic of expansion, however, suggests that the economy will continue to rise, to $610 billion by the end of 1963, when it would be at full employment. For all of 1962, GNP will be about $564 billion, a 7 percent gain over 1961 but 2 percent less than forecast last January. The range for 1963 would be near $600 billion.

The details behind these calculations are elaborated below, but behind them lie certain hard facts and more general assumptions. The foreground fact is that the economy is performing powerfully, not poorly. Total goods and services are moving to final users at precisely the rate Roundup forecast a year ago. Final demand has increased 8.5 percent in five quarters, at once the best peacetime advance and yet the most belittled of the postwar. Total GNP is running today some $10 billion below Roundup's forecast of January, but this is chiefly due to the early settlement of steel wage negotiations. Instead of a sharp buildup in inventories then assumed as likely, metal stocks are running down. This means, however, that inventory accumulation will rise in coming months, adding impetus to the unbroken advance of GNP.

Strength for the next 6 or 12 months is also notably plain in demand for apartments and houses, for cars and home goods, and in the increasing expenditures of Government for roads as well as for armaments. Federal programs for depreciation revision and an investment tax credit, and for more public works and unemployment benefits will tend to offset some of the depressing effects recently emanating from Washington and Wall Street. The stability of U.S. prices, moreover, is quickening demand not only at home but also from abroad. While a feeling of boom is today lacking in the behavior of prices and unemployment, it is in one sense for the happiest of possible reasons. Productivity has performed sensationally, up 8 percent in five quarters, better than in a dozen years or than anyone counted on. Nothing could be more salubrious for potential returns on investment or growth of output, and ordinarily the only question now would be how far beyond next year the economy's internal forces would carry its expansion.

These are, however, not ordinary times, owing to the steel crackdown and the market break, and Roundup has allowed for these dampeners on demand. As the result of the market break in particular, consumers will spend somewhat less than Roundup previously forecast. As for business investment, in January Roundup forecast a rise of $3.5 billion for the next two quarters, but now the rise may be on the order of only $1 billion per quarter till the end of this year. Thereafter, however, there should be an upturn, particularly marked in the second half of 1963. The growth of capital stock is now and has for some years been on the order of only 2.3 percent per annum while total production has been advancing faster than that, and this rate is simply inadequate for a long-term growth of 4 percent or more in the economy. The dampened rise in investment is presenting the Nation with a due bill on the future. How and when this bill will be paid may depend, if only in part, on whether restraints on long-term growth implicit in the present tax system are lifted. It is a sign of hope, however, that such reforms are now being widely supported.

Even to attempt to look into 1963 may seem far off from present realities, but it serves to put present discussion of the state of the economy into broad perspective. Such perspective is today badly needed. The intangible of psychology is notoriously hard to judge and never more so than now after the stock market decline and while the administration's basic relation with the private economy is still not altogether clear. Of the two, the latter is wholly critical. The fact is that the business system of economy requires freedom on the part of entrepreneurs and managers to make their own market calculations about prices. Presumably everyone, including the administration, knows this, and will work to clarify unnecessary uncertainties. If, as should be expected, men are thus reasonable, investor psychology might well shift, but in any case the economy would be free to fulfill its potential. In the meantime the economy's course in coming quarters may be no smoother than it was over the past 18 months, when it ran strong and weak in successive periods, but on the whole registered a powerful advance. For practical operations, it has been less fruitful to bend to the breeze of each turn in psychology than to adhere to the inner logic of this expansion. That logic is further detailed in the following 10 critical points.

Defense: Outlays have risen by $6 billion in the past year. But expenditures will go up about half as fast from now on: by a bit more than $3 billion per annum right through fiscal 1963 and well into 1964. These added expenditures include the swelling costs of the space program, small increases for the AEC and military aid overseas, and some increases for the Defense Department. The latter are going up across the board, for limited-war as well as Polaris equipment.

Budget: The regular Federal budget will show a deficit of $7 billion for fiscal 1962 and will also be in deficit for fiscal 1963. More important for the economy is what happens to the so-called national income accounting of Federal operations, which takes account of government trust funds, and treats corporate taxes on an accrual rather than a cash basis. Contrary to some published impressions the national accounts budget was in deficit by a rate of $1 billion this spring.

By next spring Federal receipts will go up by at most $8.5 billion, and at a slower rate thereafter even if the economy is then moving toward full employment. Social security tax rates, to be sure, will go up next January at a rate of over $2 billion a year. But the revision of depreciation rules will reduce revenues by $1 billion or so.

Meanwhile, Federal outlays by next spring will have risen by $6.5 billion from a recent rate of $110 billion. This will include $3 billion more for national defense, and $3.5 billion more for a wide variety of nondefense purposes. The latter estimate assumes that Congress will vote a renewal of temporary unemployment insurance and special public

works while compromising on proposed cuts in farm costs and a rise in postal rates.

Thus there would be only a small surplus of receipts over outlays 12 months from now on the national income accounting. Looking further ahead, there could be a small surplus in fiscal 1964 under full employment conditions, but not as big as is often assumed. This whole prospect of deficit now and only a small surplus in the future means that Federal finances will not act as a drag on further economic recovery. But it also complicates the prospect for tax reform, which is badly needed to speed economic growth. There is relatively little margin for a tax program that involves a large loss of revenue.

Capital spending: The rate of investment in plant and equipment has risen by $5 billion over the past year to $50 billion now. It may not better that rise in the next year, as the result of the steel imbroglio and the decline in stock prices. But the inherent strength in investment, which led Roundup in January to forecast a $7-billion annual advance, is still great. It precludes any real recession in capital goods, and on the contrary suggests a speedup some time in 1963.

As the economy entered the spring its overall rate of utilization of capital stock was the highest since 1955. National output had grown 8 percent since the 1960 peak, capital by only 5 percent, and pressure on capacity was causing many businessmen to expand 1962 plans. In March the SEC-Commerce survey reported that plans called for an 8 percent rise in capital spending in 1962 over 1961, and subsequent Fortune and McGraw-Hill surveys indicated that the rise would be larger than that. The SEC-Commerce survey taken in May, which reflected first reactions to the steel dispute, indicated expansion in some areas but cuts in spending plans for steel and automobiles, and so on balance plans were back to only an 8-percent gain.

The break in stock-market prices introduced a new uncertainty. Initial reports indicated that a great majority of companies were holding fast to their plans—one factor being that they are not yet investing all their available cash flow. Nevertheless there have undoubtedly been scattered cutbacks by some companies, while others may now be holding back on new plans that otherwise would be in the making. While few have problems of financing, some may be worrying about the market as a harbinger.

But the probabilities favor a speedup in capital spending sometime in 1963, possibly by spring. It will be helped by revision of depreciation rules and the probable investment credit legislation. More important is the assumption that there will be a gradual lifting of uncertainty about pricing and some stabilization in the stock market. Pressure on capacity meanwhile will have increased as national output continues to grow faster than capital stock.

Such pressure is already leading electric utilities to budget more for 1963 and 1964 than for 1962. And the position today of the energy, metal, and transport industries, which account for about half of all capital investment, is enormously significant. Their outlays were very high in 1957 and so accounted for most of the sharp 1958 drop. Thereupon their expansion was moderate and the 1960–61 dip in investment was small. Today their outlays are still below the best levels of 1960, despite an increase in replacement needs, and will remain so at the end of this year. In the other half of capital investment—i.e., nonmetal lines, communications, and commercial businesses—expansion has been accompanied by large increases in sales and output. In short, strength in the capital sector flows from the fact that spending has been comparatively moderate, or based on real market growth.

Inventories: The big point about inventories is that they are definitely on the low rather than the high side, and so is the rate of accumulation. In the second quarter of 1962 accumulation ran to only $3 billion per year, principally because steel users, who had accumulated inventories as a hedge against a possible midyear stoppage, were running off stocks. This runoff will soon stop, and Roundup expects that the rate of accumulation will increase in the third quarter and run at over $6 billion per year in 1963.

Dealer stocks of cars are at the lowest in 3 years despite near-record sales, and stocks of other retail and wholesale merchants of hard goods are also low. Business has in the past year been pursuing the most conservative policy ever recorded by Fortune's quarterly surveys. Stocks have grown only half as much in the past 2 years as sales of goods to final users, which are up 8 percent over mid–1960. All in all, inventories, which now come to more than $100 billion, should grow at least in pace with final sales of goods. Roundup projects this rate at a bit over 6 percent a year through 1963.

Constructions: Starts of nonfarm private houses should continue to run about their present 1,500,000 rate through the next 12 months. Contracts for apartment building this summer and fall swelled to a rate of 400,000 to 450,000 per year. Meanwhile builders of prefabricated and semi-finished shell homes report increases in sales. Demand for one-family homes should strengthen since interest rates for both FHA and conventional mortgages are coming down. The whole market for housing is being expanded by an upturn in the marriage rate, and these young householders are not likely to be affected by the drop in the stock market. This drop may for a time adversely affect the market for alterations and additions to existing housing, which has been slow to respond to rising incomes. But there may be a catchup in 1963 as more people come to understand the new home-repair credits legislated last year. Construction of dormitories, motels, and other nonhousekeeping units will continue to boom.

Public works will rise sharply with the start of the new fiscal year, which will open up large new allocations of highway trust funds, and end the lag in such construction. Also, Congress seems likely to vote an 18-month program for public works for depressed areas. Gains in housing and public works will interact upon one another and will also have effects on commercial and institutional building (a rising portion of capital investment).

Prices and wages: The general price level keeps rising a bit over 1 percent a year owing mainly to the slow, steady increase in the price of services. But commodity prices remain on even keel, and as unit labor costs have been stable for some years, this trend should continue. While manufacturing wage rates rose 2.7 percent in the past year, productivity in manufacturing exceeded the postwar average gain of a bit over 3 percent. Productivity in total nonfarm business has been going up spectacularly. After stalling from 1955 to 1957, and rising about normally thereafter from 1958 to 1961, gains in the past year have been unusually large and have restored the postwar trend of average gains of 2.9 percent a year. Although cost pressures are naturally increasing a bit as productivity gains slow down to more normal rates, there appear to be no significant upward pressures on prices on the immediate horizon.

Income and savings: Personal disposable income is running at a rate of about $385 billion. It is naturally expanding with rising employment, while benefit payments of all kinds will once again rise sharply in coming months, in part under new legislation (temporary unemployment insurance, manpower training, etc.). Real income per person has now climbed 6 percent over 5 years ago (with the slowdown in wage rises balanced by slower price rises). It has gone up over 3 percent in the past year and will do at least as well in the next.

It is quite possible that people who suffered outright or paper losses in the stock market will curtail some consumer expenditures in order to restore their assets. At the very most such savings could come to a rate of $10 billion. So Roundup expects that in the next several months the rate of savings may go up by $3 billion, and that the percent of income saved will go back to over 7.

Consumer spending: Consumer spending is now running at a rate of about $360 billion. Discounting for price increases, the volume of spending will be up about 4 percent in the next year as against 5.5 percent last year, and as compared to an average gain of about 3.5 percent per annum since spring, 1957.

The drop in the stock market may slow spending a little but more significant is the fact that incomes will continue to rise. Expenditures on food and services will continue to grow, but the big potential is in buying of goods, particularly as low-price lines have widened markets. Purchases of goods are up about 8 percent over a year ago, and may rise by 5 percent more. Home-goods sales particularly will expand a good deal with more new apartments and houses.

New cars have led the goods upswing, and 1962 sales (including imports) will crowd the 1955 records. This year's sales of cars will about match Fortune's projection of 7,200,000, based on normal replacements and growth. An extra million jalopies of 1946–50 vintage, which should normally have been scrapped by now, are still on the road. Replacements generally will be speeded by the increasing appearance of compacts in the used-car market. All this suggests that another year could produce a rise in new-car sales from the 1962 volume.

Credit and stocks: The stock market has hardly been acting according to Hoyle this spring. Bear markets are almost always preceded by a financial pinch that is reflected in banking figures (e.g., the debit-loan ratio). No such pinch has occurred, and indeed the debit-loan ratio is still rising, an anomaly with only two precedents in the past generation (in 1934 and in late 1938), and business did not follow the market down.

When business has followed the market down in the past, it has been after financial stringency, and not always then. Stocks fell 25 percent in 1946, for example, but the financial pinch did not stop business from entering into the 1947–48 boom.

Industrial stock prices have fallen 26 percent in 6 months as of the middle of last month, 15 percent lower than at the writing of the June Roundup. At mid-June, Standard & Poor's 425 industrial stocks were selling at 13.5 times current annual earnings, as against 19 times at the December highs and a range of 12 to 16 times in 1955–57 (after eliminating inventory profits and extra depreciation charges).

Administration and Federal Reserve policy for nearly 2 years has attempted to keep credit easy (to spur domestic business) and yet to keep interest rates up (to avoid outflow of capital abroad). Hence rates have fluctuated relatively little, and instead of rising in pace with business this year, those at short term have been relatively steady and those on bonds and mortgages have actually declined a bit. The money supply is expanding (especially if the banks' soaring time deposits are included) and there is no present reason to expect any major change in these policies, though a continued outflow of capital is worrying the Treasury.

Exports: Foreign trade should act as a slight net stimulant to the U.S. economy

over the next 18 months. Imports will rise more gradually than they did over recent months. Exports should improve more rapidly, partly as the result of Government programs to expand foreign aid, to tie it to U.S. goods, and to promote U.S. sales of commercial and military products. Equally important, business is improving among several major U.S. customers (e.g., Britain, Western Europe), and meanwhile prices are rising in most of the industrial nations.

This will tend to improve the overall U.S. balance of payments. But capital movements are still a difficult problem since U.S. interest rates remain somewhat lower than abroad, and U.S. capital markets are open to all comers. The overall rate of dollar deficit is now running at about half or less of the $3.8-billion average deficit of 1958–60. The administration hopes to close the gap by the end of 1963. But this will not be easy to achieve.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent that the latest national summary of business conditions from the Federal Reserve Bulletin be printed in the RECORD at this point. It is also quite encouraging, although it is not as up to date as Fortune. It includes statistics for May, rather than June.

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

NATIONAL SUMMARY OF BUSINESS CONDITIONS

Economic activity expanded somewhat further in May with increases in industrial output, sales of autos and nondurable goods, and construction activity. Personal income and employment edged up and the unemployment rate declined slightly further. Commercial bank credit expanded somewhat further. Common stock prices dropped sharply in May and early June.

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

Industrial production in May was 118 percent of the 1957 average, up one-half percent from the April level. A sharp decline in steel production was more than offset by widespread gains among other industrial materials, consumer goods, and business equipment.

Auto assemblies increased further by 5 percent in May and current schedules indicate a continued rise in output in June. Production of furniture and some other home goods also increased in May, while output of television sets declined slightly from an advanced April level. In the equipment industries, there were gains in output of industrial, commercial, and farm machinery as well as in freight and passenger equipment.

Steel ingot production was curtailed sharply in May and the total index for iron and steel mill operations declined 12 percent. In early June, ingot output declined slightly further. Output of construction materials as well as most nondurable materials rose further in May.

EMPLOYMENT

Seasonally adjusted employment in nonfarm establishments rose slightly further in May to 55.3 million. The factory workweek increased less than seasonally from the advanced level reached in April. Average hourly and weekly earnings were maintained at record levels. The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate was 5.4 percent as compared with 5.5 in April.

CONSTRUCTION

Value of new construction activity increased in May for the third consecutive month and, at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $59.6 billion, about matched the record fourth quarter average of last year. Public construction decreased further in May, while private construction advanced 4 percent as residential and most types of nonresidential activity continued to rise.

DISTRIBUTION

Dealer deliveries of new autos increased further in May to a seasonally adjusted, annual rate of 7½ million units, including imports, as compared to a 6¼ million rate a year earlier. Department store sales in May rose somewhat further from the record March–April level and were sharply above a year ago. The preliminary figures reported on total retail sales were off slightly in May following an appreciable increase earlier in the year. Dealers' stocks of autos have been reduced this spring and stocks at department stores have shown little change.

COMMODITY PRICES

The wholesale commodity price index declined somewhat between early May and early June, as decreases among fresh vegetables and meats contributed to a decline in foodstuffs. Prices of industrial commodities generally continued to show little change. The Consumer Price Index rose slightly further in April with prices of used cars up 4 percent.

BANK CREDIT AND RESERVES

Total commercial bank credit increased somewhat further in May. Expansion in loans was at a slackened rate and holdings of U.S. Government securities declined. The seasonally adjusted money supply declined sharply in the second half of the month. Time deposits at commercial banks rose further and U.S. deposits increased substantially.

Total reserves and required reserves of member banks increased in May. Excess reserves and member bank borrowings from the Federal Reserve were about unchanged. Reserves were absorbed principally through further gold outflow and an increase in currency in circulation and were supplied by Federal Reserve purchases of U.S. Government securities.

SECURITY MARKETS

New security financing by corporations and State and local governments was in moderate volume from mid-May through mid-June. Yields on corporate bonds changed little while yields on State and local government bonds increased. Common stock prices decreased sharply further in heavy trading volume.

Yields on U.S. Government securities changed little from mid-May to mid-June. The market rate on 3-month Treasury bills fluctuated narrowly in a range around 2⅔ percent, while yields on long-term bonds averaged slightly below 3.90 percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Post entitled "Credit Tightened Slowly by Federal Reserve," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

CREDIT TIGHTENED SLOWLY BY FEDERAL RESERVE

(By Edward Cowan)

The Federal Reserve Board has been tightening up on credit in the past few weeks.

The Board is still pursuing an easy credit policy. But it is not quite so easy as it was. The difference may presage a rise in interest rates later in the year.

How far the Federal Reserve plans to go remains to be seen. It seems highly unlikely that the Nation's central bank will get downright stingy with credit. Yet, official figures strongly indicate that it is becoming a little less generous.

Officials at the Board followed their customary practice today of declining to explain subtle shifts in policy and emphasis. But they openly declined to dispute the inference that the Board's own figures on bank reserves point to a shading in the direction of less credit.

As yet, the shift in emphasis has produced no noticeable upward trend in interest rates. The Board's own discount rate still is 3 percent. Banks still have ample supplies of loan money. There is said to be an excess of mortgage money.

Federal Reserve officials feel there is no forseeable danger that modifying credit ease will hinder economic expansion.

The Board has two other concerns on its mind:

Keeping interest rates high enough to prevent investors from pulling their money out of the United States. The level necessary to do this could be higher than normal if investors became skittish about the country's two big deficits: In the Federal budget and in the international flow of dollars.

Financing of the Federal budget deficit in the year starting Sunday, July 1. Red-ink appears inevitable. There is some apprehension at the Board that it will be financed out of newly created bank credit rather than real savings of individuals and corporations.

The Federal Reserve's gradual shift toward a less generous credit policy is reflected in figures on commercial banks' "net free" or surplus reserves, which reached their lowest point since 1960 last week. These reserves are the basis for bank loans.

From a high of $517 million in the week ended May 30, the daily average of net free reserves for the banking system has dropped as follows:

[In millions]

May 30	$517
June 7	467
June 14	335
June 21	347
June 28	306

Except for 2 weeks in March, net free reserves fluctuated in the $400 million to $500 million range since late January. Their running below $350 million for 3 weeks in a row indicates the Board is soaking up a little of the commercial bank's loanmaking potential.

The Federal Reserve, under prodding by the Kennedy administration, has followed a generous credit policy to promote economic expansion. But even with loan money plentiful, business has not sustained a rapid rate of expansion. Not a few Government economists suspect the upturn may stall this summer and then resume in the fall.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, in conclusion on this particular subject, I feel very strongly that, if we are to have a tax cut, we should have our eyes open. We should recognize that this tax cut is a matter of timing. It is serious and of great importance in terms of timing; and there are very strong indications in the economy that we are moving ahead and expanding.

Certainly, if there is to be a tax cut, we should not like to have our monetary authorities at the same time follow a contracting policy which tends to discourage buying, borrowing, and business expansion, and act as a retarding influence on the economy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I commend the Senator from Wisconsin on the high intellectual level of the discussion which he has initiated.

I should like to ask the Senator this question: Is it not true that in the past,

when the Federal Reserve Board has been charged with pursuing too restrictive a credit policy, it has been said that when excess reserves amount to $500 million or so, this is an adequate supply, but that when the supply falls below $500 million there might well be said to be a shortage of available credit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois is absolutely correct. On the basis of this definition, it is perfectly clear that the Federal Reserve Board is now following, by its own definition, a tight-money policy.

This is especially true in view of the fact—which, incidentally, was suggested to me by the Senator from Illinois before I started this speech—that now these free reserves are based on vault cash. Most of the $500 or $300 million of free reserves is based on vault cash, cash never counted as a reserve before, but now being counted. Therefore, the credit policy is particularly tight.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The vault cash is needed to enable people who present checks to be paid in cash for those checks.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not a basis for further expansion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The statistics have shown consistently that the only free reserves there were in the economy were really in the country banks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is another important point. Is it not true that even when the reserves amounted to $500 million or more, they were almost entirely confined to the country banks, which, in the Nation's economy, made only a minority of loans?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is right. The record shows that when the reserves were $500 million, as I recall, the reserves in country banks were very close to that figure, by themselves. The Reserve and Central Reserve reserves were virtually nil.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Even when vault cash was counted.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I always felt that the $500 million definition was improper, and that it was much too restrictive. Now, with only $300 million actually reserved, the Senator from Wisconsin is completely correct in saying that what the Federal Reserve Board has done has been to tighten credit at this crucial period.

I did not hear all of the statement by the Senator from Wisconsin. Did the Senator from Wisconsin put into the RECORD the figures as to how much the interest rate has gone up?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin did put those figures into the RECORD. The interest rates have gone up all along the line, depending upon the length of maturity and whether one is talking about corporate bonds or Treasury bills. The interest rate has gone up consistently. It has gone up in a substantial range.

I put those figures into the RECORD, but unfortunately I do not have them in front of me at the moment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the United States should have a recession, a very grave responsibility will rest on Mr. William McChesney Martin for tightening credit at a time when the economy is in some doubt as to what is going to happen.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is right.

Furthermore, though the Senator from Illinois may disagree, it seems to this Senator that it would be historically consistent as well as economically, the more conservative policy to have some credit ease before following a policy of monetary expansion. I am saying that it would be better to follow a policy of lower interest rates before running a big budget deficit and before a tax cut.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is speaking of long-term interest rates.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is still a margin between the short-term interest rate and the long-term interest rate, is there not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is, indeed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would be possible to raise the short-term interest rate and yet to lower the long-term interest rate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. It is my understanding that, although we have pleaded with the Federal Reserve Board to do this, the Board has not tried very hard to do so. Perhaps it has tried it to a very modest extent; and, to the extent it has tried it, it has been very successful.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the European deposits in this country are primarily in the form of short-term deposits, deposits in banks which can be withdrawn at a moment's notice, whereas the American holdings overseas are in long-term investments which cannot be quickly liquidated? That is why the European countries have us, in a sense, at their mercy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. In the event our balance-of-payments situation should become really serious it would not necessarily be required that we increase interest rates sharply. We could follow a policy which virtually every other country in the world except Switzerland has followed—a policy of setting some limitation on the export of capital, on the investment of capital abroad. Perhaps that would be an extreme position, which the Federal Reserve Board might not wish to take, but it is a possibility on which it can rely if it has to. I would not support that position.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I never wish to be demagogic in my denunciation of foreign countries and their people, but is it not true it would be a terrible thing for the Swiss banks and for the Swiss bankers to determine the financial policy of the United States?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would, indeed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the resources of the Swiss banks are primarily derived not from the savings of the Swiss people but from the deposits of South American dictators and large plantation owners who put their money into numbered, anonymous accounts?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. There are some American speculators, some prizefighters, and others, who also take advantage of those banks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Second, do not the members of the "underworld" of this country largely use those numbered, anonymous accounts in Swiss banks as a means of getting rid of their "hot" money?

Mr. PROXMIRE. They do, indeed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In all probability, does not the Soviet Union use the Swiss banks?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure the Soviet Union does.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then the Swiss banks put some of this money on deposit in American banks, on call, which gives them the power at any time to call the loans and throw the United States into financial difficulties.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And William McChesney Martin then will say that the Swiss bankers have lost confidence in the American dollar.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator's point is extremely well taken. Furthermore, I point out at this juncture, that not only will the Federal Reserve Board indicate that the Swiss bankers have lost faith in the American dollar, but also that the European bankers generally are concerned about our fiscal policies because they are not in balance, as are their systems. The most recent analysis by Dr. Eckstein's group at Harvard shows that we have a far better record of fiscal balance and fiscal responsibility than they.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the budgets are on a comparable basis.

Mr. PROXMIRE. When the budgets are on a comparable basis, we have a far better record.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, if they were to count capital investments as part of current expenditures, as we do.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator has made a very able argument.

Let us suppose that the Federal Reserve Board tightens credit, helps to bring on a recession, and thus increases the pressure upon the President to lower taxes. Then let us suppose that the pressure is to lower taxes in accordance with the recommendation of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and to give the big reductions to those in the upper income brackets. If that should happen, would not the Federal Reserve Board have contributed to an alteration of our tax policies in favor of big income recipients?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The suggestion of the Senator from Illinois is extremely interesting. I had not quite pursued the problem that far, but the suggestion has very interesting implications.

The fact is that the Federal Reserve Board policy definitely has put us in such a position that a tax cut may be likely. People are now observing the statistics for June. They will do so throughout July. Then perhaps they will decide whether there should be a tax cut before this session of Congress adjourns.

The big reason they would make such a decision is that business seems to be sluggish, business is not going ahead,

construction is not going ahead, business is not borrowing at the same rate, and so on.

One explanation for that is that credit is not available. If the home buyers cannot borrow or have to borrow at extraordinarily high interest rates, home buyers will not borrow. Similarly business will borrow less, build less, do less. The result will be that there will be a contraction in the economy, as the Senator from Illinois suggests, because of the Federal Reserve Board policies. Those policies might bring on a tax cut, and a tax cut of a kind which would be regressive instead of progressive, one that would be in the interest of a very few, with very little benefits, if any, for the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, Mr. William McChesney Martin and his associates would put the administration in a squeeze.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Wisconsin has made a very able contribution to the discussion of this question. I only hope that his discussion is noticed by the financial press and by the Federal Reserve.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Illinois very much.

Madam President, I wish to emphasize once more that it makes no sense whatever to talk about a tax cut when the Federal Reserve is following policies of trying to constrict the economy and to prevent the American people from borrowing and spending. To follow that kind of policy and cut taxes at a time when we know the reduction in taxes will contribute to the deficit would be only to follow a policy which could at best be called stupid and at worst idiotic.

FOOD WOES GROW FOR GERMAN REDS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Food Woes Grow for German Reds," published in the New York Times today, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FOOD WOES GROW FOR GERMAN REDS—REGIME ADMITS IT HAS NO HOPE FOR QUICK SOLUTION

BONN, GERMANY, June 30.—The Communist East German regime admitted today that it was having unpleasant difficulties in supplying enough food for its 17 million people. It held out little hope for an early change.

Neues Deutschland, the main party newspaper, called on municipal leaders for the second day in a row to win the awareness and full understanding of the whole people that some restrictions are unavoidable for some time.

The newspaper acknowledged that meat, eggs, milk, and other dairy products were in short supply and exhorted functionaries to try and achieve a correct distribution of available supplies.

The paper said that extraordinarily bad weather last year cut the harvest of some major staple items far below expectations. Without giving basic figures, it said that the potato crop was 43 percent below the 1960 output, while beets dropped 32 percent, corn 37 percent, and grain 24 percent.

LIVESTOCK FEED IS SHORT

The lack of feed for cattle, pigs, and poultry, the newspaper continued, could not be made up with higher imports and livestock dropped considerably.

Yesterday, in a two-page account in Neues Deutschland devoted largely to the food problem the regime admitted that an increase in livestock prescribed by the Government never materialized. Instead a survey conducted in June showed that there were 46,000 fewer head of cattle and 1,300,000 fewer pigs.

"As a consequence, we now must slaughter 60,000 head of cattle in the third quarter instead of in the final quarter of 1962 as we had planned," the party organ wrote.

Neues Deutschland said that 27 percent of East Germany's annual imports consisted of food. It warned the population that its standard of living could not be improved with purchases from abroad because the shifting of foreign currency into this channel would endanger the fundament for our economic growth.

The party newspaper suggested that people help themselves by meeting production goals in agriculture and industry.

Meanwhile, the Government hinted that it might tighten its security measures along the Berlin wall to close the holes that have helped a few people escape to the West.

In an order of the day commemorating the founding 17 years ago of the peoples police, the Government called on the two armed brigades guarding the wall to increase your efforts so that we can guarantee the inviolability of our state border.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The article shows once again what I have been trying to emphasize on the floor of the Senate. The Communists are losing in the world today and we are winning. The basic, fundamental reason why the Communists are losing is that their agriculture is so retarded. It is so slow that they cannot do the job. At the same time American agriculture is moving ahead magnificently in our No. 1 success story.

SOLIDS RATHER THAN FATS STRESSED BY CALIFORNIA DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "New Milk Values Offered Dieters," published in the New York Times today, in which the California dairy industry is reported as developing and using a new system to appraise the value of milk and in doing so are emphasizing the protein value of milk rather than its butterfat value.

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

NEW MILK VALUES OFFERED DIETERS—SOLIDS, NOT FATS, STRESSED IN CALIFORNIA SYSTEM

SAN FRANCISCO, June 30.—The California dairy industry has a new way of setting raw milk values, designed with an eye upon the national trend toward low-fat diets.

The new system is a combination of the old butterfat value method with a new concept of valuing solids-not-fats, which is the powder left when butterfat and water are removed.

The system went into effect April 1. One element of it was to establish price control by the State Department of Agriculture over a new dairy product—low-fat, high-protein milk. California, like many other States, has a system of State control over milk prices.

CENT LESS THAN REGULAR

Low-fat, high-protein milk was new in California, although it had been sold elsewhere for several years. Here the special milk sells at 24 cents a quart, a cent less than regular milk, but 5 cents more than skimmed milk.

The new produce is 2-percent butterfat and 10-percent solids-not-fats. Generally, the 10-percent level is reached by adding solids. Regular milk is 3.5-percent butterfat, and 8.5-percent solids-not-fats.

Measurement is made by a specific gravity hydrometer, similar to an antifreeze tester for automobile radiators.

Much of the attraction for the dairy-conscious State Department of Agriculture was in the appeal of the new product for dieters.

"I believe there has been a strong trend in America toward dieting," said Charles Paul, State director of agriculture. "This is particularly true among the ladies, who diet to get pretty figures."

Mr. Paul also lamented the unfavorable publicity milk fat gets among the weight conscious. The decision, he explained, was "to give them more vitamins and less fat."

But the new legislation originated within the dairy industry, and here there was another reason for its support. In northern California the leading business association in the field is the Associated Dairymen, made up of some 500 producers of grade A milk.

OFF THE GOLD STANDARD

Al Pollard, manager of the association, compared the change to "going off the gold standard of butterfat" and onto the "silver standard of solids-not-fats."

Many years ago, he said, milk was sold purely on a butterfat content basis, but later it was realized that much food value was in skimmed milk.

So the system was changed to provide a combination value based on butterfat and gross weight. But, just as with butterfat, some cows produce milk with higher solids-not-fats values than do others.

The new pricing system provides for rewarding the owners of these herds, Mr. Pollard explained.

But this will not result in any financial benefit immediately to a dairy owner, said William J. Hunt, Chief of the Division of Dairy Industry of the Department of Agriculture.

Further, it should tend to change the competition between various breeds of dairy cattle by removing the advantage held by those breeds whose milk had high butterfat content.

Wesley Sawyer, a Waterford dairy farmer and a director of the Associated Dairymen, said he believed this new system of valuing milk was the most important part of the new legislation.

A TREND IS NOTED

"This new concept recognizes all nutrients," said Mr. Sawyer.

"The trend has been away from fats in food. The separation of the food components in milk will permit the dairy industry to move, through price changes in more salable components, in the direction the public's demands move."

Mr. Sawyer called the solids-not-fats portion now the most important part of milk—"it can't be easily duplicated while butter fat is in competition with vegetable oils."

Spokesmen for two milk retailers gave summations of the companies' experience with the new low-fat milk that tended to support Mr. Sawyer.

A large grocery chain, although stocking low-fat milk for the last 10 weeks has not found a great public demand. Skim seems to remain the favorite milk for dieters. A

spokesman for a large dairy said that his company had pushed the new product and that, while sales were satisfactory, they were not startling.

LAND-GRANT COLLEGE CENTENNIAL: A LIGHT FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, 100 years ago today, on July 2, 1862, President Abraham Lincoln signed into law legislation to create the land-grant colleges.

One of them, the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, became the first tax-supported institution of higher education to open its doors to students in Texas. It is one of the finest educational institutions of higher learning in America.

For the first time, the land-grant colleges made education available to others than the fortunate few born to social status and wealth.

The 68 land-grant colleges today represent less than 4 percent of the Nation's institutions of higher learning, but enroll 20 percent of the Nation's undergraduate college students, and grant 22 percent of all bachelors degrees in the United States, 25 percent of all the masters degrees, and 38 percent of all the doctorates.

Their service to the Nation has been to provide leaders in both peace and war. Historically, they have been a major factor in the Reserve Officer Corps.

I believe it was General Marshall who said that but for the Federal Reserve Corps training in land-grant colleges, our effort in World War II would have been delayed by 6 months. The services of those colleges to the Nation have been to provide leaders both in peace and in war.

Originally created to "teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life," in the 100 years of their service, the range of studies available in land-grant colleges has grown with the times, and is now as broad as higher education itself.

Today, land-grant colleges are looking ahead with some of the vision demonstrated 100 years ago by pioneers in education. For example, on January 4–5, 1962, a national conference was sponsored in Washington by the AFL–CIO and land-grant leaders, to consider the problem of opportunities for higher education, availability of classrooms, financing, scholarships, and high school preparation for college, especially for students from lower income groups.

The land-grant colleges are continuing to cooperate in their programs with 138 national organizations, embracing agriculture, industry, professional societies, labor, and service groups.

They continue to serve the Nation as a beckoning light to those who seek higher education, and they continue to provide distinguished leadership in this field.

Twice this year, I have visited Texas A. & M. College for public appearances, and each time I am more impressed with the high quality of work performed by this magnificent institution, and the degree of its service to the State and Nation. It was their proud boast during World War II that they had furnished more officers for the armed services than even the National Military Academy at West Point.

Today, there are some 2,000 institutions of higher learning in the United States with 3,891,000 students enrolling. That a fifth of these students are in 68 land-grant colleges is a matter of pride to the fine educators in these schools and a tribute to the vision of those responsible for the 1862 act. That 25 of the 42 living American Nobel Prize winners who studied in this country had earned land-grant college degrees is another factor reflecting great credit upon the land-grant educators.

The land-grant colleges and universities are deserving of the support of all Americans. They are a living tribute to what the leadership of the U.S. Government means in the field of higher education. They are living witnesses for the legislation to aid institutions of higher learning now pending in the Congress of the United States. They are a living testament to the benefits of higher education to a person, a family, their region, this Nation.

One hundred years of progress by the land-grant colleges cries out to the Congress today to solve its petty quarrels, and make the centennial of the Morrill Land-Grant College Act a living centennial and memorial by taking another long stride forward in higher education in America.

It is time to take the price tag off higher education, and make brains—not money—the test of who sits at the lamp of learning. The golden door of education for American youth should be opened to all who have the will and capacity to go to school. The ever-increasing tuition rates should not bar them. This year is the time for the Congress to open educational doors for the next century. The best tribute to this centennial year would be a new advance, and new and vaster plans for the century to come.

The ideal for the next century should be a college education for every young American with intellectual ability to acquire it. This is a major purpose of the American dream. The Congress should be fulfillers, not sideline debators, for this American ideal.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following article from the Pasadena Daily Citizen, Pasadena, Tex., captioned "Busy Lincoln Found Time To Help Colleges Get Start"; and another from the Washington Sunday Star of July 1, 1962, captioned "Land-Grant College: Our Most Significant School Move."

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

[From the Pasadena (Tex.) Daily Citizen, May 30, 1962]

BUSY LINCOLN FOUND TIME TO HELP COLLEGES GET START

On July 2, 1862, President Abraham Lincoln, in spite of his crushing load of military decisions, found time to give thought to quite another kind of document among those heaping his desk. Picking up this document, he began to read: "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts * * * without excluding other scientific and classical studies * * * in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes."

Here was the means of giving every American the same opportunity as his fellows, whether he came from privileged position or—as did Lincoln—from the "industrial classes." President Lincoln took his pen and signed this famous Morrill Land Grant Act, thus bringing into being the world-renowned system of land-grant colleges and universities.

Now, on the occasion of the celebration of the centennial of the Morrill Land Grant Act, the system number 68 institutions, one or more in every one of the 50 States and Puerto Rico. Included are such giants as the universities of California, Illinois, and Maryland, Rutgers, Purdue, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

One of the few States to have more than one land-grant institution is Texas. The two colleges which place Texas within such an elite group are Texas A. & M. and Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College.

One hundred years ago 1 young American in 1,500 went to college. Today one in three attends. The land-grant system has become the Nation's largest single source of training and educated manpower.

As well as bringing into vivid reality the idea of equality of educational opportunity, for the first time colleges were brought to the people. Teaching and research were no longer confined to the campus. Land-grant people conduct special classes, they go to factories and farms to test research results, they contribute to the cultural life of the community, and they seek solutions to economic, social, and physical ills of their fellow citizens.

The value of land-grant research alone exceeds by many times the total amount spent on these colleges since they came into being. These researchers have made discoveries ranging from agricultural pest-control drugs to mining processes and the first atom-smashing cyclotron.

A subject of great importance to Americans and the free world—against the backdrop of the struggle which pitted brother against brother, Morrill included in his act a provision for on-campus training in military subjects. Morrill, seeing far beyond his time, created a structure that has served our Nation well in four major wars.

Early in World War II, General George C. Marshall, then Army Chief of Staff, estimated that the ROTC, born under the 1862 act, had speeded mobilization by 6 months.

* * * * *

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 1, 1962]

LAND-GRANT COLLEGE: OUR MOST SIGNIFICANT SCHOOL MOVE

(By G. K. Hodenfield)

They said later that Abraham Lincoln on that day had lighted a candle that would guide future generations of Americans out of the dark night of ignorance.

But it was a moment of history that passed without notice, an act of faith that was long unsung.

In midsummer 1862, the Nation writhed in civil war. Confederate Gen. Robert E. Lee had just thrown back Gen. George B. McClellan's army of the Potomac in the 7 days' battles.

The Treasury Department in Washington was advising its agents: "Wherever you find an article, a product, a trade, a profession, or a source of income, tax it." Long months

of bloody fighting lay ahead, and the future was bleak.

Small wonder then, that the country paid scant heed when President Lincoln on July 2, 1862, signed into law the Morrill Act, the most important single piece of Federal legislation in the history of American education.

The Morrill Act led to the establishment of 68 unique land-grant colleges and universities, including such honored and distinguished institutions as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the University of Illinois, Auburn, and Texas A. & M.

But it did more than that, much more.

BROADENED EDUCATION

It put higher education within the grasp of all who could profit by it, be they scions of wealthy families or children of the poor.

It paved the way for an agricultural revolution that is the envy and the wonder of the world, and which is not yet ended. It spawned programs of adult education and extension services which may well be this country's most important exports to the undeveloped areas of the world in the years ahead.

Not even Representative Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont, himself, could have foreseen the wonders that were to blossom from the legislation for which he had fought so long.

If Lincoln made any comment when he signed the bill, history doesn't record it. But sometime during a hot and sticky day 100 years ago tomorrow he took a quill pen in hand and signed:

"An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes."

The act granted each State 30,000 acres of Federal land lying within that State for each of its Members of Congress. States which no longer had enough Federal land within their boundaries for the purposes of the act were given scrip which entitled them to land in the still undeveloped Western States. New States collected when they entered the Union, or sometimes while still territories.

Income from the sale of the land and the scrip was to be invested in "stocks of the United States or of the States, or some safe stocks, yielding not less than 5 percent upon the par value of said stocks."

The capital investment itself was to "remain forever undiminished." The income from the investment was to be used only for the educational goals of the act.

Eventually, the States received 11,383,082 acres in either land or land scrip, and sold them for a total of $13,478,946. By today's standards, that $13.5 million is a bagatelle. Purdue University, for instance, now has an annual operating budget of nearly $50 million, which does not include construction.

But the interest alone from that $13.5 million set great forces in motion.

Today there are 68 land-grant colleges or universities, at least one in every State and one in Puerto Rico.

They enroll 20 percent of all U.S. college students. They confer 40 percent of all the doctor's degrees awarded in this country. Through their ROTC programs, these institutions provide almost half of all the Regular and Reserve officers in the Armed Forces.

NOBEL PRIZE WINNERS

Twenty-five of the forty-two living American Nobel Price winners have earned degrees from land-grant institutions.

Research at these colleges and universities brought the development of the first cyclotron, television tube, transistor, the production of pure uranium, and the discovery of such wonder drugs as streptomycin, stilbestrol, and dicumarol.

The ceramics, soybean, and woodpulp industries all had their start in land-grant colleges.

But perhaps the greatest impact these institutions have had is the field of agriculture.

As former Representative Dixon, Republican of Utah, told the House in a speech a few years ago:

"The fact that the productivity of our agriculture is unparalleled in world history, the fact that our problem in America is how best to use our abundance rather than how to prevent starvation, the fact that we are sharing our plenty with the hungry of this earth—all of these blessings are due in immeasurable degree to our land-grant colleges."

In 1862, a farmer produced enough for himself and only four others. Today he produces enough for 26 others.

In 1862, the average corn crop in Illinois was about 15 bushels per acre. Today it is 77.

In 1862 the South harvested about 120 pounds of cotton per acre. Today that same acre produces 438 pounds.

All this was part of the dream of Representative Morrill when he first introduced his Land Grant Act in Congress on April 20, 1858.

"Men waste hundreds of acres of land on the theory that it is inexhaustible," Mr. Morrill told the House.

"Our population is rapidly increasing and brings annually increased demands for bread and clothing. If we can barely meet this demand while we have fresh soils to appropriate, we shall surely reach the point of our decline and fall.

"The nation which tills the soil so as to leave it worse than they found it is doomed to decay and degradation."

THE ORIGINAL IDEA

Historians do not agree on whether Mr. Morrill or Jonathan Baldwin Turner should be credited with originating the land-grant idea.

Mr. Turner, in 1850, urged that Illinois endow a State university with the money it received from the sale of public lands. Mr. Morrill said later he first got the idea of land-grant colleges about 1856, but "where I obtained the first hint of such a measure, I am wholly unable to say."

But whoever had the idea first, it was Mr. Morrill, son of a Vermont blacksmith, who pushed it through Congress.

To do it, he had to overcome opposition from westerners, who did not want the land within their borders sold to outsiders; from southerners, who saw the federally financed institutions as an invasion of States rights, and from President Buchanan, who vetoed the measure after it first passed the House and Senate.

The Morrill Act squeaked by the House in 1858 by a vote of 105 to 100, and the Senate by a vote of 25 to 22, only to run into President Buchanan's veto.

Mr. Buchanan said the bill would cost too much, would confuse the relationship between the Federal Government and the States, injure the newer States, compete unfairly with established colleges and universities, and violate the Constitution.

The veto was upheld in Congress, despite an impassioned plea by Mr. Morrill.

PRESIDENT ASSAILED

Mr. Morrill said, "the President has committed, if not a crime, at least a blunder." He called the veto incomprehensible, and declared, "the telegraphic news of this veto will start a tear from the eye of more than one manly boy, whose ambition will now be nipped in the bud."

In December 1861 when Mr. Morrill brought his bill before the House again, he found the going much easier.

First, the secession of the Southern States had removed much of the opposition.

Second, Mr. Morrill had added the proviso that the land-grant institutions must teach military tactics, and Congress was painfully aware of the need for more officers.

(Ninety-six years later, another Federal aid-to-education bill was given a boost through Congress by being called the National Defense Education Act of 1958.)

This time the vote was 91 to 25 in the House and 32 to 7 in the Senate.

Although President Lincoln made no recorded comment when he signed the bill, he was aware of the potential. As he eloquently put it at the Wisconsin State Fair in Milwaukee on September 30, 1859:

"No other human occupation opens so wide a field for the profitable and agreeable combination of labor with cultivated thought, as agriculture. * * * Every blade of grass is a study, and to produce two where there was but one is both a profit and a pleasure."

UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS NEED STABILITY TO ATTRACT INVESTMENTS FROM OUTSIDE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, one of the most important factors in helping underdeveloped countries to improve their economic stability is the encouragement of outside investments. Difficulties faced by prospective American investors in foreign countries are discussed in an editorial in the Houston Chronicle of Monday, June 18, 1962.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial entitled "Stability Attracts Foreign Investment" printed in the RECORD.

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

STABILITY ATTRACTS FOREIGN INVESTMENT

In seeking to bring about the permanent economic well-being of underdeveloped areas among the new nations coming into existence these days, a most important factor is private foreign investment. This is the opinion of A. A. Fatourous, a member of the law faculty of Western Ontario University. He explains the whole field in a book, "Government Guarantees to Foreign Investors," to be issued Tuesday by Columbia University Press.

Four obstacles, however, stand in the way of foreign investment as this observer views the problem. The possibility of eventual expropriation is perhaps the greatest concern of private investors. Coupled with this is apprehension concerning the political and economic stability of local governments. Lesser evils but still considerations are the limitations imposed on operations by these governments and the exchange controls.

The book reviews for the first time the various types of guarantees extended to foreign investors and examines their efficacy. Among these are bilateral and multilateral international treaties. More common, however, are the specific individual agreements between investors and governments of both capital-importing and capital-exporting states.

We have seen in Cuba and elsewhere how the violent overthrow of an established government with which the United States and its businessmen had had agreements and treaties can blow down the whole house of cards. The best security of all, therefore, is for the governments to prove themselves stable and worthy of the confidence of their own people as well as the confidence of the investors.

CALLUP OF RESERVES AND NATIONAL GUARD EMPHASIZED NECESSITY OF PREPAREDNESS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Dallas Times Herald of Monday, June 18, 1962, entitled "A Lesson Learned," commenting on the need for preparedness for an emergency callup of Reserves and National Guardsmen.

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

A LESSON LEARNED

The Army undoubtedly made some mistakes in the calling up of Reserves and National Guardsmen last fall.

But it also learned some valuable lessons. And some of these lessons are going to be put to good use.

One lesson learned seems to be that soldiers called into service have to have a place to live and train. And it's a lot easier to have a place ready for them than to put it into shape after they arrive.

So the word is that the Army intends to keep Fort Polk, La., and Fort Chaffee, Ark., open after the reservists and guardsmen return home in August.

This kind of preparedness, like that of having adequate reserves and adequate equipment, strikes us as good commonsense.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR KUCHEL AT CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, on last Thursday I was privileged to speak to the State convention of the American Legion, at Fresno, Calif. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my comments on that occasion be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

A STRONG AMERICA SHALL REMAIN FREE

(Text of remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the California State convention of the American Legion, Fresno, June 28, 1962)

As a member of the Legion, I am particularly honored to accept your invitation and to join with you today. You and I, and the thousands who belong to this organization, share a common concern and a common responsibility: How to maintain our Nation's strength so that our ideals of freedom and equality of opportunity shall prevail.

The American Legion clearly recognizes that no matter how great the technology and the scientific advances in military strength that it is still the human being—his brainpower and his willpower—who determines the outcome of armed conflict. We recognize, too, that as we build a modern Defense Establishment, in this nuclear era in which we live, we must care responsibly for American veterans of all wars who responded to the challenge in past decades when our country was in danger.

As a U.S. Senator, I have assumed that one paramount responsibility is to make available the assistance of a grateful nation to our fellow veterans who require a helping hand. The better to discharge that duty, the Senate, in my view, ought to have a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I have coauthored such a proposal, and I will continue to work for its approval.

I am particularly gratified that in 1954 I could be of service in securing funds for the construction of a new wing to accommodate paraplegics at the Long Beach Veterans' Hospital. In the same year, I sponsored the amendment to get the Veterans' Hospital at Palo Alto underway. Two years ago, I helped to push along the funds necessary for a sorely needed Veterans' Administration Hospital at Martinez. I have voted against crippling amendments to cut back on the medical research funds available to the Veterans' Administration.

As you know, at last the House has sent to the Senate H.R. 10743, which would raise the compensation payments to veterans with service-connected disabilities. While this legislation is still inadequate in several respects, it is a step in the right direction. I am hopeful that Congress will approve it and thus end the parliamentary war on veterans' legislation which does a disservice to the veterans whom we seek honorably to serve. A grateful nation cannot, must not, and will not turn her back on her soldier-citizens who have given of their bone and marrow to keep America free.

The fact of the matter is that the price of freedom is not, and never has been, cheap. All too often we brush aside the fact that we today in America enjoy freedom only because, from almost every generation, our fellow Americans have fought and died to protect our liberty.

When I have supported veterans' legislation—endorsed by the American Legion—there have been some, usually nonveterans, who falsely labeled the legislation as "give-away," and who libeled both the beneficiary and the sponsors in the process.

There are some Americans of varying political ideology who refuse to understand our Nation's needs and the defense requirements which have been imposed upon us. Some of them would render us defenseless by having our Nation unilaterally disarm. Some would weaken America, by repudiating President Kennedy's courageous decision to keep our nuclear arsenal supreme through atmospheric nuclear testing. They would weaken the common strength of our free friends by having our Government abandon a nuclear deterrent within NATO. They would weaken the moral fabric of the free world by recognizing Red China, whose rulers are as wanton and as evil as this world has ever known. These Americans speak through fear or dread, or something worse. But, thank God, their voices fall on deaf ears.

There are some people amongst us who, through frustration or fear, demand that the United States commence a nuclear war against the Soviet Union. They do not know what they are talking about. They do a disservice to the cause of American security, and to the cause of American ideals, and to the cause of a just peace, indeed, to the very future of the globe.

The United States of America does not seek armed conflict with anyone. That is not a statement of weakness. It is a statement of high principle. We seek peace with justice in the world. That is our goal. That is what we strive for. We maintain a vast and superior Military Establishment, not to commit an act of aggression, but to demonstrate the utter and awesome and costly futility of any potential aggression against us. We maintain a vastly superior nuclear arsenal strategically deployed around the globe, on land, and in the air and beneath the seas, not to provoke war, but to deter it.

Meanwhile, we diligently seek to find a way to peaceful and honorable solutions to the international disputes which plague mankind. We recognize the eternal truth uttered by that great American soldier statesman, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur who said:

"Global war has become a Frankenstein to destroy both sides. No longer is it a weapon of adventure—the shortcut to international power. If you lose, you are annihilated. If you win you stand only to lose."

It is said that the world lives in a balance of terror. We do. It is said that it is frightfully difficult to make peace. It is. But, in this unchartered nuclear era, we, together with like-minded nations of good will, continue to try to find an honorable way. We intend to continue our supremely powerful Defense Establishment, never to commence armed conflict, but always to deter aggression or if, unhappily necessary, to combat it. We intend, also, to keep our defensive agreements with our free friends for precisely the same purpose.

Meanwhile, this troubled and divided world moves on in history. From the agreements, which the free nations in the Atlantic communities have long since reached for purposes of defense, they, most of them, have gone forward to strengthen their economic and cultural ties. I believe the European Economic Community is a natural and logical development of the NATO defensive charter. Today the so-called European Common Market represents solid progress toward the dream of a United States of Europe, composed of free countries and free peoples dedicated toward the maintenance of their liberty and their integrity.

The European Market is sure to grow and to prosper. Several weeks ago I had an opportunity to talk with the Prime Minister of Norway. He told me his country desires to become a member of the Common Market. Denmark is interested. So is Iceland. So are Ireland and Austria and Switzerland. And the United Kingdom, notwithstanding its own economic problems with members of the Commonwealth, also aspires toward association. The growth of this new economic union among free peoples has moved the Soviet to bitterness and, I think I may say so, to envy. Free peoples are becoming stronger, economically as well as militarily.

And now, a new development takes place within the Common Market. The other day its Council of Ministers took a unique and challenging step by agreeing in principle to offer $780 million of financial aid to 16 African States and Madagascar under a new 5-year association agreement to become effective next January. We have a great stake in the future of all of Africa. We want her newly emerging countries to be free and independent. It is an encouraging development to see Western Europe prepare to assist them.

Last year, the President appointed me a member of the American delegation to visit the new African country of Senegal on the occasion of her independence celebration. I saw evidence of poverty and disease. But I also saw a happy people, whose leaders are dedicated to maintaining the new-found freedom of their people and to improving their own standards of life. Communism remains a problem in Africa, but it is a problem that can be won by the West, and by freedom. I have seen this same spirit and drive reflected in those leaders of other new African nations as I have been privileged to meet and speak to them.

Whatever problem our own U.S. economy has with respect to trade policy developments in Europe, I believe the Common Market adds strength to Western security. I shall favor, in the Senate, legislation permitting Americans to deal with the Common Market to maximum, mutual advantage of America and of our friends in Western Europe. Our Government must have adequate authority to permit it to negotiate effectively with the Common Market in the interest of our own industry, and our own agriculture. Trade policy properly negotiated should mean more American jobs. And I remind you as Californians, our State is the first international trader among all 50 of our States. In 1960, California exported $1.8 billion in agricultural commodities and manufactured goods.

Time is on the side of freedom in this long, dreary struggle in which it is engaged with communism. The Soviet Premier is eternally wrong when he prophesies communization of the world in the next two generations. Americans reject imperialism, Communist or otherwise. And to the contrary, I suggest that the Soviet Union's grandchildren, in their day, may well live in freedom. And never once in all the history of the Soviet Union, has a people or a country voluntarily accepted communism. When communism has come to engulf and subjugate a people, it has always come by force or by subversion.

Life goes on, and on this side of the Iron Curtain, Western society makes progress. We shall make more. In this intrepid and challenging chore the United States plays a preeminently important part. Ours is the responsibility of leadership in the cause of free men. We shall, we must, discharge it with firmness, with vision, and with courage, and with an unswerving belief, that in God's good time, human liberty will prevail.

Years ago, General Eisenhower, during his Presidential career, uttered the sobering declaration that there is no longer any alternative to peace. We, my fellow Legionnaires, live somewhere between war and peace. The strong wage peace better than the weak. And we shall remain strong.

We live in complicated times. We must be wary, but not afraid. We must be resolute, not shaken. We need to reaffirm the values of Western civilization, not renounce them.

Those who are entrusted, by their fellow citizens, with the responsibility to advise and decide the great issues which confront our Nation at home and abroad also require balance, perspective, and understanding. Complicated times and the problems which arise from them, require complicated solutions, not emotional appeals, panaceas, or slogans.

What is required is a sense of history and an understanding of it. We in America, our free world allies, and the underdeveloped nations are confronted with a common enemy. The enemy is a world revolutionary force known as international communism. The zeal in a Communist's eyes comes from his belief in the Marx dogma that history is inevitably on his side, and that all will be swept before his cause. We disagree. So will history. The power in a Communist's hands comes from the more practical formulas of Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev, who have said one thing, only to do another. The phrase "peaceful coexistence" has all too often been used as a cloak, under which intrigue and subversion have fomented pressure and peril on the West. The free world must never forget last summer when, in the midst of Geneva conferences on disarmament, Khrushchev suddenly announced a new nuclear test series. While there is no rule book for the Communist, he understands only too well the rule book of the West. He knows that we are products of the Judaic-Christian tradition. He knows we believe in the rule of law and the sanctity of contract. We make a mistake sometimes in assuming the Communist believes as we do. We assume he is rational, when he is a zealot. We assume he seeks an honorable peace when he seeks conquest.

Many in the West have a great capacity to believe only what they want to believe. Hitler and his nazism—another perversion of Western values—told us what he wanted, but with a lack of brainpower and willpower we did not understand and believe until it was almost too late.

If the history of Communist expansion teaches us anything, it teaches us that communism respects strength, not weakness. With the exception of the tragic fiasco in Cuba, our Republic has an honorable record—we stood firm in Berlin under Stalin's threats by starting the airlift. Over a decade later, America again stood firm in Berlin. We are there by right and by agreement. Speaking for myself, I oppose the creation of any international control agency on access routes to Berlin, which would contain any representatives of the puppet East German regime.

Under President Truman we maintained the freedom of Greece and Turkey. Under President Eisenhower we maintained the freedom of Guatemala, Iran, and Lebanon. So, too, in the Congo, the United Nations, with the approval of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, has rebuffed Russian intervention. Interestingly enough, the same Russian planes which delivered supplies to Communist subverters in the Congo, were later photographed delivering supplies to the terrorists operating in Laos.

As assistant leader of my party in the Senate, it has been my privilege to attend bipartisan meetings at the White House under two Presidents for frank discussions on proposals for resisting tyranny and for furthering the cause of freemen. I am a Republican. Our President is a Democrat. But we—all of us—are, first, Americans. And I continue to believe that we, all of us, or, at any rate, most of us, want our foreign policy and our national defensive arrangements geared simply and solely to what is in the best interests of our Republic and its perpetuation.

I will disagree with the President when I believe he is wrong. But I will try always to make it constructive criticism and never narrow obstruction.

I have criticized those who approved a loan to Ghana—a country I do not regard as a "free, friendly nation," as our law requires. In 1961, I helped lead the fight in the U.S. Senate against revision of the Battle Act which would have authorized the granting of American assistance to Communist satellites. I stand today on this issue exactly where I stood 1 year ago.

Last year, I cosponsored the language in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which would permit the President to invoke economic sanctions against Communist Cuba. Congress overwhelmingly approved this legislation. I urged the President to make immediate use of it. And we are grateful that he did earlier this year.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I have been privileged to scrutinize the defense budget of this Nation. I have supported two Presidents in their requests for sufficient funds to assure that our own military power, and our own nuclear deterrent, remain superior to any other nation on earth. I have objected in the Senate when some Senators from both parties have used the Defense Budget as a place to establish their so-called economy votes.

I shall continue to support an effective mutual security program in the future as I have in the past. As an American delegate to the Conference of NATO Parliamentarians, I have found that those representing the Western Alliance share common aspirations and purposes which are sure to surmount any of the temporary and frustrating disagreements which so often take place among friends. Each is proud of his own country. Each wants, in friendship and good comradeship, to have our peoples stand together against a common foe.

But, with it all, each, or most, with understandable pride, wants his country to remain sovereign and independent. And I know I do, and you do, for your family and for mine. I am simply an American, working in the Senate of the United States, for the perpetuation of his own country, and for the liberty which God has given its people.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1526. An act for the relief of Joey Kim Purdy;

S. 1943. An act for the relief of Hajime Sumitani;

S. 2107. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard", to extend the application of certain laws relating to the military services to the Coast Guard for purposes of uniformity;

S. 2130. An act to repeal certain obsolete provisions of law relating to the mints and assay offices, and for other purposes;

S. 2198. An act for the relief of Lise Marie Berthe Marguerite De Simone;

S. 2300. An act for the relief of Byron Wong;

S. 2309. An act for the relief of Tio Sien Tjiong;

S. 2355. An act for the relief of Filomena F. Schenkenberger;

S. 2586. An act for the relief of Alexandra Callas;

S. 2606. An act for the relief of Patricia Kim Bell (Kim Booshin);

S. 2607. An act for the relief of Lee Hwa Sun;

S. 2633. An act for the relief of Susan Holt Lerke (Choi Sun hee);

S. 2679. An act for the relief of John Axel Arvidson;

S. 2709. An act for the relief of Ernst Fraenkel and his wife, Hanna Fraenkel; and

S. 2732. An act for the relief of Yoon So Shim.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1969. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes; and

S. 3062. An act to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage under certain conditions.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1962—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12154) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 29, 1962, pp. 12358–12363, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator with that understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The attachés of the Senate should take notice

that this will be a live quorum. I want every Senator to be notified to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 109 Leg.]

Aiken	Gore	Monroney
Allott	Gruening	Morse
Anderson	Hartke	Moss
Bartlett	Hayden	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bible	Hickey	Neuberger
Boggs	Hill	Prouty
Burdick	Holland	Proxmire
Bush	Hruska	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Russell
Cannon	Javits	Scott
Case	Johnston	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Keating	Stennis
Clark	Kerr	Symington
Cooper	Kuchel	Talmadge
Cotton	Lausche	Thurmond
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Tower
Dirksen	Long, Hawaii	Wiley
Dodd	Long, La.	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McCarthy	Yarborough
Ellender	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Fong	Metcalf	
Fulbright	Miller	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Maryland [Mr. BEALL and Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, last Friday night the House and Senate conferees agreed on a compromise version of the sugar bill. The Senate conferees, as is their custom, stood firm, and gave ground only when absolutely necessary and only when the benefits obtained seemed to well outweigh the loss. I shall state very briefly the results of the conference, and Senators can judge for yourselves how the conferees represented them in this matter.

In the first instance, the Senate version of the bill had an expiration date of June 30, 1967. The House version date was December 31, 1966. On this point the Senate conferees receded, with regard to the domestic production part of the bill, for what seemed to be sound reasons. Domestic quotas are on a calendar-year basis; and, for a number of reasons, it seemed wise to have the bill continue in operation until the end of some calendar year. We did not count this as any real concession.

With regard to the added allocations of the growth factor, the Senate conferees were adamant. This firmness was soon evident, and the House conferees conceded. So the conference report allows 65 percent of the growth factor to be allocated to domestic areas—instead of the 63 percent in the House version—and a 65,000-ton-a-year reserve for new areas, as against the 50,000 granted in the House version. The entire language of the Senate version with respect to this was adopted, with very minor changes which were obvious improvements.

The Senate conferees then made somewhat of a concession on the section of the bill pertaining to the imports of direct consumption sugar. The House version was more restrictive in this respect than the Senate bill, and finally the House language was adopted. This would limit the direct consumption sugar that may be entered from countries other than the Republic of the Philippines to the average amounts entered during the years 1957–59 for all countries with total quotas of 20,000 tons or less. No direct consumption sugar would be permitted to enter from countries with quotas of more than 20,000 tons. All sugar brought in as replacement for the suspended Cuba quota must enter in the raw state, so long as raw sugar is reasonably available from other authorized sources.

The House conferees receded, and accepted the Senate version with regard to the definition of "alcohol." The Senate had clarified this section of the basic law, which provides that sugar brought in for the manufacture of livestock feeds and alcohol need not come in under the quota provisions. The Senate amendment was adopted.

The Senate conferees receded and adopted the House language concerning the importation of liquid sugar. The purpose of the language in both versions was to limit possible abuses and danger to the program through the importation of liquid sugar. The two versions were not far apart; but the House proposal seemed a little tighter, so the Senate did not lose by this concession.

The real problem in the conference, and one which several times threatened to leave us with no sugar bill at all, involved the features of the foreign quotas. At one point the conferees agreed to disagree, and the conference broke up; but after a little time, during which both sides had the chance to analyze the situation and contemplate the serious nature of the results of no sugar legislation, another final effort seemed to bring results which, although not quite satisfactory to either side, at least seemed to leave them equally unhappy—which is about the best one could hope for under the circumstances.

The country allocations of basic quotas in the House version were substantially larger than in the Senate version. In any compromise on this, the amounts in the Senate version would have to go up, and those in the House version would have to come down. However, any allocations at all were involved in the question which caused the real impasse—namely, whether these quotas would remain stable, with the premium price constant, or whether the premium should be reduced on a graduated basis.

The Senate version provided that the more moderate quotas assigned to foreign countries should be granted on the basis of a gradual increase in the percentage of the import fee to be collected upon importations of sugar from those countries. On a 5-year basis, 20 percent of the import fee would be collected the first year, and 40 percent, 60 percent, 80 percent, and 100 percent in the succeeding years, respectively. The House version had no such graduated scale of import fees, for it had no import fee at all.

The ice was broken for the first time when the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] suggested a possible compromise of a shorter extension, with the import fee applying. An earlier suggestion for a simple 1-year extension of the foreign quota features of the bill had been rejected. But since the House conferees seemed to prefer to have no bill at all, rather than to have a 5-year extension with a gradual reduction in premium payments, there began a discussion of a shorter period. The possible compromise seemed to be along the line of a shorter period for the foreign quota sections of the bill only, and this was explored and debated.

As a part of this problem, the conferees debated the reallocation of the Cuban quota and the size of the Cuban quota to be maintained for that country when and if our mutual relations improved. The House conferees finally conceded on the Cuban quota reserve; and the Senate provision that the unfilled Cuban quota should be purchased on a "global quota" basis—that is, purchased from any country desiring to sell, but with the payment of a full import fee based on the difference between the world price and the domestic price was adopted. This constituted a major concession on the part of the House conferees, and it seemed for the first time that a bill suitable to both Houses could be drafted.

The Senate had hoped for a larger Cuban quota to be available to that country when and if it deserved it and could handle it. The Senate version provided for a substantially larger quota for Cuba, even though it could not be assigned there at the present time. The Senate finally compromised on a figure of 1,635,000 tons, to be kept in reserve until such time as Cuba might again join the free world. The House conferees receded from their former position of requiring that the Cuban quota be reallocated on a full premium-price basis. The conference report states that all importations under the suspended Cuban quota shall come in under full recapture of the premium; in other words, all such

imports are to be subject to the full import fee, and will be bought on a first come, first served basis.

After settling this major problem, the conferees proceeded to discuss the basic quotas for the rest of the world. Some countries granted quotas under the House version were dropped; some quotas in the House version were reduced, which meant that some country quotas in the Senate version were raised. The list of allocations to the various countries is rather long, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

	Tons
Peru	190,000
Dominican Republic	190,000
Mexico	190,000
Brazil	180,000
British West Indies	90,000
Australia	40,000
Republic of China	35,000
French West Indies	30,000
Colombia	30,000
Nicaragua	25,000
Costa Rica	25,000
India	20,000
Ecuador	25,000
Haiti	20,000
Guatemala	20,000
South Africa	20,000
Panama	15,000
El Salvador	10,000
Paraguay	10,000
British Honduras	10,000
Fiji Islands	10,000
Other countries	11,332

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, the House conferees receded further from the position that no premium price reductions would take place; and the Senate conferees receded a little on the length of time of the operation of the part of the act applying to foreign quotas. As agreed upon, the quotas are allocated to the countries named for a period of 2½ years, or until the end of 1964, with a three-step reduction in the premium payments. The first year imports must pay 10 percent of the import fee based on the difference between the world price and the domestic price; the second year, 20 percent of the difference; and in the third year, 30 percent.

This reduction in premium payments was a very important part of the Senate version of the bill. The administration had indicated that it was highly advisable to begin to do away with the premium price system; and it is gratifying to be able to report that we have, at least, made some progress in this direction.

Madam President, I hope the conference report will be adopted. I hope the Senate will agree that the conferees from this body upheld the Senate traditions and brought back a suitable compromise. I understand that the full House has adopted the conference report by a vote of 248 to 31. I hope the Senate will sustain the Senate conferees.

I should like to add that the anti-confiscation amendment contained in the House version of the bill was strengthened in conference, in light of the action undertaken by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when it voted for a rather strong provision along that line.

The provisions which would have made it possible for the President to have dispensed with sugar quotas and sugar payments in instances in which American property had been seized without compensation, by determining that it was desirable to take such action, were eliminated from the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I compliment the Senator from Louisiana and other members of the conference committee. In the main they have reported not only a livable bill, but also one which is much better than the version of the bill which came to us from the House.

I am particularly interested in two features of the bill, although I wish to make very clear that I shall not in any way obstruct early adoption of the conference report, because I think early continuity of the sugar program is highly desirable under the existing conditions.

Next, let me say that I notice that from the list of countries among which sugar was prorated by the provisions of the House version of the bill, only Argentina, in this hemisphere, and Mauritius, not in this hemisphere, were eliminated from the list in the House version. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct. The quotas for some other countries were reduced; but those were the only two countries for which quotas were completely eliminated.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is the way I understand the report.

I am particularly concerned with the elimination of the Argentine quota, because I have found the Argentines very cooperative with us, particularly in the tung-oil field, with which the Senator from Louisiana is familiar, inasmuch as his State, Mississippi, and my own State are the three heavy tung-oil producing States. The Senator from Louisiana will remember that in that field we secured a quota for Argentina some years ago; but our Argentine friends felt that the quota was not exactly as fair or as mutual as it should be, and requested that it be discontinued, and agreed to confine their shipments to this country within substantially the same limits as those the quota had fixed; and certainly they have lived up to that commitment. I am very anxious to know why the premium price quota for Argentina was eliminated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Perhaps the Senator from Florida recalls that the Senate version of the bill did not contain any quota at all for Argentina. In other words, the Senate version of the bill assigned quotas only to countries which had had quotas assigned by previous legislation. Even then, it had a provision that every year the premium payment would be reduced 20 percent, so that in 5 years there would be no premium payments.

The Senate bill gave Argentina a fixed quota and no reduction in premium.

The Senate conferees, in trying to hew to the Senate version of the bill, were trying to stay as close as possible to the Senate approved bill. So far as the Senate conferees were concerned, they were willing to take that version, so far as concerns assigning a quota to countries other than ones that had had a quota historically. The House yielded on this point, and with regard to reductions for others.

The Senator will recall that only these countries were included in the bill: The Philippines, Peru, Dominician Republic, Mexico, Nicaragua, Haiti, the Netherlands, the Republic of China, Panama, and Costa Rica. Outside this area, Canada, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Hong Kong, and the British West Indies were included.

The conferees became embittered at times, and in seeking to have the House eliminate the premium payment amounts, the House, yielding insofar as it could—I would assume on the basis of the information the House conferees had—with regard to Argentina did not support it as much as the others. This was a matter of the House yielding to the Senate, and not the other way.

It may be that we can ask the President to take another look at this question, in view of the fact that there was provision for a country quota. The President felt that none should have a country quota other than those who had had it historically, and even then there should be a premium reduction. We did obtain a reduction, but not as rapidly as the President wanted.

Mr. HOLLAND. I fully realize that in conference one cannot get everything he would like. The thing that disturbs me is that Argentina alone among our hemispheric friends originally included was completely cut out of the entitlement to a premium quota basis. I note that several of our other good friends among the Latin American countries have had their premium payment quotas continued. I certainly do not want to deprive them of any of their benefits under the conference report. It seems to me it is particularly necessary, with our Alliance for Progress program underway, to deal as evenhandedly as possible with our friends in Latin America. Does the Senator from Louisiana agree with me in that statement?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I agree with the generality of the Senator's conclusion. I say to him, however, that the Senate conferees went to conference committed to the Senate's position not to let any of those countries have quotas. We are not taking away anything they had, in so far as relates to countries which had quotas temporarily being gradually reduced. If the Senate conferees had had their way, all of them would have been left out. Instead, the following countries were included: El Salvador, Guatemala, Brazil, Colombia, French West Indies, Australia, Paraguay, India, British Honduras, Fiji Islands. Mauritius did come out. The position of the Senate is to try to put the entire act on a basis under which there would be no premium payments 5 years from now, and only those who had had premium payments for 5 years gone by

on a legislative basis, would have had any. We succeeded in going very far in that direction. Perhaps some persons felt we went too far, but we had the Senate approved bill before us, and that is what we were trying for.

Mr. HOLLAND. I can appreciate that the Senator was fighting for the Senate bill. I am glad he prevailed in so many respects. I am only sorry that if any of the Latin American countries that were scheduled to have a premium payment basis under the House bill were eliminated, they were not all eliminated.

The Senator from Louisiana made a statement to the effect that he understands there may be some action contemplated to correct that situation. Is it contemplated for the immediate future?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall certainly be glad to consider it. As I said, the Senate bill assigned very little under quotas. We went to conference on a basis of a difference of 1,200,000 tons between what the House assigned under quotas and what the Senate was willing to assign under quotas. We came out with a 1,635,000-ton reserve to be purchased at the world market price.

It might be said that we yielded to the extent of about 600,000 tons in order to get a conference report. It may be that as a result of yielding on this issue as between countries, some adjustment may be indicated. That is a subject on which the State Department should advise us. But the House conferees had a right to do what they did on the first motion, which was to exclude all the administration's advisers from the room. I do not blame them for doing it. Under the separation of powers, they had a right to do it. With the administration supporting the Senate's position, it was probably necessary, in order for the House conferees to maintain their position, that there should not be any advisers from the Department of State or Department of Agriculture in the room.

On that basis, it might well be that the administration might recommend that there should be a relatively small, or even a substantial, adjustment in connection with foreign quotas.

From the Senate point of view, we were doing the best we could to uphold the Senate bill. I believe the Senate is in the best position it has ever occupied in conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I think he is correct. I think this is a true give and take. I am sorry as much had to be given in the field I have mentioned.

As I understand, the Senator is not averse to having a correction of this matter so far as Argentina and any other adversely affected Latin American nation is concerned.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be perfectly willing to put Argentina on a basis with the other countries in this hemisphere. I would want to get the advice of the State Department and the President on that subject, because they are in a better position to know the situation than this Senator is.

From where we were standing in the conference committee, we thought it would be better to have such advice, but we were dealing with a coequal legislative branch of the Government. We did the best we could to adhere to the Senate position.

Insofar as some inequity may be involved as between friends of ours within this hemisphere, the Senator can recognize that it was a matter of the House yielding on some of these questions. If the House yielded too far, it was not because the Senate did not try to get the Senate bill all the way.

Mr. HOLLAND. Again I compliment the Senator from Louisiana for the degree of success in the conference.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. At the time Argentina was removed from the provision, the Senate conferees did not know that other countries would not also be eliminated. We were hoping they would be. Our position was that we wanted to stay with the Senate bill, and stay as close to holding the Senate position as we could.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

My next question has to do with the increase for domestic producers, with which I know the Senator from Louisiana is concerned, not only on a national basis, but in the interest of the producers of his own State.

Will the Senator state for the record the result of the conference insofar as relates to the increased production permitted under the conference for the mainland sugarcane producers?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That which was in conference was the difference between the House figure of 63 percent of the increase and the Senate figure of 65 percent of the increase. We adopted the Senate figure of 65 percent of the increase.

As a practical matter, I believe the Senator will find that with respect to every item in conference, with possibly one or two minor exceptions, insofar as the domestic industry is concerned, the agreement which was reached was to the advantage of the domestic industry. When the House version of the bill seemed to be more favorable to the domestic industry, we took the House provision, and the House generally yielded to the Senate when the Senate provision was more favorable.

The Senate bill would have provided a longer duration than the House bill, but the domestic industry felt that this program should be on an annual basis, because in that way the farmers will know what they can plant and can make their plans at planting time.

When we took the shorter expiration date of the House version, so far as the domestic industry was concerned, it was on the basis that it would be better for the farmers to know in January what their situation was going to be when they started planting than to have a bill passed and leave them in a situation of uncertainty at the end of June.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have one more subject which I should like to have the Senator discuss. I appreciate his kindness in yielding.

My understanding is that there was no difference between the two versions of the bill passed by the House and by the Senate on the immediate increase to domestic producers either in the cane-sugar industry or the beet-sugar industry.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There was no conflict in that regard. That was not in conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was it the intention of the conference committee, and is it the Senator's understanding of the intention of the Congress, in respect to the bill, that the added tonnage to the domestic industry is to take care of the increased plantings that have been made in the cane-sugar industry and the increase in plantings made and to be made in the beet-sugar industry?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct. I believe there would be an increase of about 625,000 tons.

The State of Florida, relatively speaking, probably will benefit more than the State of Louisiana, because Florida is increasing its sugarcane acreage much more rapidly than is Louisiana. Florida has climatic advantages over Louisiana. That additional tonnage will be available for the domestic producers of beet sugar and cane sugar. I do not have the breakdown as between the two, but the additional tonnage will be available under the act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator is mindful of the fact that in my State the planting of sugarcane has substantially doubled in recent years as the result of the cutting off of the Cuban source of a large portion of our sugar. Is it the Senator's understanding that the added domestic sugarcane tonnage, under the terms of the bill, is designed to take care of the added plantings of the domestic sugarcane industry? I am thinking particularly now of the addition to planting, which has been very heavy in the Florida cane sugar industry.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Florida will get its full share of the increase. Of course, there will be some increases also in the beet sugar areas. I do not know whether Louisiana plans to greatly increase its sugarcane planting, but I understand the Florida situation. There have been very substantial increases in planting.

Historically, Louisiana has produced about 10 times as much sugarcane as Florida, but Florida, has been able to produce very efficiently and very economically, as the Senator knows, in competition with other beet and sugarcane producers. Of course, Florida will be in a position to harvest the crop and to market the crop being produced there.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I am particularly anxious to have this point made clear for the RECORD, because those who have planted new acreage in my State are very much concerned as to whether they are to be taken care of under the terms of the bill. They are much concerned as to whether they will have an equitable opportunity, along with the older growers, to have their acreage cared for under the terms of the bill. As I understand the situation, from the Senator's comment, they will have.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of course, this matter will be under the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, and the bill gives to the Secretary the powers he

needs to protect the new growers in the Senator's State.

Mr. HOLLAND. And it is the intention of those framing the bill to take care of the new acreage?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, it is.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. ALLOTT addressed the Chair.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also wish to compliment the committee of conference for being able to reach agreement. I was somewhat dubious on Friday as to whether or not they could do this.

I regret, as many other Senators regret—particularly my good friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]—that the Senate was more or less compelled, in order to get a bill, to add new countries to those which already receive permanent quotas. As I recall, under the present law only 10 countries in the past have received quotas. They are Cuba, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, the Republic of China, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Haiti, Panama, and the Netherlands.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator left out the Philippines. The Philippines were once a part of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know, but the Philippines are treated separately. As the Senator from Florida has pointed out to me, the Philippines have a treaty with the United States.

What concerns me, with respect to the countries to the south of us having permanent quotas—Brazil, the British West Indies, the French West Indies, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala, El Salvador, Paraguay, and British Honduras—is that we have provided no quota for one of the most important countries to the south of us, Argentina. My fear is that by not providing a sugar quota for Argentina some friction may result. I have hopes that something can be done about that. The only reason I suggest the problem is that the conference saw fit to agree to add quotas for several countries to the south of us, and, as I said, left out Argentina.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I explained this situation to the Senator from Florida in considerable detail. I believe part of that explanation occurred before my colleague entered the Chamber.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand what happened. I was present and I heard everything the Senator said. There is one thing we must not overlook, however. I think it will be pleasing to quite a few of us. The Senate version of the bill provided a graduated recapture of the premiums payed over a period of 5 years. The House had no such provision in the bill it passed, but the House conferees did agree to a recapture provision of 10 percent for the first 6 months, 20 percent for the next year, and 30 percent for the third.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Until the act expires.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am very hopeful that in time all of the premium payment will be recaptured and will find its way to the general fund of the Treasury. That, of course, must be done gradually, I will say to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I do not think it could be done overnight.

I was very hopeful that the Senate version of the bill would be accepted. Since that was not possible, I express the hope that the Senate will rectify the situation so far as Argentina is concerned in some way.

However, it is imperative that we accept some type of conference report today, because, as the Senator knows, the Sugar Act expired on June 30. My fear is that if we try to obtain another conference, there is no telling what would happen and how long it would take. It is my belief that the Senate should accept the conference report, as did the House. Then we can deal with a quota for Argentina in subsequent legislation. I hope that is the course that the Senate will take.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there is no doubt in my mind that if the Senate sees fit to send to the House a bill which would place Argentina among those who do have some premium sugar, the House will pass it. The House bill contained a provision for Argentina; the Senate bill did not have a provision for Argentina. As the Senator knows, that is the sort of thing about which the State Department should advise us.

The Senator spoke about the various points that we won as a concession from the House. In my judgment, we did far better than the Senate conferees have ever done in relation to the Sugar Act in years past. Previously the House conferees would sit adamantly and refuse to yield on a point, and since most of the conferees came from States or districts in which no sugar was produced, they were in a position to take the attitude that if we did not want a Sugar Act, very well, the Sugar Act would expire.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not registering any complaint about that. To the contrary, I believe the conferees did a very good job in getting the House to accept these two principles.

First, the Senate bill contained a provision that would permit a great deal of the Cuban quota to be distributed on a global basis.

Second, we would gradually recapture the premium payments that are made to foreign governments.

As I review the bill as a whole, the 9,700,000 tons of estimated consumption of sugar for the current year would be distributed as follows:

Beet and cane sugar producers of this country, including Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico, would receive a quota of 5,810,000 tons. The Philippine Islands would receive a quota of 1,050,000. Under previous laws, which were reenacted, other countries would receive quotas totaling 11,332 tons. That accounts for 6,871,332 tons. If we deduct that sum from 9,700,000 which is the estimated domestic consumption, 2,828,668 tons remains, of which Cuba's allocation would be 1,634,122 tons. The remainder of the countries named would receive quotas totaling 1,194,546 tons.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table setting forth those figures.

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

	Tons
Estimated U.S. consumption for current year	9,700,000
Allocated as follows:	
Domestic producers	5,810,000
Republic of the Philippine Islands	1,050,000
Others	11,332
Total	6,871,332
Balance for foreign distribution	2,828,668

Distributed as follows:

Country	Percentage allocation	Amount (tons)
Peru	6.71	189,804
Dominican Republic	6.71	189,804
Mexico	6.71	189,804
Brazil	6.37	180,186
British West Indies	3.19	90,234
Australia	1.41	39,884
Republic of China	1.24	35,075
French West Indies	1.06	29,984
Colombia	1.06	29,984
Nicaragua	.88	24,892
Costa Rica	.88	24,892
Ecuador	.88	24,892
India	.71	20,084
Haiti	.71	20,084
Guatemala	.71	20,084
South Africa	.71	20,084
Panama	.53	14,992
El Salvador	.36	10,183
Paraguay	.35	9,900
British Honduras	.35	9,900
Fiji Islands	.35	9,900
Netherlands	.35	9,900
Subtotal	42.23	1,194,546
Cuba	57.77	1,634,122
Total	100.00	2,828,668

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator tell me why Argentina received no quota? Was that subject discussed in any way?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senate bill assigned no quota to Argentina, El Salvador, Guatemala, Brazil, Ecuador, French West Indies, Australia, Paraguay, India, South Africa, Mauritius, British Honduras, and the Fiji Islands.

The Senate conferees fought to eliminate all of those countries that were not included in the Senate bill. As a practical matter, the Senator's question should be asked in the House. The House bill contained that provision. The Senate bill did not.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand. I merely wished to ascertain the reason. I did not know whether it was an oversight or what had happened. A number of countries that had not had quotas heretofore have now been given quotas, as I understand. Argentina had no quota heretofore and she is not given even a token quota now. It occurred to me that perhaps Argentina should have at least a token quota, as some of the other countries were given. I do not know whether it is quite proper to single Argentina out or, by circumstances, allow her to be singled out as the only South American country not to receive a quota of any kind. Perhaps there is a reason.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. At the time the House of Representatives yielded on

Argentina, the Senate conferees were hoping they would take all the rest of the countries out, too. But the House conferees became adamant and would not yield on the remainder. We reduced the number of countries as much as we could.

I am trying to point out to the Senator that we went to conference with a Senate bill that provided an assignment of 2,600,000 tons of sugar on a global basis—on a first-come-first-served basis—without any premiums. We came back from the conference with a bill that would assign 1,635,000 tons on that basis.

The Senate conferees were compelled to yield on roughly 600,000 tons. The House conferees were compelled to yield to the extent of about 1,635,000 tons. That was the main point in the conference. Perhaps the House conferees should have yielded more with regard to some of the countries and less with regard to Argentina.

I hope that if the bill works out in a way that the administration feels is not proper and that there should be some provision for Argentina, that the President will send us a recommendation so that we can make a provision for Argentina. My best understanding is that there would be no real opposition on the House side to such a provision. At least a great majority of the Representatives in the House would go along with such a proposal.

There is so much involved in the conference report, including industrial and agricultural interests in this country, as well as so many things in the field of foreign relations about which I am certain we are right, I hope that the Senate will agree to the conference report, and that if we are wrong with regard to Argentina, that the error will be corrected at a subsequent time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe the conferees did a marvelous job. I commend them. I think we are all very much gratified at the measure of success the conferees finally had in bringing in the conference report. There is no criticism at all from my standpoint. But, unless there is some reason about which I do not know, we should not leave Argentina standing out like a sore thumb. We should not appear to have slighted Argentina, because I am sure that was not the intent of Congress. I cannot conceive that we intended to do anything like that.

I hope that as a result of our making the record now, the President will take some action to indicate clearly that the conference report was, after all, the result of a tug of war and a compromise, and that we did the very best we could. If he has the authority to make some adjustment, I hope that such an adjustment will be made promptly so that our attitude toward Argentina as compared to other South American countries will not be misunderstood.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the President feels the same way the Senator from Arkansas does about the question, he will make that recommendation and this Senator will be glad to support it. But at the time we were in conference, as I pointed out previously, the Senate conferees were supporting the administration position. The House conferees——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Since the conferees had to yield——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Permit me to make the following point: The Senate conferees were supporting the position of the administration up to that moment. The House conferees were at war with the administration's position. The first motion that the House conferees made was to send all the administration advisers out of the room. On the question of permitting one country to have a new quota and letting some other country come under a quota, the advisers are in no position to advise. The House insisted on the maintenance of the theory of the separation of free and coequal branches of the Government, with the result that they did not want any administrative advisers in the room, and for good reason.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So far as the Senator knows, is there any reason why, if we are going to let all the other countries come in, why Argentina should be excluded?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is there any reason for it?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No. I would say that if we are to assign a quota to Paraguay and Guatemala and El Salvador and Brazil and Ecuador and Colombia and India and South Africa and British Honduras and the Fiji Islands, Argentina certainly can make as good a case as many of them for being included.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what I think. The record should be made clear in the Senate that Argentina is not being singled out by the Senate, with any idea of penalizing her, or by way of retaliation, or anything like that. Such an erroneous impression should not go out of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As a matter of fact, this will be something that the administration will have to look into.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope so. Of course, I have no more interest in Argentina than in any other South American country. At the same time, I do not think we should single out one country and treat that country in a way different from that in which we treat other countries.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

If we prove to be in error about this matter, I would be glad to help, on any reasonable basis, in subsequent legislation, to modify any error that we might have made here.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I believe we have pretty well covered the Argentina situation. As I understand, the Senate conferees got as far as having Argentina stricken.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And Mauritius, also. We took Mauritius out of the bill completely.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then the bomb, we might say, struck, and that was as far as the conferees could get on that subject.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We succeeded in reducing what was available to most of the rest of the countries, and also in reducing the amount of the premium payments these countries would get. So far as the quota that would be assigned to the countries which were obtaining quotas for the first time is concerned, that was a case of the House defending its position, with the Senate trying to take them all out.

Mr. ALLOTT. I believe we have gone into the Argentine matter for a half hour now in the debate. It is perfectly clear what happened. Before I ask the Senator another question, I wish to say that I believe the Senate conferees did a wonderful job.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. ALLOTT. I compliment the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his part in the accomplishment. What the conference committee did was outstanding. By and large I feel that the viewpoint of the Senate was sustained at least so far as the conference bill expresses our point of view.

There is one item in which I am particularly interested. In the original House bill there were temporary allocations made of 1,250,000 tons of Cuban sugar. I opposed this temporary allocation for two reasons: First, I felt there is no such thing as a temporary allocation, because once we make it it becomes permanent in the mind of the recipient. Second, having assigned the quota, it no longer is a plum which we can dangle before people who may become disenchanted with what is going on in Cuba, to give them an opportunity to reestablish themselves economically through the cane sugar industry, which is the only method they have, even though it may take years. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of course; that is, so long as the premium payments are made. If the premium payments are no longer made, they will have to sell at the world market price. However, so long as the premium payments remain in effect, then, of course, if Cuba were a friendly nation, as she has been in the past so far as the United States is concerned, the Cuban cane industry could receive the large amounts of premium payments on their great sales of sugar to the United States, as in the past. I salute the Senator for trying to maintain that situation, so that a free Cuba could again have a substantial portion of the allocation of the sugar sales in the United States on a premium basis, as it had in the past.

Mr. ALLOTT. Even if the sugar were not sold on a premium basis, it would still mean a market for the Cuban sugar when the premium had worked itself out. It is not Cuba's allotment now; it is what used to be the Cuban quota, which we are segregating for the time being.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have two sets of figures before me. One set of figures shows Mexico receiving an allotment of 80,108 tons under the present law. Then I have another set of figures which I received from the staff. Those figures show 95,409 tons. Does the Senator

know which of these figures are correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The 95,409 tons were the original quota for Mexico. Under the conference report the quota would be 190,000 tons.

Mr. ALLOTT. So that Mexico has doubled its quota for this year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. I notice, in checking these figures, that there are other countries which have done comparably well. Can the Senator from Louisiana give any particular reason why Mexico, in its present attitude toward the United States—even though the President has spent a weekend there—should be entitled to double its quota?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is not a matter of what I think. The House originally provided 200,000 tons.

Mr. ALLOTT. They provided even more.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. Our effort was to reduce it below that figure. As a matter of fact, the Senate bill provided for 95,000. We would have been happy to settle for that amount.

Mr. ALLOTT. In the original bill the House provided a quota of 95,000, plus 200,000, plus a temporary quota of 150,000.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. That brings up a question in which I am very much concerned. I never begrudge anyone making a living. However, we have reached the place in the enactment of sugar legislation which presents the question of how far we should go when we observe people in Washington, representing foreign governments on a contingency basis, acting the way they do. In my opinion it represents a poor concept of law and a very poor principle of legislation. It is bad enough that the Senate and the House should be lobbied by every interest in the country. There is an effort to serve a proper function in a situation like that. On the other hand, grave questions are raised as to the function that is served when pressure is exerted when the undertaking is to see how much can be cleaved off or how much can be gotten out of Uncle Sam for an individual country, particularly when that is done on a contingency basis.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. For the Senator's information I should state that the Senate did not yield to any such pressure as that.

Mr. ALLOTT. I realize that, of course.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senate did not add an extra ton, unless we talk about the 10,000 tons that eventually got into the bill for Ireland. Aside from a few tons for Ireland, the Senate did not yield anything.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am speaking about the principle involved, when we see people who represent foreign countries whose interests are absolutely inimical or at least contrary to the interests of this country operating as they do, and doing it on a contingency basis, as they have done in connection with the pending proposal.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should observe that their interests are not necessarily in conflict with the interests of our country. In this respect, I am defending the House position. I have heard it said so often I might as well say it to the Senator, let us be fair. The fact is that there is a large volume of precedent in legislative history behind the writing of quotas into the law by the Senate and the House.

I have become convinced that this is not the sort of thing we ought to be doing. I believe that the Nation should speak with a single voice. Only the President should recommend what our foreign policy should be. After he does, we should undertake to say whether we think he is right or wrong about it.

Historically, the House Committee on Agriculture would write in the proposed quotas, and the Senate Committee on Finance would have the same privilege. When the Senate committee undertook to write in the quotas in recent years, it was done at the recommendation of the administration; in other words, we provided in the bill what the State Department, and the President would recommend to us. So long as I have been a member of the committee of conference, I cannot recall that we have undertaken to vary from what the administration recommended as a proper arrangement.

Mr. ALLOTT. I recall very well the traditional arrangements between both bodies on this matter. I think the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and the entire body of conferees have effected an excellent compromise. Personally, I feel that the bill should be enacted, and enacted at once, so that there will not be any further hiatus between the expiration of the old law and the beginning of the new one.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My judgment is that if we consider the bill from the point of view of the United States, it is the best sugar bill we will ever have passed. It leaves much to be desired; but so far as I can point out objectionable features, like those the Senator has stated there are in the bill, it is at least a move in the right direction compared with the previous act.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think the Senator from Louisiana depreciates himself and the members of his committee a little too much; because while they did give away 600,000 tons, roughly, under the Senate position 1,635,000 tons are still retained. This is an amount larger than was available under the bill as it came to the Senate. No doubt there was much discussion of this point, but the Senator did well to retain that provision.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator from Colorado. We have retained 2½ times as much as we yielded, so far as the amount of tonnage involved is concerned, between premium payments and nonpremium payments.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I join with other Senators in complimenting the Senate conferees upon having worked out a far better piece of legislation than I thought was possible. I think they have reached an excellent solution.

I wish to ask one question: What formula is used now to determine the distribution of the domestic allotment as between cane sugar and beet sugar? Is it the same formula as was used in the past?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I assume the formula will be the same. The bill does not touch that phase. The only thing the bill provides on that subject is that 65,000 tons a year shall be reserved for new areas. This is, of course, larger than the 50,000 tons which the House provided.

The committee had in mind that that amount would go to beet-sugar mills. It might be enough to make possible the building of two new sugar mills a year. As a Senator from a cane-sugar-producing State, I am willing to go along with that. I believe all the increased production per acreage will be in beet-producing States. They will get most of the increase. Perhaps there will be some increase in the cane-sugar-producing States. We believe that that increase will go mostly to Florida, not to Louisiana.

But we did not seek to provide a formula for the distribution. Usually about 90 percent of the domestic sugar production has been beetsugar, and 10 percent has been cane sugar, within the continental United States. We expect to maintain that proportion. As a matter of fact, the proportion is nine-tenths to one-tenth. The figuring by tenths related to the time before Hawaii was admitted to the Union. Including Hawaiian cane, the percentage is about one-fourth to three-fourths.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. So the formula will be about the same as it always has been?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; we did not touch that. That will remain in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I do not know of anyone who is complaining about that factor. I can appreciate why the Senator from North Dakota has raised the question. Not being a member of the committee, he would not want to have North Dakota prejudiced. But this provision would not have that effect.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. A few importers in New York import refined sugar from the United Kingdom, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Canada. I gather that the continuation of those imports, which amount to about 5,500 tons a year, will be cut off by the adoption of the House language. The clerk of the conference has directed my attention to a provision at the foot of page 6 of the conference report on that subject.

My question is, first, to confirm that that is so, and the reason for it; and second, to ask a question which those people have put to me. Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana can help with that; perhaps he cannot.

It is the fear of the New York importers that the Department of Agriculture may seek to make this part of the act retroactive, so that even if the im-

porters could get some of the sugar into the United States in the next few days, before the bill became law, the entry of it would be invalidated for some reason. That seems inconceivable to me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was not understood in the conference that anything in the act would be retroactive. I do not know of any basis on which that would be the case. I could be proved wrong by the express wording of some section in the bill, but I do not know of anything to that effect.

Mr. JAVITS. It is not the intent?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not so far as the chairman of the Sante conferees is concerned.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator give the rationale which dictated the elimination of this type of import?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The more raw sugar that is imported into and refined in the United States, the more jobs and the more business the American sugar refiners are able to have in refining sugar. I believe that this is a House provision which was agreed to. As I recall, this was a difference between the House and the Senate bills. In a long, hard fought conference, extending over days, a conference which at times became acrimonious, this was one of the instances in which the Senate conferees were able to agree with the House and took the House position, although on something of this sort someone gains and someone loses.

Mr. JAVITS. So far as we in New York are concerned, our refineries gained very definitely from the provision which relates to the elimination of the 250,000 tons of refined sugar which could otherwise have been imported if the Cuban situation had remained intact. That comes out of the Senate version, incidentally. Perhaps, therefore, it was a compensatory provision. That is, the Senate having prevailed in terms of 250,000 tons, the House provision prevailed with reference to this rather minor tonnage, but which does effect some New York importers.

I am not complaining about this, but I wanted to get to the point, first, of the rationale that these people will not feel that no attention has been paid to them; and second—what I hardly felt would be the case—they need have no fear of retroactivity.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When we allow more production to our domestic beet growers, we then are compelled to reduce the importation of white sugar. Cane sugar is produced as raw sugar and is refined. Beet sugar is refined. If more beet sugar is to be produced in this country, necessarily it is white sugar. That being the case, by producing more beet sugar, necessarily we reduce the amount of refined cane sugar imported into this country.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it fair to say that the New York sugar refiners having gained something appreciable in terms of employment because of the prohibition of the importation of 250,000 tons, it was not unexpected that these small importers would have to give up something, and that this was the compromise that was reached?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; that is how it worked out. I believe the Senator will find that there is nothing retroactive. Once the importers have received their sugar, they can refine it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. I have followed the discussion on the report of the conference. I, too, wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana and the other conferees for an excellent report. It seems to me that we have before us a report on a sugar bill which will be far superior to anything we have had up to this point.

I also wish to agree with what has been said by a number of other Senators about the elimination of Argentina, when other Latin-American countries were included. I think something should be done to rectify that oversight, or elimination.

Does the Senator understand that if the conference report shall now be agreed to, and the bill sent to the President, some immediate action would be forthcoming to deal with the problem of Argentina in another way, through another legislative vehicle outside the sugar bill itself?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I understand that such an effort will be made. I do not ask any Senator to commit himself to it, but I understand there will be such an effort, based upon the President's judgment of what the overall effect might be when he considers the quotas for additional countries. I was against including new quotas for any new countries.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am keenly aware of the very great difficulties with which the Senator from Louisiana and his colleagues on the conference committee must have been faced when they went into the conference and had to face the doughty and intrepid chairman of the House committee, whose views on these matters are well known and often have been stated. So I do not criticize the Senator from Louisiana for not having gotten a better deal than he and the other Senate conferees did.

But I wish to emphasize the point that I represent the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which is greatly interested in obtaining sugar for its consumers as cheaply as possible, for basically Pennsylvania is a sugar-consuming State, although a few sugar refineries are located in the Commonwealth. But basically Pennsylvania is interested in obtaining sugar at as low a price as possible. Of course I understand that the interests of the beet-sugar and the cane-sugar producing States are different from the interests of our State in connection with this matter.

It is my understanding—and I hope the Senator from Louisiana will correct me if I am in error—that under the bill recommended by the administration—for which I voted with some reluctance, because of the increase it provided in the domestic production—the Cuban quota was to be transferred to a world quota, instead of being allocated to particular countries.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not true that under the conference report, of the 25 countries to which the House committee had assigned quotas, 23 still would get quotas?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There was a difference, as between the House version and the Senate version of the bill, in terms of tons——

Mr. CLARK. I should be glad to discuss the tons later on, but at this time I prefer to discuss the number of countries.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Numerically, more countries will receive quotas. But let me show the Senator from Pennsylvania some of the progress we made.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be very happy to listen to the Senator. But it is a fact, is it not, that the House version of the bill made assignments to 25 countries; and the President did not want assignments made to any countries; and the conference report makes assignments to 23 countries?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct—that far. But, in addition, the House assigned temporary quotas, amounting to approximately 1,500,000 tons, I believe, to many of the countries which would receive quotas for the first time, and perhaps to some countries which already had had quotas assigned to them. The Senate conferees were successful in putting all the temporary quotas under the so-called global arrangement, for which the Senator from Pennsylvania voted, and for which I, too, voted, I may say.

Mr. CLARK. Nevertheless, is it not true that the House Committee on Agriculture proceeded to deal with a field which, in my opinion, at least, is one which should be exclusively a part of our foreign policy, and more or less assigned sugar quotas to 25 countries, over the objection of the administration; and the conference report assigns quotas to 23 of those countries?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, the conference report still provides quotas; but under the conference report the damage is not anything like as great as it was when we started out.

Mr. CLARK. I do not doubt that is true. Nevertheless, does not the Senator from Louisiana agree that the assignment of those quotas is a very delicate matter which affects the foreign policy of the United States?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, as the Senator from Pennsylvania knows, the President does not want any quotas at all assigned.

Mr. CLARK. If the President does not want any quotas assigned, and if we do not want any quotas assigned, I should like to have the matter dealt with, in the interest of the foreign policy of the United States, by someone who has considerable knowledge of this area and can deal properly with it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When I said the President does not want any quotas at all assigned, I may say that the President recognizes that some of these countries have had quotas in the past, and were expecting to have them again. So, rather than cut them off immediately, the President thought their quotas should be phased out—reduced by perhaps 20 percent a year.

Mr. CLARK. However, certainly the President did not want countries which had not had quotas before to receive them now. Yet that is what the conference report does.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is what the House committee decided, and that is what the House voted for. We did the very best we could to prevent the inclusion of new quota assignments in the conference report.

The Senator from Pennsylvania says we dropped only two countries from the list. But when we consider the impact on consumers, from the point of view of obtaining sugar at as low a price as possible, it is correct to state that for every ton we conceded under the premium basis, we managed to get 2½ tons removed from the premium basis. So we made a great amount of headway in the direction the President was advocating, and, I suppose, in the direction the Senator from Pennsylvania would advocate.

Mr. CLARK. Can the Senator from Louisiana state how many new countries were awarded quotas by the House, in the bill it passed, although they did not have quotas last year?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Fourteen.

Mr. CLARK. Was the Senator from Louisiana able to determine, as a result of the conference, what was the rationale for granting quotas to the 14 new countries? Is there some high foreign policy reason which affected the judgment of the House Committee on Agriculture? Did they think that provision would be to the advantage of the foreign policy of the United States; or was it simply the result of some gigantic lobby deal?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, no one said the latter; and I suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania that he would not have suggested that to the House members of the conference committee, if he had been one of the conferees, unless he wanted to break up the conference completely.

Mr. CLARK. I realize that the Senator from Louisiana is very brave.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not brave, but I recognize the situation as it existed there. The House took the position that there is not a world surplus of sugar, and that, in fact, there may be a shortage. Having determined that, the House undertook to determine which sugar-producing countries were friendly to us and could be relied upon to supply us with sugar in the event we encountered trouble.

The Senator from Pennsylvania knows that there have been times when it was difficult to obtain sugar in the United States. During World War I, the price rose as high as 26 cents a pound, I believe; and at that time the dollar would purchase a great deal more than it will now.

But this was the best judgment which the House Agriculture Committee saw fit to give us, after that committee had had a chance to study the matter and confer with spokesmen for the administration and others. It was not my position; but let me say that if there had been a written record of what was said in the conference room, I believe it could be found that the House conferees expressed themselves—and with some considerable logic—in almost as complete disagreement with the logic behind the Senate's position as the Senate conferees expressed themselves in disagreement with the logic behind the position taken by the House—and much of it with considerable appeal to some groups. For instance, I refer to statements to the effect that the State Department could not be trusted to handle such matters in ways which would best protect the interests of the people of the United States.

Mr. CLARK. So the House committee members took the position that they were better able to handle the foreign relations of the United States than is the State Department, insofar as the allocation of sugar is concerned? Is that about what their argument boiled down to?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; in some instances. I did not agree with that. As the Senator knows, we hear much criticism, from time to time, of our foreign policy; and it is very easy to pick out some phase of our foreign policy, and contend that in that connection the State Department is failing to protect the interests of the American people.

Mr. CLARK. How many of the 14 new nations which the House Agriculture Committee undertook to give quotas to are still going to get quotas under the conference report?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Twelve. Of course, some will not get as much as the House wanted to provide.

Mr. CLARK. So the Senate was able to cut out two?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator recall which two?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mauritius and Argentina.

Mr. CLARK. Could the Senator tell me what the rationale of the House was in not standing firm in insisting that Mauritius and Argentina should be given the same quota as those countries that some of us feel are not as deserving, and in not giving those countries the same treatment and most-favored-nation treatment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I can only say that those of us on the Senate side felt that if we could have, we would have taken them all out and would have reduced the premiums by 20 percent a year for all countries, even those historically getting them. We could not take them all out. Some of the countries receiving sugar quotas that are temporary or permanent under this legislation had reductions of as much as 90 percent as compared with what the House provided for those countries.

Mr. CLARK. It was my understanding that the Senator said a few moments ago there were slightly more than 2 million tons of sugar in global quotas as the Senate passed the bill, and that the Senate had come back with 1,600,000 tons intact. Is that correct? I thought I so understood the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is my impression. I would like the right to correct that statement. Some of these figures may not be completely correct.

Mr. CLARK. But the Senator did make that statement?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder how the Senator will reconcile that statement with the statement made by Mr. COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 30. He was addressing himself to the conference report and the Members of the House. He said:

> I point out to the House that more than 2 million tons allocated by the committee—

He is referring now to his committee—

> on this country-by-country basis, changes affecting only 135,000 tons of these allocations were made in the conference.

That would seem to me to be a little inconsistent with the Senator's position.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would like to check the figures.

Mr. CLARK. Suppose the Senator takes time to check the figures. I am sure that later in the debate he will be able to give us the accurate details.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have enough figures before me to compile a statistical index. This is a complicated subject.

Under the global quotas, there would be 1,635,000 tons.

Mr. CLARK. That is what the conference report provides?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That was what came out of conference. The House did not have any of it in its version.

Mr. CLARK. Going into conference, how much did the Senate provide?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I will try to provide the Senator with the figures.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will indulge me further, and this will be my last line of inquiry—the Senator from Louisiana has been very patient and very courteous, as he always is—I am interested at the grave concern of some of our colleagues about the failure to give an allotment of 10,000 tons to Argentina, which when the bill was passed last year was to help a struggling democracy rule, which now has—temporarily we hope—a regime permitted to continue in office at the sufferance of the military. Some of our colleagues have said much about the 10,000-ton quota, but I have not heard anything said about the Dominican Republic, and what might happen to that Latin American country, in which there has been a great effort by the people and a dictatorship has been ousted. The Dominican Republic now has a democratic system of government which it seems to me vitally needs the help of the sugar program of the United States, and yet nobody speaks out in support of the Dominican Republic.

I have an article in my hand from this morning's New York Times entitled "Dominicans Fear Internal Crisis Over

Sugar Quota Cut by United States" which states:

White House and State Department officials worked throughout the weekend here trying to avert a major crisis in U.S. relations with the Dominician Republic over this country's new sugar legislation.

The new Sugar Act approved yesterday by the House of Representatives and scheduled for Senate action tomorrow would, in the opinion of Dominican officials, greatly reduce their sugar exports to the United States.

The Dominican Republic, struggling to carry out a transition to democracy and to move toward basic reforms after three decades of dictatorship, fears that this would lead to an economic collapse and a political upheaval that would favor the pro-Communist elements in the country.

There is much more to the same effect, which I shall refer to later when I get the floor in my own right.

Was the plight of the Dominican Republic discussed in the conference at all, and why was not some quota adopted to help keep this Government in some shape, if we are going to help everybody else fighting on our side?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wish the Senator would not hit me with these one-two attacks, one from the right and one from the left. The Senator mentioned Argentina. Our bill cuts out Argentina from a quota. Then the Senator comes back and attacks me with respect to the Dominican Republic, wanting it to have some of the quota.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct. My position has been inconsistent. So has the Senator's. The Senator and I both wanted to have no quotas; he came back with about 23 quotas, some for countries which do not deserve to have them; others may deserve them but are not getting them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator will look at the amounts, he will see that we held two-thirds of what we went after. After all, in a conference, in order to get an agreement, we must give something.

Under the Senate version of the bill, the Dominican Republic would have had 111,000. Under the House version of the bill it would have 350,000. We came out with 190,000 tons, which is 160,000 tons less than the high figure of the bill. I suppose the Senator is now supporting the foreign policy of the House Agriculture Committee when it puts the Dominican Republic on the high side.

Mr. CLARK. According to the New York Times this morning, under the conference report the Dominican Republic would be awarded 190,000 tons annually, or 95,000 tons for the second half of 1962, which compares with 476,000 tons that the Dominicans exported to the United States in the first half of this year, as its share of the permanent quota and temporary assignment of the Cuban quota.

So it seems to me that what we are doing is a terrible economic slap in the face at the Dominican Republic. I do not want to argue with the Senator. My question is, was it discussed in conference?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is making a very misleading statement. The article the Senator read tends to mislead.

Mr. CLARK. I am glad the Senator is not accusing me of misleading.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. From hearing this discussion, one would gain the impression that the Dominicans had a quota of 480,000 tons.

Mr. CLARK. No; the first half of this year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They might have sent us that much, and I assume they did, but the fact of the matter is that tney had a quota of only 111,157 tons. What this Nation bought over and above that was due to the fact that Cuba did not fulfill the allotment given to her.

Mr. CLARK. The same conditions obtain now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Dominicans can still sell us sugar over and above this quota. We are talking about what they sell us on a statutory premium price basis.

So far as selling sugar to the United States at the world market price is concerned, they can come in on a first come, first served basis and sell us a great deal more sugar than they did last year.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his courtesy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Senator from Louisiana and to the Senator from Pennsylvania, it is not true no one was concerned about the Dominican Republic's sugar quota. I spoke out during the debate in the Senate on this subject. I called the White House in regard to it. I called the State Department in regard to it. I have been very much upset about the attitude which has been taken in some quarters concerning the Dominican Republic's quota of sugar.

A year ago the Dominican Republic was given a larger quota, out of the Cuban quota, under the premium price schedule. This year, under the terms of the conference committee bill, there is to be provided 190,000 tons of sugar under the premium price program. However, the Dominican Republic has more than 900,000 tons of sugar available for export.

A democratic regime in the Dominican Republic, not a dictatorship, a year ago increased the wages of the workers there about 300 percent. It did this because it believed the previous conditions with regard to labor in the sugar fields in the Dominican Republic, under Trujillo, were unbelievably bad and literally resulted in slave labor. A new regime came into the Dominican Republic, following the ousting of Trujillo and his assassination. A new democratic regime took over. The new Government sought to benefit the workers. The new Government sought to provide better working conditions and better housing. The new Government tried to institute a sugar program under the kind of conditions which we in America say we favor—private enterprise with good working conditions.

The quota this year is to be larger than the assigned quota a year ago; but, because of the conditions prevailing a year ago, as a result of which the Cuban quota was reassigned under premium prices, the Dominican Republic was able to sell a large portion of its sugar to the United States.

I pointed out these facts last Wednesday. I filled the RECORD with documents which indicated the serious situation confronting the Government of the Dominican Republic.

I am happy to note the conference committee was more generous than the Senate as far as the quota for the Dominican Republic is concerned.

I believe it would have been well to restrain the quotas to the Western Hemisphere. That made good sense. I think it was a tragedy Argentina was not given a quota. I hope we can remedy this. We have a method for remedying it.

Argentina had no lobby. Argentina had no one representing it except its distinguished Ambassador. The plea was made to the State Department, yet Argentina got no quota whatsoever. Argentina needs a quota.

I wish to say, for Argentina, that Argentina is making a desperate effort to preserve constitutional government. Argentina should be given every opportunity to have some way to do something about its balance-of-payments situation. Argentina is a good customer of the United States.

I think it might be well to pay a premium price for sugar to our Latin American friends in order to encourage better working conditions. It is healthy to encourage industry in these countries under the private enterprise system. I might add, Mr. President, that the United States, as a party to the International Sugar Agreement, ratified by the Senate as recently as 1959, has recognized that the minimum sugar price which will permit the objectives of that document is 3.25 cents per pound, as set out in article 21 of the agreement.

I think the conference report has many features which are creditable. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that one cannot get everything he wishes from a conference. It is perfectly obvious that, had the other countries not been included, it would have been necessary to go back to the old system. Every Senator knows that if we do not pass a sugar bill with some degree of permanency, next year we shall face even more trouble with regard to the domestic quota, more trouble with regard to what we call the growth rate under the domestic quota, with more refineries and more sugarbeets planted and less available for the foreign countries to sell to the United States.

Sugar is one of the commodities the sale of which permits the people of other countries to buy other commodities from the United States.

I think the conference committee rendered a good service under all the circumstances. It had a difficult assignment.

Is the domestic quota to be for 5 years?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The foreign quota is to be 2½ years. Actually, it is to be 4½ years for the domestic quota and 2½ years for the foreign quota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Four and a half years and two and a half years.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The domestic situation, relating to the beet and cane sugar growers in the United States, will be settled on a formula basis for 4½ years under the proposal. There will be an opportunity, 2½ years from now, to review the entire foreign quota problem without inclusion of the domestic problem in negotiations.

All during the process of preparing the sugar bill those who had responsibility for it worked hard. I make no bones about it; I did a great deal of work on it month after month, to try to get some order out of incipient chaos, to try to get the domestic producers to arrive at some realistic settlement which would be fair, which would provide a fair quota with regard to immediate availability of sugar and the growth rate for the future.

I worked with Myer Feldman at the White House, with the Department of Agriculture, and with the Department of State.

I support the conference committee report, with the thought we shall be able to amend it, in some other piece of legislation, to provide a quota for the Republic of Argentina. I think that quota is desperately needed.

I think also that the quota for the Dominican Republic is inadequate. I agree with what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said. This is a government which at this time needs to be able to furnish sugar to the United States under the premium price schedule.

I do not know whether the other quotas to be assigned are adequate. I do know that our neighbors in Latin America deserve some degree of stability of economic commitment. We have made commitments under the Alliance for Progress program. I think we could make some commitments under the sugar program. This would help.

So far as the other little areas are concerned, under the House bill—of which I have heard—I am not drawing any judgments. I would not have voted that way, but I know that our colleagues on the conference committee did what they could. I was close to our colleagues last Friday night on this subject. I know they did the best they could in the light of the circumstances they faced as conferees. If any Senator thinks he can have his way in conference, there is no use in calling it a conference. A conference is a give-and-take proposition. It involves a compromise.

I think the Senators did quite well. The amount of 1,635,000 tons was saved for global quota—only to find out now that the experts had testified it is imperative that something else be done for the Argentina Republic, Dominican Republic, and possibly Peru. I think these are facts we must face.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, with reference to the Senator's statement, I, too, would like to see the Sugar Act based someday on the principle that if the nations involved will raise wage standards and improve living conditions of the people who work in the canefields, we will pay them more for their sugar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Why do we have a Sugar Act? It is intended to make possible a minimum wage and decent hours for the people of our country. If there were no Sugar Act, wages of 60 cents and 80 cents an hour in this country, which have been so severely criticized, could not be paid. We could not meet the production cost of those who pay people 6 cents an hour in those fields.

I agree with the Senator that the proposal is the best we can do under the circumstances.

The Senator has touched on a subject about which I believe a point should be made. The best single provision in the bill is that the foreign sections will expire in 2½ years, and the sections relating to domestic production will expire in 4½ years. There are some Senators—and this Senator is one of them—who would like to fight all the way to make the sections relating to foreign production complete good sense and to support what seems to be a sensible foreign sugar policy.

We find ourselves in conference with an act expiring, as the present one has now expired. Anyone, including the Russians, who wishes to do so, can bring ships to our shores and unload sugar at a nice profit in the United States. There is no impediment to such action by Cuba, Russia, and other countries. There is nothing to prevent them from coming in unless the President should see fit to invoke the Trading With the Enemy Act or some other act of that sort. At present sugar is being diverted to American ports, where other nations will dump their sugar because they will have the advantage of a better price by putting it on the American market.

For the first time in 26 or 28 years we now have a situation in which anyone, friend or enemy, can pour sugar into our country on a first-come-first-served basis. It is essential that the act be renewed if for no other purpose than for the benefit of the working people and the farmers of the United States who produce sugar.

As I pointed out, we would divorce the two sections. We would have a part relating to domestic production, which would be separated from the part relating to foreign production, which would expire first. Then we could think about the domestic industries insofar as sugar production is concerned, and we would be in a position to completely ignore any pressures that might be brought by House conferees, who for the most part represent districts in which sugar is not produced.

Those individuals have insisted upon having things their own way. The Senate can be as tough as the House, and perhaps a little tougher. For the future we appear to have resolved that impasse. That result is one of the best provisions in the bill.

So far as the principle for which the Senator has spoken, I point out that the junior Senator from Louisiana voted to require the premium payment to be put back into the Treasury, when the proposal was offered by the Senator from Illinois a year ago. The only reason we lost at that time on the floor of the Senate was that the President was opposed to such a provision. I am frank to say that if we had managed to obtain it, we could not have gotten the House to agree to it. Now we have managed not only to get the provision in the bill but also to apply it to much of the sugar that is produced offshore. We have made a great deal of progress by having included a provision for gradual reduction in the premium.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did I correctly understand the Senator earlier to state that he thought that the making of allocations of quotas in the manner in which they have been made was not a satisfactory method, and that the allocations probably should be made by the executive branch, since it was not a function of the legislature?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think I said that if there were to be any allocations, the executive branch should recommend what they should be, and that unless the Congress should find some overriding reason for differing with the recommendation of the executive branch, it should accept the judgment of the Executive rather than try to write a foreign policy in the House Committee on Agriculture, or even in the Senate Committee on Finance. That is the way the Finance Committee has undertaken to do it throughout my service in the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would not the Senator agree that if there was ever a time in which to stop the practice of jockeying in the Committee on Agriculure and Foresty over a question of extreme importance in foreign relations, now is the time to do it? Although officially the allocations are made for 2 years, the Senator knows that a great many of the States to which quotas would be given are not now producing as much as the quota would allow.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope the Senator is not going to undertake to renew his fight against having any Sugar Act at all, because this Senator comes from a State in which a great deal of sugar is produced.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not wish to raise that question. The Senator comes from one of the two States that are legitimate sugar producers. I have always made that statement every time the question has arisen.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am glad that beet sugar is produced in some areas; otherwise we would probably be out of business now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What does the Senator from Arkansas mean by "legitimate"?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I mean a State that can compete on a legitimate economic basis without the outrageous subsidy that is being paid, the like of which we cannot find in any other area of our

economy. While I do not know that it can now do so, probably the State from which the Senator from Louisiana comes could have been a legitimate economic producer of cane sugar.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I doubt that any State—even Louisiana—in our country could compete with Cuba if we were required to match their low wage standards.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If we had arranged to protect the sugar industry, as we have done with respect to other agricultural commodities, on the same basis on which we deal with tobacco, rice, and other commodities, there would not have been a major economic problem. If a support price were paid to the sugar cane industry, the cost to the Treasury would not have been anything like the present cost. The Senator would agree to that statement, would he not?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My guess is that a beet producer today can compete as efficiently as a cane producer. In fact, I think it could be shown that in some cases high wages are being paid by the beet producers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not correct that the cost of a beet sugar factory is far greater than that of a cane sugar factory?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Oh, yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Much greater. Generally speaking, the industry did not start until the beet sugar producers were included in the bill, whereas the industry had started in Louisiana long before then. Is that not so?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. The Louisiana industry was in operation for more than 100 years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what I meant by a legitimate economic industry. It was not a creature of the bill.

I wish to return to the impassioned plea of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has suddenly become concerned about the Dominican Republic. I am concerned, too, about its political repercussions. I believe they probably grow out of mismanagement, in the way the bill has been handled by the House particularly. But the truth is that the Dominican Republic was not pleased with the bill in the beginning. Is that not true?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not think it was. I believe the Dominican Republic was not pleased with either bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The truth of the matter is that under the Senate bill the premium price would have been paid on only 96,000 tons. Yet the Dominican Republic would have had an opportunity to share in the 2.6 billion tons of the global quota; and it is in the best position of any country to compete for that quota, is it not?

The Senator talked about the cost of production. The Senator from Minnesota made a great plea. I call attention to page 368 of the hearings, at which point appears a report of one of the largest producers of sugar, certainly outside the Trujillo properties, in the Dominican Republic. I read from a report of South Puerto Rico Sugar Co., three-fourths of whose business or production is in the Dominican Republic, although the company is named the South Puerto Rico Sugar Co.:

> The proportionately lower cost of making sugar in such large volume, plus larger sales in the United States, offset the effect of low selling prices in the world market. As a result, profit margins were the widest in 4 years, and operating income advanced 35.8 percent. Earnings before provision for taxes gained 58.1 percent. After U.S. and foreign income taxes at 51.1 percent, as against 56 percent in fiscal 1959–60, final net rose 75.8 percent. Net income in 1959–60 was before a net refund of $266,121 from employees' retirement plan, equal to $0.26 a common share.

That is the official report on the company. The president of the company testified before the committee, and he did not challenge the figures. That indicates that these profits were made at the world price after the premium had been retained by the president.

In other words, the large volume of production under the Senate bill, giving them a larger part of the global quota, would indicate, according to the report of the company, which is one of the largest sugar producers, that they would profit very well at the world price. In fact, it is so stated. These figures are shown at the world price.

It is very easy to talk about new housing and better wages, and so on. They have increased wages. Good for them. That would increase these figures by about $16 million. However, we are concerned with $245 million in payments from this country. That will not wipe out their profit by any means.

There is more misinformation spread about the pending bill than about any other bill that I have ever seen go through the Senate. It is complicated, of course. It is always brought to the Senate at the last minute. The argument the Senator has made can be advanced, because the bill is never brought here until the last week in the fiscal year. They never come to us with a bill in January or February. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is not for me to say, but it has always been my opinion that it is brought here at this late hour so that the House will be able to exert pressure on the Senate conferees.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator comes from the leading sugar-producing State in the country. I am glad to have him admit that this is not the proper way to deal with this subject, especially as a foreign policy matter; that the sugar should be allocated after consultation with the State Department and the Department of Agriculture. Certainly those two departments should consult in a matter of this kind. I for one do not see any better time for doing it than now. Once the quotas are allotted, they will never be taken back. It could very well be used as a reason for breaching diplomatic relations if they were taken back.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator from Arkansas is in a position to override the House on this matter I would be glad to consider what he has in mind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to have the Senate reject the conference report. If the House will take the Senate bill, all right. If they will not do that, let us take the House bill. I am confident the President will veto it. Then we would get rid of the matter at least temporarily.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we reject the conference report, I know what will happen. We will have no Sugar Act. Furthermore, over a period of time we will have no domestic sugar industry at all. I know that the Senator from Arkansas would be pleased to welcome such a development. I would not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no. I have never said that I wanted to destroy a domestic industry. As I have said before, the bill should be handled as we handle a bill for any other agricultural commodity. I have said to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, "Why should not sugar be handled like cotton or rice?" Why should we not handle sugar in the same way we handle cotton or rice in the chairman's State and in my State? There is nothing comparable in our whole system to the way we handle sugar.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The fact that sugar is a deficit crop is one reason. I suppose it is fair to say that if we did not have an act to protect the domestic sugar industry, and if we were to put sugar on a completely free-trade basis, we would have no domestic sugar industry. At a time when there was a shortage and we did not have full access to the world market, as was the case in World War I, consumers had to pay almost 26 cents a pound. It would mean that under such conditions we would be paying over 50 cents a pound, the equivalent of what was paid during the First World War. The same thing can be said with reference to World War II. If we had no reliable supply of sugar, we would be placed at a great disadvantage. That is one of the reasons why it has been determined that we should continue the sugar industry in our country.

I have no doubt that if the conference report is rejected, and if what the Senator from Arkansas has indicated should happen, and we go back and tell the House, "We are not going to let you write a new section in the bill. You will have to take the general concept of the Senate bill," there will be no Sugar Act. The President would be compelled to act under the defense amendment; he would have to invoke that provision to preserve the sugar industry in this country, because preservation of that industry is important from the national defense standpoint.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows very well that what would happen, if we rejected the report, would be that there would be at least an extension for 60 or 90 days of the existing law until we were able to work out a bill. The Senator knows that very well.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not know any such thing. I wish I did.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows that the House has always taken a more intimate interest in the bill than

has the Senate. It has insisted on initiating the legislation. It has called the tune ever since we have dealt with the subject.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator will find that there is not a senior House Member of the conference committee who has very much sugar produced in his district. They can very well take the position of not wanting any law.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How can the Senator explain their extreme interest in the bill if what the Senator says is the case?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would not undertake to explain their position. I can explain my own position, and perhaps the position of the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. In connection with what the Senator from Arkansas has said, as I pointed out earlier today, the Senate bill had in it the principle of recapturing the premium payments. We induced the House to adopt that principle. It is now in conference. In other words, we are recapturing these premium payments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To a limited extent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Ten percent for the remaining 6 months of this year, 20 percent for the next year, and 30 percent in 1964. That is 30 percent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then it stops.

Mr. ELLENDER. That amount will be recaptured.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It stops because the act stops.

Mr. ELLENDER. Inasmuch as that principle has been adopted, it is my judgment that future Congresses will continue that principle.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The bill does not go nearly as far as the Senate bill did. We phase it out completely in 5 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. The House bill had nothing of the kind in it. The House has accepted the principle that was included in the Senate bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We phase it out in 2½ years. That amounts to 30 percent of the premium payments.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Thirty percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Ten percent, twenty percent, and then thirty percent. That is a substantial phaseout.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The act expires then. If we then want to step up the phaseout, we will be in a position with respect to the separate foreign portion, and we will be in a much better position to insist on the Senate position when an expiration would mean that they would not get any premium. In 2½ years we would be in a much better position. What would happen otherwise, if we went back to conference, would be that we would be back in the position where the majority of the Senate would get hurt a great deal more than a majority of the House. The House would be in a better position to say, "If you do not take it, let us see how you can live with no Sugar Act."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have heard a great deal said about the inefficiency of the beet sugar industry. I want the Senator from Arkansas to know that the Red River Valley of North Dakota and Minnesota, where we pay $1.11 an hour, can produce beet sugar as cheaply as any area in the United States. It is a matter of record that the land there is among the most fertile in the country. Each year we do not have a Sugar Act, and each year we go on an emergency basis, more and more acres will be plowed up and put into beets. When more land is put into beets, more refineries are needed. The result would be that, instead of 60 percent, the domestic allotment will be 70 percent, and at the same time we will jeopardize our relations with our Latin American friends.

I should like to go back to the discussion of the Dominican Republic. The world price of sugar 2 years ago was considerably lower than it is today. Last year it was higher than it is today. Last year the United Kingdom imported 450,000 tons of sugar from the Dominican Republic; this year, none. Why? They are getting it from Russia and Poland. Why? Because Russia and Poland get Cuban sugar. Castro is in the picture. That is one market gone for a friend of ours. Four hundred and fifty thousand tons of sugar from the Dominican Republic that used to find its way into the United Kingdom is gone today. Why? Because Mr. Khrushchev, through his connection with Mr. Castro, has the Cuban sugar. Any time Russia wants to undersell us with Cuban sugar, unless we have some kind of price arrangement made with their friends and associates, they can do so. We can buy sugar from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union would be delighted to sell us some Cuban sugar. I imagine they would sell it far below 2.56 cents a pound. I imagine we could get it for 2 cents a pound. The Russians would like some American dollars. As a matter of fact, 70 percent of the entire Dominican Republic earnings come from dollar sugar.

Do we want to give the Dominican Republic money out of the Treasury in the form of grants of foreign aid, or do we want to let them have an opportunity to earn it? Here is a government which in 200 days has increased the wages of its workers 300 percent. It has adopted a minimum wage law. It has passed agrarian reform legislation. It has provided housing for low-income workers. It is a country which is in serious trouble. Why? Because of a severe limitation upon its sugar quota.

I am of the opinion that if the Senate should reject the conference report which has been brought to us, even with all its inadequacies—and every Senator who was a member of the conference has expressed some doubt about it—we will be thrown into a no-man's land of utter economic chaos, as far as sugar is concerned. Any Senator who has beet producers in his own area will find out they will be terribly disappointed, and we will have more trouble. Furthermore, we will find the world markets will be manipulated by the Soviet Union, which has the largest bloc of sugar in the world—35 percent of the total sugar production. Give any country like the Soviet Union 35 percent of the total sugar production, with a market which is a so-called free market, and we will find what will happen to the market. Our Latin American friends will be put on the pin of Soviet imperialism, so to speak; they will not know what to do. Every one of the Latin American countries will be at the mercy of a market that is manipulated.

This is why I think our Government today is much more concerned about sugar quotas than it was last week. The sad facts have started to come out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Minnesota has stated some statistics which are at variance with the International Sugar Council report of April 1962. This report contains the sales, for example, of the Dominican Republic to the United Kingdom. The amounts are in metric tons. If they are translated into U.S. tons, the amounts would be a little higher.

The Dominicans sold to the United Kingdom 313,960 metric tons in 1959, 330,071 tons in 1960, and 236,215 tons in 1961.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And in 1962?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The reason why the Dominican Republic has not sold to the United Kingdom in 1962 is that it has committed almost its entire output to the United States.

The Senator from Louisiana said that in the first 6 months of this year the Dominican Republic shipped 400,000 tons of sugar to the United States and had nothing left for the United Kingdom.

All the talk about the danger of Russia, and so on, is pure propaganda, designed to influence the Senate. There is no basis in fact for such a statement. The Dominican Republic has not sold 700,000 tons of sugar at any time to the United Kingdom.

I refer Senators to table 29 on page 31 of this report.

The Senator said that the United Kingdom—Great Britain and Northern Island—does not buy sugar from the Dominican Republic because they buy sugar from the U.S.S.R. or from Poland.

I ask Senators to refer to the table on page 88. That table gives the source of the imports by countries of origin from 1958 to January 1962.

The United Kingdom and Northern Island got from the U.S.S.R. exactly nothing in the way of refined sugar.

From Poland, in 1958, a total of 400 metric tons. In 1959, 37,014 tons; 1960, 15,087 tons; 1961, 11,212 tons; in January 1962, nothing.

That was refined sugar. Let us now consider the amount of raw sugar that was shipped.

Raw sugar, from Poland, in 1959, nothing; in 1960, 31,543 metric tons; in 1961, 88,699 tons; in January 1962, 15,956 tons.

That is not an appreciable amount when we consider that the United Kingdom is the largest single importer of

sugar in the world. So it just is not so—this enormous takeover by the U.S.S.R. and Poland of the sugar market of the United Kingdom.

The Dominican Republic is not selling to the United Kingdom because it is selling that commodity to us at a higher price for the first 6 months. They got a premium on this year's sugar. I ask the Senator from Louisiana if that is not so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. For the first 6 months.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They were not pushed out by any flooding of the market.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They got a premium for it; but we certainly needed that sugar. If it had not been available, we would have been in bad shape.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Louisiana is not telling us that there was a shortage of sugar, is he?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we had not had that sugar, we would have had to find it somewhere else.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Argentina is one country that is a legitimate exporter of sugar.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But the Senator from Arkansas voted to cut them out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the report which the Senator defends so vigorously eliminates Argentina and substitutes a country not now producing the amount of its quota, and which did not do so last year. Several countries named in this report have been given larger quotas than they produced last year, and were unable to fill the quotas they had last year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That happened to be in the House bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is in the conference report. Some of those quotas are still larger than the amounts they can produce. What is being proposed is the creation of a new industry, an expanded industry, that has not been able to produce at levels which were assigned to them last year——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So far as the committee thought of that. Perhaps that is so in one case or two. But we are going only a small fraction as far as the House of Representatives went.

If the Senator from Arkansas had been more interested in getting a sugar act than in defeating one, and if he had been a member of the conference, he would have gone as far as we did. But if he had been interested in defeating the bill, he would have done what one other member of the conference did; he would not have signed the report; he would have hoped the report would not be agreed to.

I do not know what study the Senator has in mind for the domestic industry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We should do for sugar what we do for other agricultural commodities in this country. I do not know why sugar should have special treatment. I have said so a dozen times. Sugar ought to be handled by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on a basis similar to that of other agricultural commodities.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Arkansas made a statement a few years ago that we should get all our sugar from Cuba, and Cuba should get all its rice from us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If we had treated Cuba properly 10 years ago, Cuba probably would not be a Communist country today. The first time the Senator from Louisiana heard me say that was about 12 or 15 years ago. If we had had any sense at all, we would have treated Cuba in such a way that she would not have become a Communist country.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I suspected that Castro was a Communist long before the Senator from Arkansas did, because I was one of the first to favor cutting off his sugar quota.

The point is that we ought to be able to rely upon our own industry to produce our essential requirements for war purposes, if for nothing else. We have known what we must expect of the sugar industry. We know what it can do.

The Senator said we ought to sell rice. Every acre that produces sugar in Louisiana can produce rice. The rice industry would be in a fine fix now if we had made such a deal, because if we could not have produced our own sugar, we would be in a position to flood the whole world with rice. Then we would find it necessary to find some way to reduce acreage for rice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. By the way, Minnesota does not produce any rice.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And we would have been crying tears of bitter regret, to find out that we had destroyed our sugar industry and had run Arkansas out of the rice industry, and that here we were with no market for our surplus rice.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Let me say that I am glad the Senator has gotten around to this point, because some Senators seem not to realize why the sugar program was initiated and why it is vitally important to our Nation and its survival.

In the case of sugar and in the case of wool, we have heavy deficits in those two vital commodities, alone; and we had heavier deficits in them when we began those programs some years ago.

So far as wool is concerned, everyone knows that in the event of war we must have warm clothing for the men in our Armed Forces who engage in combat; so in connection with the wool program we have premiums for the production of wool; and of course we have to pay more to have it produced in the United States than to have it produced in places where labor is much cheaper and where, for other reasons, wool can be produced more cheaply.

In the case of sugar, insofar as the Nation as a whole is concerned, there is no vital food, other than sugar, in which we are faced with a deficit in production. So some years ago we began with this program—it began not long after World War I, and before World War II. We have had to step it up since then, because we discovered that we did not have an adequate production of sugar; and we know perfectly well that, with the changed conditions in Cuba, which is so close to our shores, we have an even more precarious problem confronting us now, in the event of war.

So I think that Senators who try to put the sugar production program and the wool production program—because they stand together—on the same basis as the programs for corn, wheat, tobacco, cotton, and rice—when all of us know that those commodities are produced in great abundance in the United States and that we have vast surpluses of them—expose their lack of understanding of a critical problem for our country.

I am glad this program is not handled by the Foreign Relations Committee, because some measures which have come from that committee have seemed to indicate that the Foreign Relations Committee was paying more careful attention to the problems of other nations than to the problems of survival of our own people, in time of world war.

The question of whether the program should be handled in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or in the Finance Committee is beside the point here. In the House of Representatives, the bill initiated in their Committee on Agriculture. So far as I am concerned, I feel that every compliment and every commendation are due the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the other conferees who worked with him to bring out this conference report, which is by far the best conference report in this field which has been brought here in many years. So, instead of caviling about these questions, we should remember that we are happy and fortunate to have in this hemisphere other nations—which in the main are friendly to us—which can produce sugar at relatively short distances from our shores, as compared with the geographical position of other great producers of sugar throughout the world. So certainly we should place every emphasis on the point of giving friendly and generous treatment to those nations in this hemisphere. To do so is directly in furtherance of the Alliance for Progress program.

I am only sorry we did not do that in the case of Argentina. I am perfectly willing to go further in the case of the Dominican Republic.

But I certainly agree that the approach to this matter by the Senate and by the Senate committee was the better of the two approaches, and I emphasize that the Senate conferees are to be very warmly complimented.

I hope that without further debate the Senate will recognize that it is dealing with a problem vital to the survival of the Nation in the event of war, and will proceed to approve the conference report—after which I strongly hope, and I urge, that we take the steps necessary to meet the problem of our neglect of Argentina and our relative neglect of the Dominican Republic.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. DOUGLAS obtained the floor.

PROPOSED TAX RELIEF AND EXPENDITURES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for what I understand is to be a brief statement by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. President, my fears are that we are at the threshold of a course of action recommended by certain institutions and economists to the Congress which seemingly will bring temporary relief to the economy, but forebodes dire economic difficulties in the future.

The talk is now intense about the need of an across-the-board tax reduction, knowing that such a reduction will create the largest peacetime deficit in the history of our country.

This alarming course is recommended in spite of the fact that we have had deficit operations in 25 out of the last 31 years; that the purchasing power of the dollar has dropped from 100 cents, in 1941, to about 46 cents, in 1962; that our gold reserves are being drained by our short-term international creditors; that we have ended the fiscal year 1962 with a deficit of at least $7 billion; that only a short time ago we passed legislation authorizing the United States, together with 10 other countries, to create a $6 billion pool of gold and hard cash, primarily to be available for draft by the U.S. Government to support its possible *falling value*; and that we in the Congress are in the process of considering a bill that would remove the silver support of our $5, $10, and $20 silver certificates.

Should we not give heed to what has happened in Canada as a consequence of deficit operations?

Should we not immediately direct our attention to the grave problems confronting the economy of Canada, in connection with which Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, through a five-point program, is attempting gallantly to save the Canadian economy?

The Prime Minister of Canada has increased the import tariffs; cut the amount that Canadians are allowed to spend abroad; raised interest rates, to attract foreign capital and reduce borrowing; and has announced a $250 million cut in his own budget.

But these drastic actions are not all that have been taken. Last May 2 he deemed it necessary to devalue the Canadian dollar, making it worth 92½ U.S. cents. Obviously the net result was that the prices of all things at home were raised, while the prices of things sold in the world market were lowered.

The problems of Canada resulted from a practice of spending more than it had available in money.

Since 1957, Canada has accumulated a deficit of about $2 billion; and that accumulation of a $2 billion deficit in 5 years would be the equivalent of a $42 billion accumulation in a similar time in the United States.

It is a fallacy to argue that Federal deficits do not create inflation. Can we forget the destructive erosion of the currency in Germany which resulted from the Government's spending more than the money it had available? Can we forget that a million marks were needed to buy a single sausage in Germany? Can we forget the experience of France, whose 20-cent francs were finally worth two-tenths of a cent, or that of the Italians, the Greeks, and the Romans, or that of any other country which resorted to the printing press in order to pay public bills?

It is rather certain that none of these governments which are still in existence will try it again—or, at least certainly not until new generations have had time to forget the damaging results produced when their federal governments interminably spent more than they took in.

In our country we have increased our debt, after World War II, from the low level of $255 billion in 1952 to approximately $300 billion in 1962. This experience of not reducing the debt incurred in war in the protracted period of about 16 years is quite foreign to our past experience in this country.

Historically, our Government has pursued a policy of relatively prompt reduction of the national debt. Alexander Hamilton, in the earliest days of the Republic, set the tone for future generations. He argued that a national debt has a number of useful attributes, but that one of its foremost characteristics is that it could help a nation establish its credit rating among the nations of the world—if the debt were paid off with promptness. Over the decades, the debt rose primarily during wars and depressions, and fell largely in response to the basic philosophy that the national debt should be extinguished. Twenty-four years after the War of 1812 the debt was entirely paid off. In 27 years after the Civil War the debt was reduced by almost two-thirds; and in the 10 years after World War I the debt was reduced by one-third.

Since the last war we have had periods of unprecedented prosperity, but during those periods our national debt was not reduced. We did reduce taxes in 1953—all, in my opinion, to the ultimate damage of our national security.

Even without the proposed tax reduction covering the fiscal year of 1963, the prospects are strong that in that year we shall have another deficit of about $5 billion. With the proposed tax reduction, the deficiency would in all probability be around $12 billion.

Our Nation simply cannot stand that; the result would be a cheapening of the dollar; the accelerated flight of gold; the robbing of the annuitants, pensioners, and the humble possessors of life savings. More frightening, however, is the possibility that we might have to follow the course of Canada by either devaluing the dollar or removing the gold support that now gives the currency of the United States some sense of stability.

Before this proposal of reducing taxes is acted upon, it ought to be given far deeper consideration concerning its ultimate implications to the economic security of our Nation.

My own opinion is that the proposal is bad and is not in the interest of either our economy or our security. The cure is worse than the illness for which a remedy is sought. Confusion would be piled on confusion.

The ancient Greeks in trying to climb to the heavens conceived a grandiose scheme. They proceeded to pile Mount Ossa on Mount Olympus and Mount Pelion on Mount Ossa; thus, through that laborious process, they hoped to reach their goal. But when they finished their work, they found their problem was worse than when they began.

So will it be when this desirable but imprudent objective of reducing taxes without reducing expenditures is finished. Our economy and our security will be in a worse position than before the cure was applied.

Our citizens ought to have tax relief—but on a basis consistent with the security of our economy and our country. Let us eliminate imprudent expenditures, giveaway programs, the pyramiding of unneeded personnel on the Federal payroll. Thus we can reduce operating costs and make possible foreseeable tax reductions.

Repeated and increased deficits aggravated by the proposed tax reduction are not the way out of our troubles.

I repeat that increased deficits are the cause of depreciation in the purchasing power of the dollar.

I submit to my colleagues that we would cure a temporary condition by a proposed tax reduction that would create, in 1963, a deficit of $14,500 million.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hesitate to decline to yield to any colleague, for I know I have no particular claim to the floor. But it so happens that I have been waiting for several hours. I prefer to have the debate confined to the sugar bill, rather than to turn to other matters.

However, if my friend, the Senator from Tennessee, has a deep and burning desire to speak at this time——

Mr. GORE. I do have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well; then I cannot resist the request of the Senator from Tennessee, and I yield to him. But I hope that in the interest of comity, he will exercise some restraint.

Mr. GORE. I shall try.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield for a question.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator repeat his last sentence? Would we provide a temporary cure?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. My position is that a temporary cure would be provided by reducing taxes, but that the cure would be worse than the evil it remedied.

Mr. GORE. With no assurance that it would work.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The tax burden would be decreased by $9½ billion, for the next fiscal year.

Mr. GORE. This is advocated on the ground that it would put money in the spending stream. Does the Senator feel any assurance that many people, both at home and abroad, would not regard

this as an act of desperation? It might drive more money out of the spending stream than it would put into it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has stated more clearly that I have been able to state the very thing I fear. I am of the belief that if we reduce taxes in the manner recommended, the very opposite from what we expect is likely to be the result; but even though it would produce a temporary cure, even though it would put money in the spending stream——

Mr. GORE. Without driving more out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; the piper would have to be paid. We would have to pay for the music, and the price that we would have to pay would be far greater than the benefits that would be received.

Mr. GORE. Without trespassing upon the time of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that I share his concern. It may be that the economy needs a spur, though I notice that many aspects of the economy are making new records. Automobiles are selling at a rapid pace. Building is breaking all records. It may be that the economy temporarily needs a spur. If so, there are many ways to do it without making big tax cuts which would bring about huge deficits that would shock this country and might shock the economies of other countries.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall conclude my remarks by saying that once there was a theory, "Spend in accord with your income." Subsequently the theory was adopted, "Spend more and more, and tax less and less." It cannot be done. It can lead only to disaster.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1962—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12154) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we all recognize the difficult task which faced the Senate conferees. They were dealing with a tremendous subsidy to foreign producers and a big bonus to domestic producers which had been paid over a long period of time; and those who had made a profit at the expense of the American consumers naturally did not want to give up this subsidy.

The Senate conferees were also dealing with a powerful House committee which in the past has called the tune on sugar legislation.

I, too, feel that the Senate conferees not only did the very best they could, but they did better than I feared they might be able to achieve. But they did not do as well as I had hoped they might achieve. I think the issue at stake should be clearly recognized by the public, the Senate, and the press.

With the world price of raw sugar at 2.7 cents a pound, and with the tariff and freight cost to New York at nine-tenths of a cent, it is possible, to lay down raw foreign sugar along the Atlantic seaboard at a cost of approximately 3.6 cents a pound.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did not the Senator recognize the other day in a speech the fact that with any considerable demand for this so-called world surplus, the so-called world price would rise considerably?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would probably go up. How much it would go up is a question. But the domestic price is now 6.4 cents. Therefore, there is a bonus of 2.8 cents a pound or $56 a short ton above the world price which is paid to foreign producers and also to domestic producers.

Slightly less than 10 million tons of sugar are consumed inside the United States, 60 percent is produced inside the United States, and approximately 40 percent is imported, of which roughly 1 million tons comes from the Philippines, and slightly less than 3 million tons from outside this country excluding the Philippines.

This means that with a bonus, a premium, or a subsidy of $56 a ton, the total bonus which the domestic consumers pay amounts to approximately $550 million; $330 million of this goes to the domestic producers, $220 million going to the foreign producers. And of these foreign producers, approximately $60 million goes to the Philippines, regulated under a treaty and outside the scope of this legislation. Therefore, a $160 million subsidy is paid to countries other than the Philippines.

As Senators know, the Senator from Illinois has been maintaining for several years that this bonus, premium, or subsidy to foreign sugar producers should be done away with.

I am frank to say that, as one who believes in low tariffs and as one who in general believes in the much vaunted free market, I have not been happy about the $330 million paid to domestic producers, but I did not propose to attack it, because I believed it was politically impossible to do so. The strength both of the cane sugar States and of the beet sugar States was such that, as a practical matter, we could never reduce the subsidies, at least at this time. But I did think it possible that we could eliminate the subsidies paid to foreign producers, and buy sugar at the world price, and put into the U.S. Treasury the fee which would be the difference between the world price and the domestically maintained price but which now goes as a subsidy to the foreign producer.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is that not what is done in the case of lead and zinc?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not certain.

Mr. GORE. A tariff is imposed on imports of lead and zinc; is it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. GORE. If buying at a premium price is a good principle, why could we not do it in the case of lead and zinc, in the case of oil, and in the case of many other commodities? What is the point of passing a reciprocal trade program? Let us buy what we need on a quota basis and at a premium price. Then we shall really be there.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Perhaps there is some merit in what the Senator has said.

Last year, as we know, the Senate Committee on Finance, by a unanimous vote, adopted the amendment which I offered to pay the fee into the Treasury. We came to the Senate with it. It met with the opposition of the foreign sugar producers and their lobby, and it met with the opposition of the State Department, which convinced the administration that the administration ought not to support it. Of course, in the background there was the opposition of the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

As a result, we lost the fight on the floor of the Senate, and the system of paying domestic American prices for all the sugar imported was continued for a year and a quarter. So, for the past 2 years, foreign producers have been able to receive the domestic price for sugar, which results in a subsidy, outside the Philippines, of approximately $160 million a year, or a total of at least $320 million for 2 years. Having received these sums, naturally the foreign producers do not wish to give them up. Having drunk some of the economic lifeblood of America, they do not wish to give up drinking this economic lifeblood.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. What about the nations which are to be cut in, which have not had this sip of our blood?

Mr. DOUGLAS. These nations see others drinking the blood, so they wish to share it.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator know who owns the refinery in Ireland?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know.

Mr. GORE. Why is Argentina to be cut out and Ireland to be cut in?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know.

Mr. GORE. Does Ireland produce enough sugar for her own needs?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; but I think there is a product known as chocolate crumb which Ireland feels she could export to the United States.

Mr. GORE. All the argument about Argentina being cut out and other nations being cut in illustrates how unsound it is to pass legislative quotas on this product.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The House included nearly every producing country.

I noticed, at the end of the hearings, that certain areas had been omitted. I asked if any one of those areas was represented either in person or by a lobbyist. I asked if there was anyone from the New Hebrides who wished to testify; or anyone from the Canary Islands; or anyone from the Azores; or anyone from the beautiful rocky island of Tenerife or Tristan de Cunha; or anyone from Christmas Island, where the mutineers from the *Bounty* went; or anyone from Norfolk Island, which used to be a penal colony; or anyone from Easter Island,

which was the religious center of the Polynesians with its magnificent statues.

They did not appear, so they were left out.

I daresay that if those islands had had representatives around they would have been included, but they failed to get in on the distribution of the pie, or the drinking of the blood. The rite known as the drinking of the American blood is the exploitation of the American consumer.

Mr. President, a great deal of trouble was caused last year by the failure to purchase sugar at world prices. We built up many countries and many sugar producers, who demand as a right what was given to them as a privilege. They had no right to the extra bonus, subsidy, or premium. It was made perfectly clear on the floors of the two Houses of Congress that the allotment was temporary. We have checked with the State Department, and the State Department assures us that all those countries were told that the allotment was merely temporary, and that there was no permanent commitment by the United States. Nevertheless, these countries now say, "We have had it. We are entitled to it. If you do not continue to give it to us, we will go to the Communists or we will break away."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. They make a more dire threat than that. The Dominican Republic, according to the New York Times, said last night that it would quit accepting our aid under the Alliance for Progress program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That would be a very severe penalty. We would indeed have our feelings grievously hurt by this terrible threat.

Mr. GORE. This has driven certain people into a "tizy." One country is going to quit taking our aid unless we give it a sugar bonus also.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe Mr. Nehru said he might become so aggrieved with us that he would refuse to take our aid.

Mr. GORE. And the President of the Philippines says that he will not come to visit us until we pass a bill he favors. Is this not a wonderful world?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think either the Senator from Tennessee or the Senator from Illinois is demagogic, when we raise these issues.

I wish to maintain the point that these countries were not given a vested right. It was purely a gratuity, and in my judgment a mistaken gratuity, which, once given, has been claimed by its recipients as a right. An appetite developed in this way breeds an increased desire.

This year we succeeded in convincing the Senate, with the support of the administration that the principle we advocated was right. I think the Senate made a very wise decision. It allocated the roughly 2½ million tons of Cuban sugar for purchase on a global basis at world prices. Thereby we expected to save approximately $140 million. On the remaining 330,000 tons, given to those countries which had quotas before Castro, the premium quota payment or fee was to be continued but was to be phased out over a 5-year period; 20 percent off the first year, 40 percent off the next year, 60 percent off the next year, 80 percent off the fourth year, and completely terminated in the fifth year. Eventually, these relatively small additional amounts, too, would be purchased at the world price.

Then they would go upon the world price basis. At the end of the 5 years we would be saving not $140 million a year but approximately $160 million a year. The average for the 5 years would be $150 million a year, or a total of about $750 million in 5 years.

Some may say, "That is not very much." It is three-quarters of a billion dollars. That is quite a bit.

The ability of the United States to stand the burdens of these subsidies is not unlimited. We are the strongest Nation in the world, but our strength is not unlimited. We are in grave difficulty, as the Senator from Ohio has said, because of an unfavorable balance of payments. We can save, in 5 years, $750 million which otherwise would go overseas. Certainly, if other things are equal, that is worth doing.

We know that when our conferees went to conference they faced a very difficult situation. The House was wedded to the idea of foreign subsidies. I do not know why, but it was.

I am sure the conferees of the Senate did the very best they could. I am willing to give them a decoration for bravery—not the Congressional Medal of Honor; not even the Navy Cross or the Silver Star; but I would be willing to give them the Bronze Star, which is a fine decoration for bravery and for good performance under fire.

The conferees have brought to the Senate a bill which, in the initial year, would save for the Treasury of the United States not the $140 million or $144 million for which we had hoped, but roughly $100 million. The 1,635,000 tons would be purchased at the world price, at a savings of $56 a ton. If my hurried multiplication is correct, that would be a little more than $91 million a year. On the remaining 1.2 million tons, there would be a decrease in the premium price, fee, or subsidy of 10 percent the first year, of 20 percent the second year, and of 30 percent the third year. My figures, roughly, are that the total savings the first year would be a little short of $100 million and in the third year would be a little more than $110 million.

This would be better than the present situation. I point out, however, that at the end of a 3-year period 22 countries still would receive a price roughly 70 percent above the world price.

It would provide a subsidy not of 2.8 cents a pound, but of 2 cents a pound, or $40 a ton.

I should like to point out what the subsidy would be for the first year. I shall read the list by countries.

The total subsidy provided for Peru on a 190,000-ton basis in the first year would be $9,576,000; for Mexico, $9,576,000. For the Dominican Republic the total subsidy would be $9,576,000; for Brazil just over $9 million; for the British West Indies over $4.5 million; for Australia $2 million. Incidentally, Australia is inside the British system and would get a premium price for selling sugar if it should sell sugar to the British Commonwealth.

The total subsidy to the Republic of China would be just under $1.8 million. The French West Indies, who are under the French system, would receive $1.5 million, as would Colombia. Nicaragua would receive $1,260,000; Costa Rica $1,260,000; India, our dear friend, $1 million; Ecuador, $1,260,000; Haiti, $1 million; Guatemala, $1 million; South Africa—that bastion of racial tolerance—$1 million; Panama, $756,000; El Salvador, $504,000; Paraguay, $504,000; British Honduras, which is inside the British system, $504,000; The Netherlands $504,000; other countries, $576,000.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to complete a sentence and then I shall be happy to yield.

All other countries would receive a total of 11,000 tons. I think we will find that Ireland, Mauritius, and Argentina will get in under the wire and be admitted to the holy convocation after a time.

I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that the Union of South Africa receives an American subsidy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The producers in the Union of South Africa would be given 20,000 tons, which in the first year, at $56 a ton, would result in a subsidy of over $1 million.

Mr. MORSE. Does the record anywhere give us the reasons why the Union of South Africa is to be included in the sugar quota?

Mr. DOUGLAS. A representative of that country testified. I was not satisfied with his statement, but it had a witness present. In short, it wants the subsidy.

Mr. MORSE. Was that the sum and substance of the testimony?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think so.

Mr. MORSE. Was he able to show any obligation of any kind?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have no obligation to any of the countries involved, with the possible exception of the eight countries which had quotas when Cuba had and used its quota. We were gradually cutting and phasing them out, and I did not object to that. I did not wish to see the quota taken away all at once. But South Africa was not one of those countries.

Mr. MORSE. Does the record show anywhere a need for extending the subsidy to any of the countries other than the original eight countries to which we have been granting a subsidy?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think probably on political grounds a case could be made for the Dominican Republic. The case of the Dominican Republic has been overstressed in the last 2 days, but I believe a case could be made for assistance to the Dominican Republic.

Mr. MORSE. We have been of some assistance to the Dominican Republic for how many years?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In 1960 President Eisenhower very wisely suspended the premium paid to the Dominican Republic when it was ruled by Trujillo. I think approximately $22 million in subsidies was impounded and paid into the Treasury. Then when a democratic government was established, the premium payments were resumed. The Dominican Republic is now suing to obtain the $22 million, claiming that that was a right which should not have been taken away from it, and that as the inheritors of Trujillo they are entitled to get it. I do not think that country has any case whatsoever in law. If the case were in the courts, I am sure it would be defeated. But they then went to the House and obtained recognition from the House of the claim for $22 million. But, thank the Lord, a provision for that amount of money is not in the conference report as it has come to us. I congratulate the Senate conferees for having that provision eliminated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has referred to a claim on the part of the Dominican Republic for a quota as a matter of right Does the Senator know of any case involving any country in which the country as a matter of right has a legitimate claim to a continuation of the subsidy?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I do not think there is any case in which, as a matter of legal right, the United States is bound to continue to pay the subsidy of $56 a ton. It may be, in the case of the 330,000 tons which went to the eight countries which had quotas when Cuba had a quota, that the bonus payments should be removed gradually, as was provided in the Senate bill. But it should not be enlarged.

Mr. ELLENDER. The conference report so provides.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The conference report would only taper off the subsidy. It would not eliminate it. The great merit of the Senate bill was that, at the end of the operation of the Senate bill, the subsidy would have been gone completely. But the present provision would leave the subsidy at 70 percent at the end of 3 years, and if present prices prevail, that would amount to a subsidy of 2 cents a pound, or $40 a ton.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator realizes that, insofar as the foreign elements are concerned, the bill will expire in 2½ years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. ELLENDER. When we reinstate it, we can continue the gradual cutting off.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We can, but will we? There is the whole point. Last year, when we continued the practice, it was said, "This is not a permanent assignment. Next year we can change it."

But this year the countries involved are more determined, more rapacious, more avaricious, more demanding, and more insistent that we continue the subsidy. We built up appetites which demand more and more. The time to have ended the practice was last year; or, rather, in 1960 we should not have started it. But last year perhaps we could have stopped it.

A great responsibility for continuing it last year rests upon the State Department and the man who then headed the Latin American Division, Mr. Thomas Mann, who, I notice, is up for promotion today. A great responsibility rests on those people for perpetuating the system for another year and a half, getting us in deeper and deeper.

If we continue the practice for another 2½ years, even at 70 percent of the premium, I do not believe we will ever get rid of the program, because then the countries will have been getting the subsidy for 5 years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not a fact that the House bill did not include the tapering off feature?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This is the first time we have ever been able to get the House to agree on a stated period of time under a schedule for phasing out the premium payments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I said I think we have attained in compromise approximately 60 percent of the Senate bill. But there are grave abuses which continue and which we need to recognize.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. But I believe the point that can be made with reference to the conference report is that certain breakthroughs were made on fundamental principles, such as, first, phasing out of the premium payments. Second, a long-term program for domestic producers, thereby stabilizing that particular situation, which was being aggravated every year. Third, the establishment of the principle of world quotas under an apportionment of the so-called Cuban allocation.

So if we take a good look at the situation, I think we have made substantial progress. My worry is that if we reject the conference report, we shall have nothing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At the moment I am not saying that the Senate should reject the report, although I expect to vote against it. I should like to emphasize this point, and I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not take it amiss. The Senator from Minnesota and I have fought side by side for 15 years on the hustings and on the floor of the Senate. I hope we shall continue for a long time to fight side by side. He is a terrific fighter. I must say, however, that his idea that the way to help the poor peons abroad is to give a sugar subsidy to the plantation owners does not square with his domestic political beliefs. In his political career at home he has always advanced the Democratic theory that the way to build up the prosperity of the Nation is to do it from the bottom up; that we should help people at the bottom so as to build up purchasing power. I never heard my good friend advance the Republican theory of trickle down that he is now advancing with respect to foreign sugar policy. He says we should give the subsidy to the plantation owners; that then they will pass it down to the peons at the bottom. The Senator from Minnesota should be consistent, and he should adopt the same foreign policy and the same foreign economics that he advances so vigorously at home.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know the Senator will not deny me a chance to respond.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I could not do it even if I so desired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the Senator's wise understanding. I say to the Senator that the program which he is advocating is that we should buy each pound of sugar that comes into this country at the world price, and let the lowest bidder get the business. This would jeopardize wages in many countries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to reply to my friend.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We know that workers' wages in some of the countries have been increased.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They have been increased to some extent. However, let me read some of the wages.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We do not have any evidence that the global quota system on a universal basis would do the job. The Senator from Minnesota is not opposed to a trial of the global quota system. He is trying to recognize some of the facts; namely, that when we exclude a country like Argentina, while other countries are included, we are getting into trouble. We have a treaty with the Philippines under which we would take 1,050,000 tons at a fixed price. We will pay the Philippines one price, and then we will tell the people of Argentina, "Sorry, but we cannot help you."

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Philippine quota is fixed by treaty.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That does not change the price situation. The benefit trickles down in the Philippines, too. I am not in favor of the trickle-down theory. I am trying to preserve a system that has had some credibility. One of the stable commodities in the United States has been sugar, in terms of price. I have not heard many customers complain about the price of sugar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, yes. The price has been fairly stable, but the price has been set higher than the world price and kept there.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course it has been higher than the world price.

Mr. DOUGLAS. About 2.8 cents a pound more than the world price, or $56 a ton. The Senator has been weeping copious tears about the workers on the plantations. Let me tell the Senator about those wages. I knew that he or some other Senator would raise that issue on the floor. Therefore, some time ago we sent cablegrams to our embassies in various countries and asked what the wages were. Let me read some of them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Before the Senator reads them, I wish to say to him that I do not weep copious tears about this

situation. I am dry eyed about it. I am not worried about whether we will get a better deal by having the Government recapture the premium. What the Senator from Minnesota has stated is that the conference report is a good beginning toward solving a difficult problem. I say to the Senator from Illinois that if the conference report is defeated—and apparently that is the purpose of some Senators—chaos will result in the sugar market. It is as simple as that. Let us not get a great deal of minutiae into the discussion. I have heard a great deal said about the inefficiency of the sugarbeet producer. In Minnesota we pay $1.11 an hour.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I say to my very dear friend from Minnesota—and I do not use that adjective sarcastically—that the wage of a field hand in Peru last year, on the basis of an 8-hour day, ranged from 19 cents an hour to approximately 27 cents an hour. In Haiti, it was 10 cents an hour. In Costa Rica, it was 14 cents an hour. In the Dominican Republic, about which the Senator has been speaking, it was 25 cents an hour.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was last year?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. In the Republic of China, it was about 12½ cents an hour. In Mexico it ranged from 12 cents to 20 cents an hour. In Nicaragua it was 27 cents an hour. In Panama, it ranged from 12½ cents to 22 cents an hour. I am translating day wages to hourly wages in terms of an 8-hour day. If it is a 10-hour day, the hourly rate is less. In Brazil it was 19 cents an hour. In Argentina, it was a little less than 25 cents an hour. Ecuador, 15 cents an hour. Guatemala, 10 cents an hour. British West Indies; in Barbados, about 37 cents an hour; in Trinidad, 27 cents an hour.

The plain facts are that not much of the prosperity of the planters trickles down to the workers. It is a well-known fact that with some exceptions—Mexico and Costa Rica are the best examples—land is tightly held by a relatively small group. Sugar milling is even more tightly concentrated. The result is that the profits go to a relatively small group of people who own the mills, and to some of the bigger plantation owners. The men who cut the cane get very little out of it. The big plantation owners then send their money abroad. They put their money into numbered accounts in Swiss banks. That is where most of the money would go. It would go into the Swiss banks. Then the plantation owners send their lawyers up here to say that it is absolutely necessary for the stability of the government that they continue to get these enormous sums.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon, who, as we know, is chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and therefore knows a great deal about the Latin American situation.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is very kind, but I do not know very much about it, or I would not be asking these questions to elicit information. Can the Senator from Illinois tell me what the percentage of our sugar imports would be under the conference report for which we would not pay a premium price?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Excluding the Philippines, about 60 percent would not be at the premium price.

Mr. MORSE. That would be on the world market.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. With respect to the remaining 40 percent, it would taper down by 10 percent a year. Therefore, at the end, 40 percent of the imports will be at 70 percent of the premium price or subsidy.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it is 10 percent, 20 percent, and then 30 percent.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, I am excluding the Philippines, because that situation is governed by treaty.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I apologize to the Senator from Oregon. I wish to enter into the debate with one observation. The Senator from Illinois was a little worried, as I was worried, that the imports taper down so slowly; namely, 10 percent a year for a couple of years.

In connection with the one portion of the conference in connection with which I was permitted to sit in, because one of the conferees had to be absent, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, I suggested that we go ahead with cutting down the allotment to 20 percent, as the President had suggested.

We got absolutely nowhere. We found ourselves in complete disagreement. Later I suggested we take 10 percent the first year and 15 percent for 6 years, and accomplish the program in 7 years instead of in 5. Here again we ran into an absolute stone wall. Finally, we agreed on 10 percent.

I agree with the Senator from Illinois that it is not sufficient but when we get into this kind of situation, we do the best we can in the final analysis.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to make it clear that I am not blaming the committee we sent to conference. They had a difficult problem to solve. I can never understand why the House conferees continue to insist upon paying foreign producers these huge subsidies. I cannot understand it; yet I recognize that it is a fact of life.

Mr. ANDERSON. We had hoped that at the end of 3 years it would be a total of 60 percent, but it came out a total of 30 percent. We tried all sorts of other figures, and it became impossible. We insisted that the principle of the Douglas amendment be maintained. I appreciate that we did not accomplish all we had hoped to, but that was sometimes hard to do.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was glad to hear the Senator mention in his discussion the problem of the Latin American oligarchs. We all know that one of the great handicaps which confronts us in the whole Alliance for Progress program is that as the American Government pours more of the money of American taxpayers into Latin America, aimed at helping the economic and productive power of Latin America, which is essential to raising the standard of living of most of the people, we are confronted with the obstacle of the economy policy of the oligarch.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. The oligarch in Latin America is not, by and large, investing in the economic future of his country, but, as the Senator from Illinois has pointed out, is investing in Swiss and New York banks. What happens is that we, as taxpayers, are really assuming the burden that ought to be assumed by the wealthy of Latin America.

Has the Senator from Illinois given any thought as to whether, if we are to continue these premium payments, we can insist upon certain strings being attached in regard to tax reforms, for example? It would be interesting, if we had the data, to have the Senator read not only the figures of the wages paid the workers on the plantations, but also to read a statement of the taxes paid by the sugar plantation owners into the treasuries of their respective countries. I do not have such information. I think the Senator from Illinois would find it at least surprising and disappointing that we are dealing with an economic class which, by and large, does not begin to pay the taxes which their ability to pay warrants.

So we are saying, in the whole Alliance for Progress program, "We will help if you will help yourselves. When we speak about helping yourselves, we mean we will take a look at your tax reform program, your land reform program, your health program, and your education program."

On a problem such as this, I think we must either fish or cut bait. So I ask the Senator from Illinois: Is there any way, in his opinion, whereby we can attach to the premium payments for sugar some reciprocal self-help obligations on the part of the countries concerned; that we can get some kind of assurance or guarantee in respect to wages, in respect to taxes, in respect to preventing the flight of capital out of their countries? We must remember that if the oligarchs of Latin America continue to take their capital out of Latin America and put it in New York and Swiss banks, we have one of two choices: The first is to let their countries go down to communism—which, in my judgment, will happen in many of those countries in the next 10 years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And which the oligarchs are indirectly helping to accomplish.

Mr. MORSE. Certainly they are not preventing it. Second, whether we will let that happen or will continue to pour the largess of the American taxpayer, through the Alliance for Progress program, into Latin America in order to save those countries from communism, on the theory that it is in our self-interest as a free nation to prevent the Latin American nations from becoming Communist.

What disturbs me about a program such as this is that we are pouring out

our great resources without any commitments of self-help on the part of the recipient countries. I do not suppose this can be accomplished in the sugar bill at this late hour; but I believe it is well to point this problem up, because it is a good example of one of the basic problems which confront us in Latin America. What good does it do us to pay premium prices, as the Senator from Illinois has so well pointed out, if the oligarchs are going to grow richer; if the workers are going to get very little money. We know that this is the great problem of northeastern Brazil. The money will flow into Latin America, and the plantation owners will take their economic killing for a certain number of years and then, in many instances, will go to Switzerland, France, Italy, or elsewhere to spend the rest of their lives and live in the luxury that their exploitation of the peons of Latin America has made possible.

We cannot expect to prevent such a situation as that in one shot. I know that. Yet I think it is important to point out in the debate, as the Senator from Illinois has so well made clear to the State Department, that we are just about fed up with the turning over of the resources of this country for the supposed benefit of another country, but which really brings little benefit to that country.

I do not know what good the premium price on sugar has really done for the masses of people of Latin America. I think it would be quite a job to set down on paper proof that it has done good for the masses.

It might be argued that instead of working for 14 cents an hour, the labor will be paid 19 cents an hour. But that is not much of a wage. Parents will recognize that 19 cents an hour does not save their children from malnutrition; and that condition exists to such an extent in so many parts of the area to which the premium price is given that the longevity is 30 to 36 years. The people are old when they are young, and they die young. I have said that about underdeveloped countries.

As to the other point—and I am so glad the Senator from Illinois has placed it in the RECORD—I am at a loss to understand why we provide aid to Australia. I do not know why we are pouring the premium price into Australia. It is about time Australia started paying its own share of foreign aid expenditures. I do not know why in the world we are pouring money into the Union of South Africa. Look at the position of the Union of South Africa in the United Nations. It is a country that will not even let a committee of study and survey go into southwest Africa, where, day in and day out—and it has gone on for years—the most horrendous atrocities are being committed against the enslaved people. The United Nations cannot even get a committee of investigation into southwest Africa. We all know that the Union of South Africa seeks to take over southwest Africa, without any right in law at all.

How can we expect to get support in the United Nations from the new nations of Africa, when they will tell our delegation to the United Nations to its very teeth: "Don't tell us you stand for freedom when you pay premium prices for sugar produced in the Union of South Africa under conditions which amount to enslavement"? These actions come home to roost.

So I am at a loss to understand why we pay premium prices to so many nations. I think a case can be made for the payment of a premium price for sugar, as the Senator from Illinois has said, to some of the eight countries, including possibly the Dominican Republic, to the south of us, whose supply of sugar was of vital interest in the war, when we had to get sugar from close by—and we know how vital sugar is to the diet of Americans.

I do not know why we scatter sugar quotas around the globe, because in time of war it will not be possible to get sugar from Formosa or the Philippines or South Africa or Ireland.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that sugar attracts flies?

Mr. MORSE. It certainly attracts those that think they can get more money by spreading a little sugar. But that is not the way to conduct American foreign policy.

I am in a quandry. If we could have a sugar bill which gave us some assurance that the countries in Latin America which would get the premium price would use that benefit as an assistance or help to raise the standard of living of the masses of the people, so essential to save those people from going over to communism, I would be inclined to support the report. But I simply find myself in a paradox in regard to this particular conference report, because I find the Senator from Illinois to be so persuasive as to who the real beneficiaries of this sugar premium price handout will be.

I have heard nothing in the debate, nor do I know of anything from the State Department, which indicates that it is going to use our sugar premium price as a bargaining factor to obtain the necessary reforms which we are going to insist upon if the Alliance for Progress program is to work.

The Senator from Illinois knows that here in Washington I spoke to a conference of Latin American engineers—and I did so at their request—on the Alliance for Progress program. In that speech I pointed out the need for making such reforms in Latin America if the Alliance for Progress program is not to be headed for serious trouble here in the United States. The U.S. taxpayers are going to catch up—and sooner than many persons realize—with the constant outpouring of their resources into the so-called underdeveloped countries of the world when the wealthy in those countries are not investing in the development of their own countries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Oregon for making this point in greater detail. Of course, nothing whatever in the conference report will require the countries whose sugar producers will receive these subsidies to improve labor conditions or institute any programs of tax reform or any program of land reform. It is merely the hope that these payments will "trickle down," the William McKinley theory of making those at the top prosperous, with the hope that prosperity will trickle down to those at the bottom. It has not worked at home. It will not work abroad.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield briefly?

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I wish to make a somewhat stronger case, and then I shall be glad to yield.

As one who believes in the opposite theory, as developed by Andrew Jackson, William Jennings Bryan, and within this country by Hubert Humphrey, I believe in developing a country from the bottom rather than from the top down. But this measure would not do what I recommend, and in my judgment these countries would not agree to it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope I have not stunned the Senator from Minnesota——

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Minnesota is not stunned; but he has exhilarated me, and I wish to ask what countries the Senator from Illinois voted for under the Senate version, as it came from the Senate Finance Committee. What countries were included in the Senate version?

Mr. DOUGLAS. They were countries which previously had had small quotas: The Philippines, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, Nicaragua, Haiti, the Netherlands, the Republic of China, Panama, and Cost Rica. But the sum total for all of them came to only approximately 330,000 tons, and they were to be phased out.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But were not the oligarchs getting these quotas?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I had had my way——

Mr. HUMPHREY. But that is not my question. I ask the Senator, were not the oligarchs getting those quotas?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; but we limited them to 330,000 tons, and we were going to abolish the quotas and the subsidy completely in 5 years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But were not the oligarchs getting those quotas?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, but not as much as under the bill the Senator from Minnesota is favoring.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not want to see the oligarchs get any. But the Senator from Illinois was on the Finance Committee——

Mr. DOUGLAS. And we voted to phase them out in 5 years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; but the point is, that the House committee did not vote to phase them out at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But when the conferees met, as the Senator from New Mexico has pointed out, the principle of phasing out was maintained. Some adjustment was needed between no phasing out or phasing out over a period of 5 years.

As far as the conference committee is concerned, let me point out there are

fewer oligarchs in Australia than there are in some of the countries the Senate Finance Committee included in its list. So possibly the conferees helped dilute the oligarch principle a little.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They helped dilute it by increasing from 330,000 tons to 1,200,000 tons the amounts to be purchased at the premium price or subsidy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the point is that the House committee's quotas were sharply cut in conference. Again I wish to point out that a unilateral operation is not developed by this measure. The House version included many countries which were to be given rather extensive quotas. The Senate Finance Committee attempted to cut back those quotas, and they were reduced. I think this is a worthy accomplishment.

I wish to make it quite clear there is really very little difference between what the Senator from Illinois voted for and what I voted for, because both of us voted for the Senate Finance Committee bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought the Senator from Minnesota was supporting the McCarthy amendment, which would have reduced the global quotas still further.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senate did not vote on the McCarthy amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know that; but I thought the Senator from Minnesota was quite active in supporting the McCarthy amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at all. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois, my good and dear friend, for whom I have nothing but admiration, affection, and respect—and he knows that—that what my colleague [Mr. MCCARTHY] was attempting to do was point out some of the weak points and shortcomings of an overall global quota system. But he did not press for a vote on his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was because in polling the Senate he found he could not get more than 20 votes for the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He did not have time to poll the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Perhaps not; but did not someome poll the Senate for him?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I cannot answer that.

I can only say that when the junior Senator from Minnesota is credited with giving such a vivid description of the percolate-up system——

Mr. DOUGLAS. At home.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And also abroad.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, for we cut it out for those abroad.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I submit that the countries for which the Senator from Illinois voted in the committee—Peru, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, Nicaragua, Haiti, the Netherlands, China, and the others—are just as oligarchical as are the countries for which I voted, because we voted for the same countries.

By the way, the Netherlands, which was included in the list for which both of us voted, has a good wage scale.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Netherlands were to get only 4,000 tons.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not remember; but a little sin here goes a long way. When the conferees returned from the conference, they had included some countries which were not in the Senate bill. For example, India was added. The Senator from Illinois and I have supported aid to India. There are not too many oligarchs there.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Minnesota permit me to place in the RECORD a few facts in the midst of the statement he is making? I did not vote for permanence in that connection; I voted to limit it to 5 years, and to restrict them to 330,000 tons a year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And so did I.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But now we are faced with a conference report which calls for 1,200,000 tons of subsidized foreign sugar which even at the end of 3 years will have a 70 percent premium.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I voted exactly as the Senator from Illinois—namely, to phase them out in 5 years. But now we have a report which calls for a 30-percent phaseout and a review in 2½ years—not bad.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A review in 2½ years; but in the meantime we shall have built up large subsidies, which in the first year will be $60 million a year, and at the end of the third year will be $46 million. Does not the Senator from Minnesota believe that will result in building up powerful lobbies?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois previously voted to provide employment for lobbyists for 5 years. I recommend we provide employment for them for only 2½ years. So this is a matter of legislative judgment.

But the important question is whether it is better to reject the conference report, with all its inadequacies—and it has plenty of them—or to accept the conference report, which provides for every principle the Senator from Illinois wants.

Mr. DOUGLAS. About 60 percent only.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Forty percent of the quotas are to go to countries outside of the United States, which are to receive what we call premium payments. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what is going to be preserved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under premium payments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to eliminate the premium payments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under the present system, as provided in the conference report, 40 percent of the quotas will be under premium payments, 60 percent not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true of the amount to foreign countries other than the Philippines.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota wishes to make the point that in 2½ years we are going to phase out 30 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Only 30 percent of the fee or subsidy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is better than what we have. What does the Senator want?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to wipe out the whole moral idea of subsidizing abroad. I was going to differ with the Senator because he said he believed in the subsidy system——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I said present conditions are chaotic, and it will lead to confusion and chaos in the sugar economy if we merely extend the act. I said the conference report provides a basis of 5 years for the domestic industry, and 2½ years for the foreign program, to phase out, and there is a global quota program.

I think this is a good start.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think I am violating any confidence when I say I have heard rumors that after the conference report there will appear, not sugar, but honey, and that honey will attract the flies as well as sugar, and that the honey bill will provide a subtraction of 200,000 tons from the global quotas for sugar and an increase in the assigned quotas to countries unspecified. So instead of 1,600,000 tons a year to be bought at world prices, it will be 1,600,000 tons minus x number of tons which will be added to honey—very sweet.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say most emphatically and frankly to the Senator it is a fact the President of the United States and the Secretary of State are deeply concerned over two countries involved in the Sugar Act. One of them is the Argentine, which received no quota, and the other is the Dominican Republic, which got an inadequate quota. Therefore, there may well be amendments to another bill to take care of this situation.

I think it is quite interesting that, despite all that has been done before, these two countries have not been provided for, one of which finds itself in a very difficult situation economically and politically. I think an adjustment might be made, since the quota system is being maintained. The Senate Finance Committee included the Dominican Republic under the quota. It is not included there now——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under the Senate bill we gave them 95,000 tons. Under the conference report they have 190,000 tons. Now the Senator from Minnesota proposes to increase that still further.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Last year we bought approximately 900,000 tons from her, 450,000 the first half of this year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota is such a dear friend of mine that I do not wish to engage in a prolonged discussion with him, but I merely wish to state a simple principle: The way to help people is to put the quota premiums into the Treasury and then help those people by providing schools, roads, needed economic aid, and land and tax reforms. I personally would be willing to pledge the entire receipts we get from the fee on sugar to the Alliance for Progress. But I do not believe the way to help

the people is to give the subsidies to the plantation owners and the sugarmill proprietors.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask the majority leader a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to ask the majority leader whether it is proposed to vote on the conference report tonight and whether he anticipates a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We intend to vote on the conference report tonight. It is my understanding that some Members of the Senate will ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask further whether we are going to get around to the genus apis which is imported honey bees, so that, though restricted, honey bees can get their sugar out?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know about that, but we are going to get around to the honey bees sometime.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1962—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12154) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to ask the Senator from Illinois if he does not think there is some real value in the fact that domestic quotas now run for 5 years and the quotas to the other countries go for three seasons, or 2½ years. The bill would last 4½ years; the quotas would last 2½ years. I think that is a good deal of progress.

In 1947 an effort was made to write a new sugar bill. It was finally written in the office of the then Secretary of Agriculture, early in 1948.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was the present junior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. It was then sent to Congress. It got a fine reception here, and I commend every Senator who voted for it. It was passed in 1948. I think I have been involved in every extension of the Sugar Act since that time, either as a member of the committee or when I have been brought into the discussion, as I was a couple of years ago.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the junior Senator from New Mexico sat through a long discussion of this subject at one time with the House conferees. We came up against the same question. If we should finally refuse to deal with it, the Sugar Act would fail, because we were at the end of the congressional session.

The Senator from Louisiana brought back a report at about 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning. He stood on his feet for 2 or 3 more hours, and the Senate accepted it.

I point out that we have always been under the gun. We have had to act in the face of a deadline. This time, for the first time, the bill comes to us on the first day of July in which Congress has met, and Congress is in session for what I hope will be only 1 month, but it may be 2. If it should be 2, we have plenty of time to consider the act if we do not agree with either House.

It seems to me this is great progress and a great achievement.

Second, I point out to the Senator from Illinois and other Senators who have said we ought to be more careful about allotments, that the matter can be taken care of 2½ years from now, when the bill terminates, without involving the domestic allotment. Congress would not have to be in a hurry, because sugar producting States would lose on their quotas. So we can deal with this question forthrightly.

I do not want to say I hold in my hand——

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a good phrase.

Mr. ANDERSON. I happen to have in my possession a sheet of paper that was circulated inside the conference committee on Friday afternoon and evening. The Senator from Louisiana was present when this sheet was passed around. I did not know the purpose of it.

I thought it was a proposal to settle the disagreement. I wrote some figures on the side of it. I totaled up what I thought the House was proposing. I ended with a figure of 1,170,000 tons. I added to that the 1,050,000 for the Philippines. That made a total of 2,220,000 tons. I added the 5,710,000 tons for the domestic producers, to get a total of 8,030,000 tons. I took that figure from the figure of 9,700,000 tons we were supposed to have, and I noted there was a difference of 1,670,000 tons. I thought to myself, "This will be very close to the global quotas. If we take off another 150,000 tons from the top, that will bring it to 1,820,000. The President ought to be satisfied with that."

We submitted that as a proposal to the House conferees, and that broke up the conference. The House conferees became quite belligerent. They had not intended that this paper should be regarded as an offer on their side.

The able Senator from Louisiana did not leave the room, but the rest of us did. The Senator from Louisiana stayed. It was said that there was a misunderstanding, that it was not to be understood that the House conferees were offering this paper as evidence. We thought it was their proposal.

Therefore, we tried again.

The Senator from Oregon asked a while ago, "What is Australia doing on this list?" The simple answer is that there had to be some basis for final agreement. The basis, finally, for agreement, was to accept a House list that totaled a reasonable amount in exchange for the House conferees accepting the principle of the global quotas of 1,635,000 tons plus an arrangement whereby the foreign quotas would terminate 2½ years from now, leaving us with domestic quotas for 2 additional years, so that the foreign fight could not be tied in with the domestic fight.

While this is only one man's opinion, I believe the conference report would be of great help, perhaps the greatest help ever, toward putting this program on a correct basis, in order to do the things the Senator has been talking about concerning the economies of these countries. I hope, therefore, that the conference report will be agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. It is true, of course, that we would have a strategic advantage if the foreign quotas expire in the 2½ years which we did not have in 1960, which we did not have in 1961, and which we do not have now. Each time, although the representatives from the cane sugar and the beet sugar areas have, on the whole, loyally stood with us inside the Senate, nevertheless when the problem has gone to conference the conferees have been faced with the fact that the House has been obdurate. Then if the bill lapsed the domestic feature would lapse, also. Therefore, pressure was put on the conferees to accept the House position and to continue the subsidy paid to foreign producers.

As the Senator from New Mexico states, this particular problem will not exist 2½ years from now. That will be a great advantage.

On the other hand, I think one can prophesy that there will be a continuation of a very strong foreign sugar lobby, and we shall hear piteous stories of how we would wreck the Dominican Republic, Honduras, the British West Indies, the Fiji Islands, Australia, South Africa, Mauritius, Panama, Haiti, Paraguay, Ecuador, India, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Colombia, the Netherlands, Guatemala, the French West Indies, Taiwan, El Salvador, Brazil, Mexico, and Peru. We shall all be subjected to that argument once more.

I should like to close on the final point on which the Senator from Arkansas touched several times, and which I think needs to be emphasized. This is the question of what effect the action we take will have upon the possibility of bringing Cuba back into the Association of American States on a democratic, non-Communist basis.

I point out that the proposal of the administration which was adopted by the Senate would allot 2½ million tons to Cuba if, as, and when Cuba comes back as a democratic country. That is less than the 3.2 million tons Cuba had been allotted, because the domestic quota was increased. I personally think that action was a mistake. However, at least 2½ million tons were to be provided.

Under the terms of the present proposal that would be reduced to 1.6 million tons. If honey draws in its wake a couple

of hundred thousand more tons for Argentina and the Dominican Republic, that will leave only 1.4 million tons for Cuba.

Senators know, of course, that this argument will be used to those on the fence in Cuba. They will be told, "Why come back to the American system? Why throw out the Communists when all you will get will be 1.6 million tons or 1.4 million tons instead of the 3.2 million tons you had before?" The anti-Communist movement inside Cuba will be weakened.

Not only that, but what about all the other countries which now have quotas, which would lose some of these quotas if, as, and when Castro was overthrown? This will mean that if Castro is overthrown and it is necessary to go on to the world price basis, those countries will lose money. There would be a direct economic inducement for those countries therefor to oppose the overthrow of Castro and to favor the continuation of communism, because they would make money in that way.

I am sure that was not the intention of the House committee. Of course it was not the intention of the conference committee. That will be the effect, however, inevitably. It will give these countries a vested interest in maintaining Castro in power.

If we are to talk about foreign policy being a consideration, such a policy will strengthen Castro all through Latin America.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. In addition to the 1,635,000 tons, there is a recapture provision. The Senator from Illinois correctly pointed out that the 10-percent recapture is rather slow. Just the same, 10 percent a year for a few years will recapture a great deal. All of that amount will be available for the Cuban quota.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Seventy percent would be available, but that would be at a premium of 2 cents a pound, or $40 a ton.

Mr. ANDERSON. What I am saying is that 30 percent of the amount available, some 340,000 tons, could be added to the 1,635,000 tons, to bring it up to some 2 million tons. I hope that can be used as a constant incentive for the Cubans.

After the war the Philippines wanted to come rapidly back into the sugar market. In the Sugar Act of 1948 we provided a very reasonable, and I think fancy, allotment to the Philippines, so that they could come back rapidly as producers of sugar. They did not do so, however. Years went by without their production increasing greatly.

I believe that the Castro government has had a very severe adverse effect on the sugar production of Cuba. Even after Cuba comes back to the family of nations, as I hope it will, it will take a good many years to build back the production of sugar to its former level.

I only say that I am the individual who stood on the Senate floor some years ago and moved greatly to increase the Cuban quota. I have no antagonism toward the old growers of Cuba. I should like to see Cuba come back again.

I believe the proposal before the Senate would make a move in that direction, although I agree with the Senator from Illinois that it may be inadequate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]—who is my dear friend as well as a dear friend of the Senator from Illinois—and several other Senators have referred to what they say will be chaos if the Senate does not agree to the conference report today or tomorrow. I wonder whether that is not worth a little exploration.

I am not so sure—I ask my friend from Illinois, who is more knowledgeable on the subject, since he is a member of the Committee on Finance, to give me his opinion—exactly what is the chaos to be feared. So far as the people of Pennsylvania are concerned, they would get sugar a little cheaper. We do not raise beet sugar or cane sugar in Pennsylvania. I believe none is raised in Illinois. I would not wish to state the argument on so sectional a basis alone, but it occurs to me that the chaos is not our fault. Any chaos which may result will be the fault of the other body, for failure to accept the administration bill.

I wonder how chaotic it would be if a few ships should land at U.S. ports in the next week or so, bringing in cheap sugar. I wonder whether that might not be in the national interest.

I ask the Senator from Illinois, if a few ships carrying sugar should land, does he not think that might put our friends in the other body under greater pressure than we are under?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania has made an interesting suggestion. He has in mind predominantly what the Senator from Illinois has in mind; namely, the interest of the consumers.

Everybody has been talking about the producing areas. My good friend from Minnesota talked about the Red River Valley. That was not the Red River Valley of the South, but the Red River Valley of the North. I am reminded of the words of the old song:

> Remember the Red River Valley,
> And the cowboy who loves you so true.

The Senator from Minnesota has an affection for the Red River Valley, and for his side of the Red River Valley. His affection is greater than that of the sentimental cowboy who was deserted by his sweetheart in Arkansas.

The consumer's interest is, however, extremely important. I do not think affairs would be thrown into chaos if the consumer were to be able to get her sugar at half a cent a pound less. I think it would be a practical demonstration that the price of sugar has been too high. The program has gone on without anyone knowing what was happening. Five hundred and fifty million dollars, plus $100 million in excise taxes a year, has been taken out of the pockets of the American consumer without her knowing what was happening. Virtually all of it has been distributed either in cash subsidies or in higher prices.

The Department of Agriculture has told that we could let the situation continue for a few days with virtually no effect, or we could have a 30-, 60-, or 90-day extension. There would be no difficulty. Even if the price of sugar did go down, I would not weep over it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was I too personal?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. I can understand the consumer's interest. My point is that I used the word "chaos" in speaking about the difficulties we would be in. I wish to make quite clear that each year there has been an extension of the present situation, more and more acres have been plowed up for sugarbeets. There has been unlimited planting. So each year more and more acres are plowed up. There is a greater demand on the part of producers and refiners to extend and improve the domestic quota.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the proposal has a tendency to aggravate the international situation even more so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota has never really interested himself in the matter of sugar legislation. As a former member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I was interested in the subject merely because it is an agricultural commodity, but proposed sugar legislation has been handled by the Finance Committee.

The administration wanted to come to some kind of agreement this year on a long-term sugar program that included the following facets: First, a domestic quota that was reasonable, with a growth factor that would take into consideration the growth of population and production. Second, the administration wanted to retain the historic quotas for the Western Hemisphere countries with which we have had continuing relationships in the sugar market. Third, the administration wanted to establish the principle of the global quota.

It was the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota, along with others, that we should take a large portion of the Cuban quota and make of it a global quota. This recommendation was made privately and publicly. The Senate bill which was reported from the Senate Committee on Finance contained a domestic quota of 60 percent. As I recall, the growth factor was 65 percent. The bill had what we call historic quotas and a global quota. Those were the provisions in the Senate bill.

It seemed to me that by and large it was a fairly good arrangement.

Actually, the Senate increased the growth factor in the domestic quota a little over what had been recommended by the administration.

Now we are confronted with an entirely different approach. The Senator from Minnesota has recommended the adoption of the conference committee report on the basis that if the conference committee report is not agreed to, we shall be back here a year from now with the same old fight on the same old

ground, only more aggravated, because if the present act is extended, we would have premium payments on all imported sugar. Domestic production would expand.

My point is that we are attempting to make a beginning in the tapering off of premium payments. We would make a beginning on the recapture so as to fill in the Cuban quota. We would establish a 5-year program for the domestic producers. I think it is in the national interest that this be done. I do not think there is any real basic argument on the question, despite all the minutiae that we have discussed today. I cannot help but think that the conference report is a decided improvement in the program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am not a perfectionist. I know that legislation is a process of compromise. I know that our conferees did the very best they could. But I think the program on the whole has been such an iniquitous one, at least so far as its producers are concerned, that it needs to be thoroughly aired on the Senate floor. We should impress upon our colleagues in the House that we in the Senate who believe that the sum involved should go to the Treasury rather than to the foreign producers feel very strongly about that matter and are going to press such a proposal.

I serve notice now that if I am present in the Senate Chamber when the foreign producers come here 2½ years from now, I shall try to remove all of the subsidy which is now paid to them. I know there will be a great difficulty in doing so. I think it is important that they should realize in the meantime that they have no legal vested right in the bonus payments of $60 million which they are going to receive in the next year, or the $46 million which they will get 3 years from now. It is a gratuity to which they have no legal right. It is a sum which will be given to them merely through the generosity of the American Congress. They should adjust themselves to having it taken away from them 3 years from now.

I know that my statement will have no effect on the actions of the countries involved. It will have no effect on their arguments. But the record should be clear. The consumers and the taxpayers of the United States have a right to be considered. I ask the State Department again to inform each country that is given a quota and a subsidy that the arrangement is purely temporary and they have no right to its continuance. They can look forward to a gradual phasing out—that is if I have my way.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana. I should like to make a supplementary point and I will then yield the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to add a little to what my good friend from Minnesota said. If the conference report is agreed to, it will mean a fixed quota for both the sugarcane producers and the beet growers. The growers in Louisiana and Florida start planting sugarcane next month. Farmers will know that their quota is limited to 895,000 tons, and that knowledge will prevent the race to which my good friend from Minnesota has been referring and will put the whole sugar situation on an even keel.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as one of the conferees, I felt it my duty to support the position the Senator has taken with regard to foreign producers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure that the Senator has.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I not only agree with the general burden of his argument about the premium payments to foreign countries, but also I voted for the proposal a year ago when the President was asking us not to vote for it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I assured the Senator that I expected to hold out for that position in the conference. I am frank to tell the Senator that it was my judgment that there would not have been a conference report had I done so. It was my judgment that the Sugar Act would expire, and those of us who are interested in the domestic industry would have had to go to the President and ask him to invoke the defense amendment of the Trade Act in order to do the best that could be done to handle a very bad situation so far as the domestic sugar industry is concerned. Fortunately, it was possible to arrive at a conference report which in my judgment is much better than we had any hope of achieving at the time we went to the conference.

As I recall, last year this Nation purchased at premium payments 2,840,000 tons of sugar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. From countries other than the Philippines.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator understands that with respect to the Philippines we are bound by treaty, and we have no choice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This year we shall purchase only about 1,200,000 tons at premium prices.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; the Senator from Illinois has said that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So we shall have greatly reduced the amount. About 60 percent of the purchases this year will be at the world market price, under the conference report.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has been criticized substantially on the floor for cutting too much from the premium price. The Senator made reference to the quotas which the House bill had in it. South Africa was referred to. It was in for 120,000 tons. We are cutting it down, in the conference report, to 20,000 tons. That is, it will be 20,000 tons instead of 120,000 tons. India had 130,000 tons at the premium price. Under the conference report, India would get premium payments on 20,000 tons.

Australia also was referred to. Australia had 200,000 tons at premium prices. Australia, under the conference report, would get 40,000 tons at premium prices.

We were not able to cut them out entirely, but we have cut them by about 20 percent from what the House bill provided.

French West Indies had 40,000 tons. We cut that to 30,000 tons.

Brazil had 340,000 tons at premium prices. That amount has been reduced to 180,000 tons. The British West Indies had 250,000 tons at premium prices.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe it was 350,000 tons.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The British West Indies were in for 250,000 tons. We cut it down to 90,000 tons at premium prices. Peru was in for 350,000 tons at premium prices. Under the conference report it would get 190,000 tons, slightly more than half. The Dominican Republic was in for 350,000 tons at premium prices. In the report we would cut that to 190,000 tons. Mexico was in for 350,000 tons. We bring it down to 190,000 tons. There are more reductions. The major reduction is with regard to the Republic of China, which we cut to 150,000 tons.

The Senator knows that after we have reduced some of these countries we are going to be called on to give them more in foreign aid because we have taken away from them funds they were getting under the Sugar Act. In other words, we would be taking away from them income which they had derived previously under the Sugar Act. It is money which they will contend should be made up to them at least in part in foreign aid. We can meet that problem when we face it. But that is one of the things the Senator has advocated.

It seems to me that on principle we have achieved what the Senator has been contending, and that is that the premium payments should be phased out. Dollarwise we have succeeded in disposing of two-thirds of the payments in this one bill. We have also placed ourselves in such a position that, come the expiration of the foreign phases, we shall be in a strong position to consider what the Senator believes should be done further so far as the foreign aid sections are concerned.

So far as the domestic portion is concerned, I hope very much that if we get the Senator's program for the foreign part of it, he will not compel us to take the program that he is advocating for the domestic industry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have never accused the conference committee of doing badly. I said that they did better than I feared they would, but not as well as I hoped they would.

I should like to close on one final note, and that is that there is in the conference report the House provision which prohibits the importation into the United States of any refined sugar. We formerly permitted the importation of 250,000 tons of refined sugar. This is no longer to be permitted. We have adopted, so far as this prinicple is concerned, mercantilism in its purest from. Mercantilism permits the importation of raw materials provided they are to be fabricated or processed inside this country.

We all know that in the past the sugar program has been put over by a triple alliance, the foreign sugar producers, the domestic sugar producers, and the Atlantic coast refiners. Again and again President Roosevelt pointed the finger at the Atlantic coast refiners. The Atlantic coast refiners were successful in limiting the importation of refined sugar to 250,000 tons. Now they have been successful in eliminating all importation of refined sugar. It must come in raw. What will this mean to the refiners in Cuba if, as, and when Cuba comes back into the democratic alliance and its mills again refine sugar from raw sugar?

The Atlantic coast refiners have been putting the thumbscrews on the freedom of trade in such matters. That is another weakness in the bill as it finally appears.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What was in the Senate bill on that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It permitted the importation of 250,000 tons of refined sugar.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to state to my friend from Illinois, if he will permit me to do so——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the only refining factory in Cuba was owned by Americans in Hershey, Pa. That was recently sold to Cuban interests. Of course, Castro has all of it now. So in my judgment there is no further need for 250,000 tons of imported refined sugar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In general it is a bad policy for a country to follow. It is mercantilism. We are following the mercantilistic theory, under which only raw material can come in for purpose of being fabricated in this country. This was the basis of the theory and practice of Colbert in France, and of the British mercantilists. As one who believes in greater freedom of trade, I believe this is in direct contradiction to the basic theory of low tariffs.

Perhaps I am tipping my hand prematurely, but when this act, so far as the foreign quotas are concerned, comes up in 2½ years from now I hope the Senate will reverse itself and permit the importation of at least 250,000 tons of refined sugar. I do not have too much hope about this, but I certainly believe the struggle should be made. I am an unabashed low tariff man. I am not ashamed of that fact. I am proud of it. I hope to see that principle followed.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I hesitate to take the time of the Senate at this late hour, but I should like to make a few remarks on this subject. First, let me say that I particularly agree with the final statement of the Senator from Illinois. My basic objection to the proposed legislation, as I stated the other day, is that it is contrary to the spirit of the trade bill which the House passed a few days ago. We find ourselves riding off in two different directions at the same time. The Sugar Act gives inducement to an expansion of the domestic sugar industry. I object to that, because I do not think in the long run it is for the benefit of either this country or of individual foreign countries.

I have made some calculations concerning some of the countries which have been given quotas. For example, the Irish have been given a quota. Ireland is not listed by name, but it will be included under the provisions of the bill. Everyone has mentioned it. The State-Agriculture Departments projection shows the export capability of Ireland—that is, of refined sugar—is 25,000 tons. Their domestic production is up about 30 percent in the last 5 years.

Ireland imported more than 50,000 tons of raw sugar in each of the last 5 years and exported a little more than 15,000 tons of refined sugar the past 3 years. In 1960, 22,000 tons of its imports came from Cuba. There is no report as to how much came from Cuba in 1961.

In other words, here is a situation in which a deficit country has not produced, apparently, all its own needs, although it was rapidly increasing domestic production; or, to put it in another way, the bill will induce the expansion of an almost nonexistent sugar export program in Ireland. I think this goes in the wrong direction. Generally speaking, the bill not only induces an uneconomic domestic sugar industry by this very great subsidy, but does so in other countries, as well.

Under the conference report, we are going to provide a subsidy to South Africa. There is no excuse whatever for that. All we are doing is picking up what South Africa lost in the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. The Union of South Africa formerly sold sugar to the Commonwealth under this agreement. When they left the Commonwealth they lost this preferred market. South Africa does not need this subsidy; it is relatively well off. South Africa is the largest gold-producing country in the free world. If I am correctly informed, its balance of payments is all right. There is no excuse for our providing South Africa with a sugar subsidy.

Much the same can be said of Australia. There is no excuse for granting a subsidy to Australia. Australia has the capacity, according to the State-Agriculture projection, to produce 840,000 tons for export; 600,000 tons is marketed under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. Australia markets over half of its sugar at the world price, some even to Commonwealth nations. For the past 5 years, she has had a carryover of almost 800,000 tons.

In 1961, the United States purchased 90,000 tons from Australia. Australia is one country that can compete in sugar on an equitable basis; this is evident for she is already selling a large part of her production at the world price. Yet, it is proposed here to give Australia a quota. If there is any excuse for that, I cannot see it.

The conference has given to British Honduras a quota of 10,000 tons. She reportedly has the ability to produce 13,000 tons for export. But British Honduras already has a 19,000-ton quota under the British Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. Yet we are extending to British Honduras a quota of 10,000 tons which she has not had, at a time when she has not even had sufficient production to fill her quota under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. So here is a good example of our going out of our way to induce additional production in a country which does not now produce enough to fulfill its existing preferential quotas.

I thoroughly agree with the theory advanced by the Senator from Illinois a moment ago about mercantilism. We are destroying the normal flow of trade of those countries well adapted to produce sugar and inducing artificial production in other countries, like British Honduras.

The Netherlands is a most peculiar example. The Netherlands is an overall importer of sugar. In 1961, the Netherlands imported more than 150,000 tons of sugar, including, incidentally, about 30,000 tons from Cuba. The Netherlands exports last year totaled about 60,000 tons.

The United States, with purchases of almost 10,000 tons in 1961, was the Netherlands' second largest customer; this was all refined sugar, made from imported raw sugar. I have never heard anybody attempt to explain what excuse there is for such an arrangement. Why should we raise the Netherlands' 4,000-ton quota to 10,000? I do not quite understand why there was even a 4,000-ton quota to begin with. In any case, there is no reason whatever, to justify the way in which this quota has been arbitrarily allocated.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. How would it be determined which Netherlands producer would receive the order for the additional subsidy?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not really know. Does the Senator mean which individual company within the Netherlands would receive the quota?

Mr. GORE. Yes; how would that be determined?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know. That question would have to be asked of one of the experts in this field. I do not know whether that question was ever raised in committee.

Mr. GORE. Let us consider the Union of South Africa. To what producer would the United States pay the subsidy?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Frankly, I do not know. It might be through associations which are represented by lobbyists; and the amount would be distributed in accordance with the production. But I do not know.

Mr. GORE. It is an interesting question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is not in the Chamber. He may be able to answer the Senator when he returns.

Mr. GORE. The question was raised earlier in a discussion as to the advisability of having the proceeds from the tariff on sugar which was imported, if such a tariff should be levied, go into the Treasury of the United States. Is not

that customarily the repository of receipts from tariffs?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator believe that our Treasury is slightly depleted?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is badly in need of revenue at the moment.

Mr. GORE. I should like to ask the Senate to interpret the premium price principle with respect to the balance of payments. We have a great program in effect to increase exports. Is it not true that the premium price program exports dollars?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does; at artificially high prices for commodities which we could buy for almost half of what we pay.

Mr. GORE. How does the Senator square this principle with the principle of the reciprocal trade program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not. I have said before, and I say today, that this principle is directly contrary to the spirit of the Trade Act which was recently passed by the House, and to the spirit of the reciprocal trade program, because we are seeking to make the United States self-sufficient in a commodity which we are not naturally equipped to produce economically. The principle of free trade is that each country produces in accordance with its natural advantages, so that the most efficient producer in each land will produce; and then other countries will trade with them.

I think the Sugar Act arrangement injures all other agriculture of an export nature. In the long run, I should say that this bill, in a very subtle way, would be inimical to the fortunes of the cotton producer, the rice producer, the wheat producer, or the tobacco producer in exporting his commodity, because we are, in a sense, tightening the free application of international trade in agriculture. One of the most serious problems today is agriculture—that is, the problems of agriculture going into the Common Market. That is really what has been holding up the entry of the British into the Common Market. In my opinion, a bill of this kind would contribute to that difficulty.

Mr. GORE. A question has been raised about the advisability of encouraging more production at home, and thus requiring the American taxpayer to pay heavier subsidies. I think there is some validity to that contention. But if the alternative is to pay a subsidy to some unknown producer in the Union of South Africa——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is outrageous; I agree with the Senator.

Let me cover the first part of the Senator's inquiry. The Senator raised a question about increasing domestic production.

If we are already in business—and I have always maintained that since Louisiana, for example, has been in the sugarcane business for a hundred years, sugarcane growers are entitled to consideration just as the corn or cotton or tobacco grower, or any other grower of agricultural products——

Mr. GORE. I fully share the Senator's sentiment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have made the best effort possible. We are not satisfied with the programs in other fields; but on balance, cotton, rice, and tobacco are in good condition. They are not out of balance. I think the last administration, for political reasons, not economic reasons, got corn production out of line. The acreage for the others has been held down.

In the case of sugar we would not only assist those already in the business, but we would actually pay others handsomely to go into the business. If we were successful, I suppose it would not be possible to produce enough sugarbeets in the United States, even though it is said to be important in connection with our self-defense. After all, we are much better able to grow corn, cotton, rice, and so forth. But the 45,000 farmers in this country who grow sugarcane and beets make more money. The other day someone showed me figures that shows this bill amounts to a payment of about $10,000 for each of them. I think there is nothing comparable to that. So this is very special treatment for a very select, small group; and I do not see the justification for it. I think it is contrary to the overall interests of agriculture, and those who have been engaged in agriculture for years.

Mr. GORE. But regardless of whether that is justified or is not justified, I fail to see any merit whatever, any merit of any sort, in selecting—by some process I do not understand—certain producers in the Union of South Africa, and stating that the U.S. Government, despite the condition of its Treasury and despite its balance-of-payments difficulty, will give them a subsidy of $50 a ton.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no explanation for it that I can understand, nor have I heard any this afternoon.

Mr. GORE. And what about Ireland?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have heard all the debate today, and I do not think anyone has attempted to justify the treatment proposed to be given to South Africa, except to say, "Well, we had to do it; we could not have everything our own way."

Mr. President, I hold in my hand perhaps the best explanations of how these subsidies are arrived at. I call these to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee, and ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an analysis of the lobbying arrangements made in connection with this bill. I believe they cover all but one of the countries which have been given quotas. These are records taken from both the official registration statements in the Department of Justice and from certain material furnished to the Senate Finance Committee at the request of the Senator from Illinois, when he was acting chairman. I think these are accurate figures; we believe them to be.

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

AUSTRALIA

Robert C. Barnard.

Client: Colonial Sugar Refining Co., Ltd.

Contract: An oral arrangement under which payments received are based on the amounts of work involved together with reimbursements for out-of-pocket disbursements. The agreement is terminable at any time by either party on giving notice.

Fee: As reported by Mr. Barnard to Senate Finance Committee June 23, 1962:

Period covered	Fees	Disbursements incurred	Disbursements reimbursed
Jan. 1 through June 30, 1961	$10,500	$606.98	$286.78
July 1 through Dec. 31, 1961	8,250	1,618.17	1,876.08

To be included in June 30, 1962, foreign agents registration statement

	Fees	Disbursements
Jan. 1 through Mar. 31, 1962	$4,400	$466.83

BRAZIL

Albert S. Nemir (A. S. Nemir Associates).

Client: Brazilian Sugar and Alcohol Institute.

Contract: An agreement entered into March 9, 1962, covers a period to December 31, 1962. In a letter to the Senate Finance Committee dated June 26, 1962, Mr. Albert Nemir stated that "we have not yet finalized our agreement in detail since this contract is not designed to be for representation to the Congress, but is designed for the purpose of developing a budget to maintain a permanent office in the United States to cover a broad category of services, including technical research, legal counsel, marketing research, sales service, as well as research necessary in Brazil including domestic and foreign travel expenses,"

Fee: The agreement provides for a minimum fee of $25,000 a year.

"The agreement provides further for a set-aside amounting to approximately 20 percent of normal sugar brokerage with a ceiling on the associates' earnings per year under certain conditions and with a possible acceleration beyond this ceiling under other conditions. The agreement further provides that the minimum fee paid to the associates by the institute may be charged against the total fee paid by the institute. All expenses are for the account of the associates and the budgeting of expenditures under the agreement is left to the discretion of the associates, it being understood that the budget must be based on the availability of revenue from the operation of the agreement."

This comes to about 25 cents a ton.

BRITISH HONDURAS

L. Blaine Liljenquist.

Client: Representing Government of British Honduras on matters pertaining to the securing of a sugar quota under the U.S. Sugar Act.

Contract: Letter of authorization.

Fee: None, but has an interest in the sugar mill that would be constructed if a 30,000-ton U.S. quota is granted.

BRITISH WEST INDIES

Arthur Quinn.

Client: British West Indies Sugar Association (Inc.).

Contract: Contract on file was entered into on December 1, 1960, to run until November 30, 1961. On November 14, 1961, the contract was extended for 1 additional year.

Fee: $20,000 per annum with a payment of $5,000 per annum for expenses.

Notes: Mr. Quinn also represents the Sugar Industry of Ecuador. The agreement filed in 1961 provides for payments of $800 a month plus $200 a month in expenses.

REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Robert L. Farrington.

Client: Chinese Government Procurement and Services Mission.

Contract: Represent the Republic of China regarding sugar legislation. Contract entered into February 5, 1962.

Fee: Client agrees to pay attorney for the above services a retainer fee of $2,500 upon the acceptance of this contract, plus $500 per month, payable monthly, for each month until the end of the present session of the Congress, or until the sugar legislation above referred to has been enacted into law, whichever event occurs first. Client also agrees to reimburse attorney for necessary expenses.

Fees and payments reported by Mr. Farrington are $2,500 for the initial retainer fee; monthly payments of $500 per month for the months of February through June, inclusive; and $291.36 for expenses, a total of $5,291.36.

COLOMBIA

Ernest Schein.

Client: Distribuidora de Azucares, S.A., Azucareros Independientes, Ltda., Compania Azucarera del Valle, S.A., of Colombia.

Contract: Contract to run until end of the 1st session of 88th Congress which is estimated as the summer of 1963.

Fee: "(a) A retainer of $15,000 payable before I am required to make a statement in your behalf before the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives of the United States conducting hearings on proposed amendments to the Sugar Act.

"(b) On any allotment of U.S. sugar imports from foreign areas in favor of the Republic of Colombia in excess of 10,000 tons per year up to 30,000 tons, an amount equal to $0.50 per ton of such excess.

"(c) On any allotment of U.S. sugar imports from foreign areas in favor of the Republic of Colombia in excess of 30,000 tons per year, an amount equal to $0.25 per ton of such excess.

"(d) It is understood and agreed that compensation under items (b) and (c) will be payable to me only if during the period of my employment a regular sugar quota for the Republic of Colombia is included in the amendments to the Sugar Act of the United States "It is further understood that you will reimburse me for reasonable incidental expenses."

COSTA RICA

Dina Dellale.

Client: Camara de Azucareros de Costa Rica.

Contract: Agreement is oral and runs to the end of 1963. Contract is to represent the client in all their business in the United States, including the sugar bill.

Fee: $9,000 per year including expenses.

Notes: The registrant reported to the Justice Department a minimum fee of $5,000 per year plus additional amounts if services should warrant.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Philip F. Maguire.

Client: Comision de Defensa del Azucar y Fomento de la Cana

Contract: Agreement is to run from May, 1962, until February, 1963.

Fee: $18,000 for the above period to be paid in three equal installments of $6,000 on June 1, September 1, and December 1, 1962. Expenses to be reimbursed.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

G. Douglass Debevoise.

Client: In a letter to the Senate Finance Committee dated June 25, 1962, Mr. Debevoise stated that he testified before the committee as president of the South Puerto Rico Sugar Co. and did so at the request of their board of directors. He further stated the company retains the Washington law firm of Messrs. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene for services covering Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic and Europe. At $20,000 a year.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Walter Sterling Surrey (Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene).

Client: South Puerto Rico Sugar Co.

Contract: Retainer agreement was entered into September 1956.

Fee: According to Mr. Surrey's letter dated June 25, 1962, to the Senate Finance Committee:

"Subsequent to September 12, 1956, the agreement with South Puerto Rico Sugar Corp. was modified without a written amendment to increase the retainer to $20,000 per year and to include services to be rendered both in Puerto Rico and in Europe through this firm's office in Paris."

ECUADOR

I. Irving Davidson.

Client: Ecuadorian Sugar Producers.

Contract and fee: In a letter dated June 25, 1962, to the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. Davidson stated as follows:

"I have recommended to the Ecuadorian Sugar Producers that they grant me permission to give you a copy of our agreement.

"My quarterly report filed pursuant to the Federal regulation of the Lobbying Act is correct. The only moneys I have received to date from my principals, the Ecuadorian Sugar Producers, is the $500 which appears on this statement."

According to reports, Davidson's fee calls for a contingent payment of at least 50 cents a ton.

FIJI ISLANDS

Charles H. Brown.

Client: South Pacific Sugar Mills, Ltd., and the Colonial Sugar Refining Co., Ltd.

Contract: The firm was retained on January 30, 1961, for a period of 3 months commencing January 31, 1961, to explore U.S. marketing possibilities for the Fiji sugar industry. According to a letter dated June 25, 1962, sent to the Senate Finance Committee, one-third of the firm's work for the client has been devoted to contacting Members of Congress relative to the status of sugar legislation.

Fee: $2,000 a month, plus normal out-of-pocket disbursements. Mr. Brown states that no contingency fee is charged.

GUADELOUPE AND MARTINIQUE

Walter Sterling Surrey (Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene).

Client: Amerop Commodities Corp.

Contract: 2. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron will also represent Amerop Commodities Corp. for the purpose of security authorization for the purchase of cane sugar for the U.S. market at the U.S. market price from private sugar producers located in Martinique, Guadeloupe, and Reunion. In this connection, it is recognized that the ultimate objective is to secure for these areas a permanent quota under the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Fee: 4. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron shall be compensated at the following rate: $10,000 upon this agreement coming into effect and thereafter at an annual retainer, beginning January 1, 1961, of $35,000 of which $15,000 is allocable to representation related to paragraph 2 above, it being recognized that it is the intent of both parties to continue this agreement in subsequent years.

5. Surrey, Krasik, Gould & Efron will be reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred by it in connection with the representation of your company.

Agreement amended November 17, 1961, as follows:

"In accordance with discussions we have held between us and in view of the fact it is expected there will be hearings on sugar legislation during 1962, it is agreed between us that the retainer agreement now effective, and as set forth in paragraph 4 of the letter of September 27, 1960, shall be amended by providing for the annual retainer to be paid Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene by Amerop Commodities Corp. to be at the rate of $40,000 for the calendar year of 1962."

GUATEMALA

Sheldon Z. Kaplan.

Client: Guatemalan Sugar Producers Association.

Contract: Agreement dated March 5, 1960, to extend over a period of 18 months.

Fee: $5,000 a year. The client, in a letter dated March 5, 1960, suggests that "should the proposed operation of this association become successful, we are prepared to better the fee hereby offered."

Notes: In a letter to the Senate Finance Committee dated June 25, 1962, Kaplan reported receipt of $5,000 for calendar year 1960, $5,000 for calendar year 1961 and $12,000 for 1962.

HAITI

James H. Rowe, Jr. (Corcoran, Youngman & Rowe).

Client: Haytian American Sugar Co.

Contract: An oral agreement. Firm retained for a period of 2 years beginning February 15, 1962.

Fee: Monthly retainer of $1,250. Out-of-pocket expenses reimbursed. Expenses February to June 1962, reported as approximately $300. Mr. Rowe reports that no contingent fee is charged.

INDIA

James W. Riddell (Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell).

Client: India Sugar Mills Association.

Contract: Agreement dated May 21, 1962, to advance the interests of India Sugar Mills Association before the executive departments and the Congress in obtaining a sugar quota allocation for India under the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948 as amended, and specifically under the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962.

Fee: "It is understood between us that our compensation shall be as follows:

"1. If the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962 extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, for a period of 3 years or longer, then $33,000 per year, but not to exceed $99,000 together with expenses not to exceed $5,000 per year, and not to exceed a total of $15,000.

"2. If the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962 extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, for a period of 2 years, then $33,000 per year, together with expenses not to exceed $5,000 per year.

"3. If the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962 extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, for a period of 1 year then $50,000 per year, together with expenses not to exceed $5,000 per year.

"It is also understood between us that in the event the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962 are enacted by the Congress without any consideration being given to the position of India by the terms of the legislation, this understanding of employment between us shall be terminable at the election of the Indian Sugar Mills Association (Export Agency Division), and that we shall be entitled in that event only to that compensation referred to in the above-numbered subparagraph (3), that is to say, $50,000 together with any expenses not to exceed $5,000 incurred on behalf of the association."

Notes: In his letter to the Senate Finance Committee dated June 25, 1962, Mr. Riddell states that the fee of his firm is not contingent on the quota allocated.

IRELAND

George Bronz.

Client: Irish Export Board.

Contract: According to Mr. Bronz no explicit agreement, written or oral was made with respect to services rendered (exhibit B—foreign agents registration statement).

Fee: Bronz states that he expects to bill the Export Board at his usual hourly rate of $35 an hour for the time spent. "No contingency of any kind is involved."

MAURITIUS

Ralph W. Gardner (Gardner, Morrison & Rogers).

Client: Mauritius Sugar Syndicate.

Contract: Contract to run from June 29, 1961, to December 31, 1962.

Fee: The sugar syndicate agreed to pay during the period £8,000 sterling plus expenses not greater than £100 sterling. (The dollar equivalent of £8,000 sterling is $22,243.78). The agreement further stipulated that if, prior to January 1, 1962, the situation with respect to Cuba has so changed that it appeared there was no longer any need for the services, the syndicate could so advise prior to January 1, 1962, and under those circumstances the syndicate would not be liable to pay the second £4,000 installment of the fee.

Notes: Mr. Gardner reported to the Senate Finance Committee in a letter dated June 25, 1962, receipts of $11,121.89 on July 26, 1961, and $11,220.95 on January 12, 1962. He also stated that no additional fees were due the firm regardless of whether Mauritius obtains a sugar quota. Expenses were listed at $184.38.

MEXICO

Oscar L. Chapman.

Client: Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S.A. de C. V.

Contract: Term of the agreement is for 4 years beginning January 1, 1961.

Fee: An annual fee of $50,000 U.S. currency in quarterly payments of $12,500 on the first day of the months of January, April, July, and October of each year, and in addition to the above for one time only 25 cents per tons of increase in Mexico's basic or permanent quota of sugar exports to the American market, which amounted to 115,809 tons in 1960.

NICARAGUA

I. Irving Davidson.

Client: Government of Nicaragua.

Contract and fee: In a letter dated June 26, 1962, to the Senate Finance Committee Mr. Davidson stated he had no specific agreement with the Government of Nicaragua concerning any compensation for his lobbying activities for the sugar quota. "If needed, the sum of $500 will be allotted for those expenses from my overall public relations fee."

Notes: In reports filed with the Department of Justice, Mr. Davidson has reported receiving $1,000 a month from the Government of Nicaragua although no written contract is on file.

NICARAGUA

Ganson Purcell (Purcell & Nelson).

Client: Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd.

Contract: The firm states that its representation is terminable at any time and is not contingent upon the oucome of legislation pending before the Congress. A quarterly retainer fee is charged.

Fee: Fees and reimbursement of expenses received for representation of Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., February 2, 1960, through June 20, 1962, were reported to the Senate Finance Committee by Purcell & Nelson as follows:

Fees and reimbursement of expenses received for representation of Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., February 2, 1960, through June 30, 1962

Feb. 2 through Sept. 30, 1960:	
Initial retainer	$2,500.00
Additional fees	2,500.00
Expenses	190.28
Subtotal	5,190.28

Fees and reimbursement of expenses received for representation of Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., February 2, 1960, through June 30, 1962—Continued

Oct. 1, 1960, to June 30, 1962:	
7 quarterly retainer payments of 1,250 each	[1] $8,750.00
Additional fee for January through March 1962	750.00
Expenses	364.91
Subtotal	9,864.91
Total	15,055.19

[1] During May and June 1962, extensive work has been done in connection with the preparation of evidence for presentation before the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Finance Committee. Charges for services rendered during the current quarter are, therefore, expected to exceed substantially the $1,250 retainer. Expenses for the period have not been determined but will not differ in nature from those previously incurred.

PANAMA

Wesley E. McDonald, Sr.

Client: Asociacion Nacional De Productores De Asucar.

Contract: To represent the association at any hearings held before the Senate committee on the matter of increasing the quota of sugar for Panama.

Fee: An inclusive fee of $1,500 plus expenses.

PERU

John C. Duncan.

Client: In a letter dated June 25, 1962, to the Senate Finance Committee Mr. Duncan stated that he testified before the committee as an official of W. R. Grace & Co. which owns sugar properties in Peru. "This was done at the request of other Peruvian sugar producers. I have no agreement with and will receive no payment from the Peruvian producers."

Note: Mr. Duncan is not registered with the Department of Justice as a foreign agent.

PHILIPPINES

John A. O'Donnell.

Client: Philippine Sugar Association.

Contract: Present contract period from January 1, 1961, to December 31, 1962, to serve as general counsel in Washington of the Philippine Sugar Association.

Fee: $2,500 a month including expenses.

EL SALVADOR

Rocco C. Siciliano.

Client: Sugar Producers Association of El Salvador.

Contract: Basic retainer fee for calendar year 1962 for legal services and representation of the association before Congress and executive agencies.

Fee: Financial terms set forth by Mr. Siciliano are as follows:

"1. $10,000 basic retainer for calendar year 1962.

"2. Should further services be desired during calendar year 1963 a basic retainer of $15,000 payable in equal installments at the beginning of each quarter.

"3. Reimbursement of necessary expenses including travel will be paid upon proper itemization."

This contract was signed June 21, 1962, 9 days before the bill ran out.

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

John R. Mahoney (Casey, Lane & Mittendorf).

Client: South African Sugar Association.

Contract: Verbal agreement reached in May 1961.

Fee: Casey, Lane paid in accordance with the time charges expended by partners and associates of the firm at rates ranging from $12.50 to $50 an hour depending upon which partner or associate worked on the matter. Expenses to be reimbursed.

Note: Mr. Mahoney in a letter dated June 25, 1962, to the Senate Finance Committee states that the firm of Casey, Lane & Mittendorf has neither asked for nor received a retainer fee and that no contingency fee of any type is involved. Time charges for February and March 1962 were listed as approximately $4,900 and expenses $49.45.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, when the Senator from Tennessee asks what is the explanation, I say the nearest explanation I have found is contained in those records with regard to lobbying. They constitute the only explanation which appears to have any relevance to some of the quotas, so far as I have been able to ascertain.

Mr. GORE. Did the Senator from Arkansas say Argentina did or did not employ lobbyists?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Argentina did not have a lobbyist and was left out. Mauritius, which did have a lobbyist, was left out.

I hold in my hand a telegram which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 30, 1962.*

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference sugar bill. I call your urgent attention discriminatory exclusion of Argentine quota of 20,000 tons in approved version of House subject to prompt Senate consideration. Argentina only Latin American sugar exporting country excluded while others in similar condition from Europe, Africa, and Asia have been granted old and new quotas including highly developed countries. No other quota country faces such large trade deficit vis-a-vis United States as Argentina. This means serious setback in Alliance for Progress efforts. I request friendly gesture toward Argentina by Senate including Argentina quota 20,000 tons. Regards,

ROBERTO ALEMANN,
Argentine Ambassador.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the telegram is from the Argentina Ambassador, who, of course, is the legitimate representative of Argentina in this country; he is not a hired lobbyist, as are the ones to whom I referred a moment ago—U.S. citizens who have been employed by foreign governments to plead their cause before Congress.

In the telegram the Argentine Ambassador states:

Reference sugar bill, I call your urgent attention [to] discriminatory exclusion of Argentine quota of 20,000 tons in approved version of House, subject to prompt Senate consideration. Argentina [is] only Latin American sugar exporting country excluded, while others in similar condition from Europe, Africa, and Asia have been granted old and new quotas, including highly developed countries. No other quota country faces such large trade deficit vis-a-vis United States as Argentina.

And I think that is true. Argentina buys from us, but has a deficit in her trade.

I read further from the telegram:

This means serious setback in Alliance for Progress efforts. I request friendly gesture

toward Argentina by Senate's including Argentine quota [of] 20,000 tons.

Mr. President, one interesting thing about Argentina is that it is not necessary to build up a sugar industry there, as is necessary in the case of some of the other countries referred to, for Argentina has been exporting 150,000 tons a year, for the world market. Argentina trades with us, but has a deficit in her balance of payments. She did not employ a lobbyist with regard to the Sugar Act. I do not want these remarks to be interpreted by any other countries as urging them to employ lobbyists, because I do not think it is a good practice. In one case, just a week before this bill was to be taken up, a Washington lawyer made a deal with a foreign producing association involving a very substantial sum of money to be paid for lobbying before the Congress. I do not think that is good practice. That does not take place in connection with other agricultural bills, so far as I know. We hear from representatives of the American Farm Bureau or the Farmers Union, who are well known, and are on the payrolls of those institutions. But they are not paid exorbitant sums of $10,000 a month or $50,000 a year, or contingent fees of $100,000, to help in connection with the passage of a single bill. I have not heard of anything like that in connection with any other agricultural bill.

Representatives of various agricultural organizations come to see me as they see all other Members of Congress; usually they are representatives of the farm cooperatives and similar organizations. I do not think there is anything wrong with that, for they are very helpful, inasmuch as most of them are well informed. But they do not engage in the kind of frenetic activities which have been indulged in in connection with this sugar bill.

Incidentally, staff members who went to the Department of Justice to inspect the records in connection with foreign agent registrations discovered that the registration law is almost being ignored, insofar as many of its requirements are concerned. Lobbyists do not file the details of their agreements. The law requires periodic filing, with details as to what they are paid and what the money is spent for. But in some cases they file only generalized statements, without any itemization regarding what was done with the money or without other details the law requires. In other words, the law is flouted by many of them—although occasionally one will file properly. But the theory of that act, which was passed in 1938, was that by revealing what those employed by foreign countries do—the act does not provide any penalty for being employed by another country; it is prefectly legitimate to be employed as a lobbyist, but those thus employed are required to reveal the facts—the act will operate as a sufficient restraint, so as to prevent abuse. But now we find that many of them do not abide by that law.

Furthermore, I think the information we did receive indicates exorbitant payments by some countries, including countries which, ironically enough, cannot afford to make such payments unless we make these large subsidies available to them. For example, consider Panama, which is friendly to us. We have many ways of helping her—for instance, in connection with our Panama Canal Treaty. That is perfectly legitimate, and we have revised it once; but times change, and further revisions may be justified. Panama has a sugar allocation of 4,000 tons under the present act, but the conference report would increase it to 15,000 tons. However, the State-Agriculture report shows that the current production of sugar in Panama available for export is only 5,000 tons.

So here we have a case in which the country is not producing the quota authorized by the conference report.

The argument is made that at the end of 2 years we can stop it or we can take another look at it. Look at the situation when a country is producing only 5,000 tons, and we induce her to increase production to 15,000 tons in order to get a large subsidy. At the end of 2 years, do Senators think we are going to say, "No longer"? The foreign country has a large investment in cultivation and preparation of soil. which is not an easy thing. The theory is that it can be cut back, but I do not think it will be done. All that will be done will be to inspire uneconomic sugar production in Panama. We shall really be doing that country an injury in the long run. We shall be doing a shortrun injury to Panama if we remove the subsidy, or a longrun injury to the American taxpayer if we do not. It is a bad thing, in my opinion.

In 1961 the United States authorized the purchase of 10,000 tons from Panama but that country was able to supply only 7,700 tons, and all of that was refined sugar, which I assume under this bill could no longer come into this country. We are holding out a carrot to her to increase her production over a 2-year period, at the end of which time inevitably there will be a demand to continue, and it will be a just demand.

For Guatemala the conferees provided a 20,000-ton quota. In the past 3 years production in Guatemala has increased 100 percent. In 1961, the United States authorized Guatemala to sell us 17,000 tons, of which she was able to supply only about one-half.

Early this year she sought aid from the Export-Import Bank for a sugar mill which was justified on the basis of sugar sales at premium prices to the United States. This loan was very properly refused. But here again this bill is inducing them to produce for the American market.

El Salvador has been given a quota of 10,000 tons. According to the State-Agriculture projection, she can produce 13,000 tons. In 1961 the United States authorized 12,000 tons, but El Salvador could not supply the last 600 tons.

Again, El Salvador is one of the small, poor countries paying an exorbitant fee to a lobbyist to obtain a quota, which will create a new high-cost industry tied to the U.S. market. It is no argument to suggest that the Dominican Republic is getting a quota and so should others. People say, "Why the Dominican Republic?" At least she has a tradition of production and supply, just as Louisiana does.

The conferees provided Ecuador with a quota of 25,000 tons. The State-Agriculture projection shows that she will be able to produce a much lesser amount. Her production has increased substantially in anticipation of this quota.

Similarly with Paraguay, a country which has received a quota of 10,000 tons in the conference report. The Agriculture-State projection shows an ability to produce 9,000 tons, 1,000 tons less than the quota in this bill. It would have the same effect on Paraguay, getting her to increase an industry beyond what it is now capable of producing.

All of this is very bad policy and I believe will inevitably lead to disappointment on their part or to disaster on our part.

If times do not change pretty substantially, we probably shall be forced to do something sooner or later, most likely under difficult conditions.

If we do not have the foresight to see what is going to happen and take measures now, we are asking for disaster.

I have further remarks, but they have been covered so well by the Senator from Illinois that I know they would be repetitious, and I see no reason to further belabor the RECORD.

While I am on my feet, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the conference report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope the Senate will review the record.

One last word. Much has been said about what will happen if this matter goes over for a few days. I invite attention to pages 78 and 79 of the Senate Finance Committee hearings. This question was raised with Mr. Murphy and Mr. Myers, who is the head of the Sugar Division of the Agriculture Department. It is very clear from them that no disaster would occur, if this matter were to go over for a few days for further consideration. It is very clear from this statement that if the Senate were to reject the report, and it went back to the House, in the light of these new discussions, the House might find it possible to go along with the Senate's version of the bill, which certainly was infinitely better than the conference report. I think it is worth the effort.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Arkansas in expressing disappointment over the conference report. As one of the conferees, I did not sign it because it went too far in accepting the allocation of basic quotas to many foreign countries.

Under the House-approved bill, permanent allocations of basic quotas were made to 25 countries. The conference report provides for basic quotas to 24 countries, with 2 countries deleted and another added. Argentina has been eliminated, but apparently there is a movement afoot to give Argentina its quota under a later bill. The other country deleted was Mauritius, but, on the other hand, the conferees added to the bill the Republic of Ireland.

So far as the allocation of basic quotas are concerned, the only difference be-

tween the bill as approved by the conference report, and the bill sent over by the House, the so-called Cooley bill, is that the Republic of Ireland has been substituted for Mauritius. Apparently, there are more Irish votes in Boston than there are Mauritians.

Anyway, Ireland gets an allocation of about 10,000 tons as basic quota at the premium payment rate.

As the Senator from Arkansas pointed out, there is no deadline on the enactment of this bill. We have been told by representatives of the State and Agriculture Departments that if this bill is defeated we can in the next week or two enact the necessary legislation to protect the domestic industry. There would be no harm so far as the domestic industry or consumers are concerned. I am in harmony with the statement that the domestic industry should be protected. I would support the introduction and enactment of the necessary legislation to protect the American sugar producer, but I do not think it is necessary to give subsidies to producers of 24 or 25 countries scattered throughout the world in the name of protecting the American producers.

The argument has been made that the Senate won a great victory in the conference. I do not see such a great victory—quite the contrary. The House got practically all that for which it asked. Under the Senate version of the bill the Republic of Peru would have had a basic quota of 121,507 tons. Under the House version of the bill, it would have had 200,000 tons. But under the conference report it has 190,000 tons, a cut of only 10,000 tons. The Dominican Republic had 111,157 tons under existing law. The House proposed to give it 200,000 tons. The conference report gives it 190,000 tons, or a cut of only 5 percent.

The Senate bill and the administration's proposal provided that each country should keep its basic quota as provided under existing law, but the Senate bill provided that the premium payments on these basic quotas would be reduced 20 percent annually over the next 5 years.

Mexico had 95,409 tons of basic quota under the existing law. The bill as passed by the Senate carried over existing law. The bill as passed by the House proposed to give to Mexico 200,000 tons. The conference report gives a quota of 190,000 tons to Mexico.

Brazil had no basic quota under the existing law, nor was there any quota provided under the bill as passed by the Senate. The bill as passed by the House would provide for Brazil 190,000 tons, and the conference report would give Brazil 180,000 tons as basic quota.

The administration, speaking on behalf of the President, made what I thought was an excellent argument against the permanent allocation of basic quotas to foreign countries on the basis that once these basic quotas are allocated they cannot be taken away without creating misunderstandings. I completely agree with that position of the administration. I regret to say that apparently the administration has run out on that position over the weekend.

The British West Indies, under the existing law and under the Senate bill, had a quota of 84 tons. Under the bill as passed by the House, the British West Indies would have been given 100,000 tons. The conference report would authorize 90,000 tons. That would be an increase from 84 tons basic quota under the law to 90,000 tons under the conference report.

Again, as the President said, once the basic quota is allocated with the provision that the country may keep it for 2½ years it will create almost an international incident to attempt to take it away.

Australia had no basic quota under existing law, nor was any quota provided under the bill as passed by the Senate. Under the bill as passed by the House, Australia would have been given 50,000 tons. The conference report gives 40,000 tons.

The French West Indies had no basic quota, either under existing law or the bill as passed by the Senate. The House bill would have provided 40,000 tons. The conferees have recommended 30,000 tons.

Costa Rica had a quota of 3,968 tons under existing law as well as under the bill passed by the Senate. The bill as passed by the House would have provided Costa Rica with 30,000 tons. The conference report recommends 25,000 tons.

Nicaragua had a basic quota under existing law of 17,471 tons. The bill as passed by the House would have provided 30,000 tons. That figure has been cut back to 25,000 tons.

The Republic of China had a basic quota of 3,980 tons under existing law; the same would have been provided under the bill as passed by the Senate. The House recommended a quota of 45,000 tons, and the conference report would make that 35,000 tons.

Ecuador had no basic quota under existing law. The recommendation for Ecuador in the bill passed by the House was 30,000 tons. The conference report provides for 25,000 tons.

Columbia had no basic quota under existing law nor under the Senate bill. The House proposed a quota of 35,000 tons, and the conferees would authorize a quota of 30,000 tons.

Haiti had a quota of 8,268 tons. The House proposed an allocation of 25,000 tons, and the conferees have recommended 20,000 tons.

Guatemala had no basic quota either under existing law or under the bill as passed by the Senate. The House recommended 20,000 tons, and the conference report recommends the full 20,000 tons.

Argentina had no basic quota under existing law or the Senate bill. The recommendation in the bill as passed by the House for Argentina was a quota of 20,000 tons. The conference committee recommends no basic quota, although I would judge after listening to some of the arguments which have been made here this afternoon that Argentina may come out in the end better than some of the other countries the way its prospects are snowballing. I understand there is a proposal to hook the sugar quota for Argentina to a bill dealing with honey bees. If we ever attach sugar to honey it will be hard to tell how sweet the solution will be—that is, to all except the taxpayers.

India had no basic quota either under existing law or the Senate bill. The House recommended a quota of 30,000 tons in its bill, and the conferees recommend 20,000 tons.

South Africa had no basic quota under present law or the Senate bill. The bill as passed by the House would have allocated 20,000 tons to South Africa. The conference committee approved the full 20,000 tons.

Panama had a basic quota of 3,980 tons under existing law. The bill as passed by the Senate provided for the same quota. The House proposed a quota of 15,000 tons. The conferees have agreed to the 15,000 tons.

El Salvador, Paraguay, British Honduras, and the Fiji Islands all had no basic quotas under existing law, and the Senate bill gave them none. The bill as passed by the House would have provided 10,000 tons of basic quotas for each of those countries, and that allocation is recommended in the conference report.

The Netherlands had a basic quota of 4,149 tons under existing law, and that was the quota carried in the bill as passed by the Senate. The bill as passed by the House would have raised that quota to 10,000 tons, and the conferees have agreed to that amount.

Mauritius is the little island off the coast of South Africa. It had no basic quota under present law. The Senate bill gave it none. It would have been given a 10,000 ton quota under the bill as passed by the House, but the conferees have stricken out the quota for Mauritius and instead have provided 11,332 tons for Ireland.

I might say that in the bill one cannot find Ireland mentioned by name. It was suggested in the conference committee that it might be less embarrassing politically if Ireland were not mentioned by name. Nevertheless, everyone recognizes that the unmentionable country which is to get this special quota is Ireland. Ireland has no quota now, and I understand there is presently no sugar-producing industry in Ireland, but in its generosity the Senate will now approve one.

Why it is necessary to provide $60 million to $75 million as an extra subsidy for these foreign producers throughout the world I do not understand. It certainly does not have to be done in the name of protecting American industry, nor does its allocation on such an arbitrary basis improve our foreign relations.

The President suggested—and on this point I am in complete agreement with him—that we should continue quotas only as provided under present law.

It was recommended, and the Senate bill so provided, that the program be phased out over a period of 5 years by reducing the premium payments for all foreign quotas by 20 percent per year.

Thus at the end of 5 years the foreign subsidies would be totally eliminated, and we would be operating on a global quota basis, buying at world market prices.

Our domestic industry could be protected by a tariff or by a special import tax as is presently levied. Thereby, instead of the taxpayers paying a $160 million annual subsidy they could collect something in the Federal Treasury. If we bought the sugar on a world basis and if the world market price were below the domestic market price the difference would go into the Treasury rather than into the pockets of foreign producers.

The basic foreign quota as provided under existing law is around 370,000 tons, but there has been recommended an increase of about 825,000 extra tons under the conference report.

The conference report represents about 90 percent of the basic quotas for foreign producers as provided under the bill which was denounced as the so-called Cooley proposal. I was amazed to hear this afternoon that the administration is willing to accept this proposal, that the only objection the administration now has to it is that it does not go quite far enough. The administration now says it would like to have the authority to authorize these premium payment quotas on another 150,000 tons.

I point out that if this proposal is carried through for an additional 150,000 tons of quota to be allocated as the President sees fit then we will have established a basic quota for foreign countries in excess of what was provided in the original bill as passed by the House.

I am amazed that the administration is going to swallow this and reverse its position of last week. This represents a complete about-face, considering what they told us as late as 6 o'clock last Friday afternoon. Then we were told by representatives of the administration that rather than take what they considered to be "this obnoxious bill" they would prefer to have no bill at all. The administration representatives even told the conferees that they were reasonably sure a veto of the bill would be recommended unless the firm allocation of these additional quotas at the high subsidy rate to the foreign countries were eliminated from the bill.

The administration representatives insisted that the President be given discretion to allocate the so-called world quota of sugar. I am sure that procedure would have resulted in a great savings for the taxpayers.

Another point is that one cannot allocate these quotas with the premium payments on a worldwide basis without interfering with foreign relations. We have seen examples of that. Argentina is already complaining because she has been left out. Another country does not think its quota is fair.

I do not think that the U.S. Senate is the place to be shuffling around these allocations. I do not think the Members of the Senate should divide up some $60 million or $80 million of subsidy for foreign producers.

The President for the past several weeks has been denouncing this proposal. I am sorry that he has reversed his position and is now endorsing the proposal.

I conclude by pointing out that the major difference I see in the allocations of the basic quotas as provided in the House bill and in the conference report is that the Republic of Ireland is to be substituted for the island of Mauritius.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY REQUIRES LESS GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the call of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce for a $5 billion to $8 billion tax reduction in the face of a multi-billion-dollar Federal deficit is in direct contradiction to every principle of sound business economics for which this organization has always stood.

Obviously a tax reduction at this time can only be financed by further increasing the national debt since we are already operating the Government at an annual deficit rate of over $7 billion.

To cut taxes now in the face of this continuing deficit and before a corresponding reduction in expenditures has been achieved would be the height of fiscal irresponsibility, and such action would be an open admission that the Congress and the administration do not have the courage to place a price tag on the many new spending programs which are being dreamed up daily on the New Frontier.

I notice that the Governors of New York, Ohio, and California have joined President Kennedy and the chamber of commerce in the parade calling for an immediate tax reduction.

Significantly, last week at the Governors' conference we find that the Governors were still calling for more and more Federal aid from Washington.

These Governors, as well as the President and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, know full well that a tax cut in the face of a continuous rise in Government spending would lead to a staggering deficit. A deliberately planned deficit of such proportions at this time would be the most inflationary action this administration could take, and while it may be politically popular at the time, the long-range inflationary results for America would be disastrous.

A tax reduction financed on borrowed money would inevitably result in a devalued dollar.

Inflation does not hurt the rich as it does the workingman and the middle class. The rich most often have their investments in oil wells, real estate, or in other fixed assets. They own x percent of America and a devalued dollar only raises the quoted value of their assets, and after the readjustment pains they still own the same x percent of America.

But the workingman and the retired people most often have their life savings invested in a home with the balance in savings accounts, life insurance policies, pension funds, Government bonds, social security, and so forth.

His home is his only inflationary hedge. His life savings are in the bank, life insurance, Government bonds, pensions, and so forth, and the purchasing value of all these would be reduced in direct proportion to the depreciation of the American dollar.

Instead of reducing Government expenditures the President's 1963 budget calls for a further increase in next year's expenditures of $3½ billion. This $3½ billion increase comes on top of increased expenditures of $8 billion and a deficit of near that amount during the fiscal year just ended.

There appears to be no desire at administration levels to cut these ever-increasing expenditures. On the contrary, last week Mr. David E. Bell, the Director of the Bureau of Budget, openly boasted that the Kennedy administration has deliberately planned the $7 billion deficit of the fiscal year just ending.

To now accept the political expediency of endorsing continued huge deficits in the face of a period of relatively high employment would be an open admission that the administration and the Congress has decided to pay our national debt with an ultimately devalued dollar.

A tax reduction, even though financed on borrowed money, may stimulate the economy in the immediate future, but unless such reduction was based on sound financing principles—that is, a corresponding cut in expenditures—the economy would be in worse shape when the artificial stimulant wore off.

A man cannot borrow himself rich, nor can a nation spend itself into prosperity on borrowed money. Man has tried it; nations have tried it; all have failed.

If the administration, the Governors, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce really want to cut taxes let them first support us in our efforts to reduce the expenditures of Government. This can only be done if the States, industry, and the individual citizens will stop trying to unload on the Federal Government all of those responsibilities which should be accepted as their own.

If we can cut Government expenditures by $6 billion to $8 billion we could then pay some on our national debt and pass the rest of the savings on to the American people in the form of a bona fide tax reduction.

As one member of the Senate Finance Committee and as one who has consistently opposed these increased and oft-times unnecessary expenditures, I refuse to have any part of such irresponsible action as to endorse a tax cut in the face of our present deficit. I shall continue to oppose any tax cut until such time as our Government expenditures have first been reduced to the point where such tax reduction would not be financed on borrowed money.

SEVENTEEN MILLION STOCKHOLDERS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a minute. In connection with the subject discussed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], it is extremely significant that the New York Stock Exchange has just released its 1962 stockholders' census, which finds that 1 out of every 6 Americans is today a shareowner, as compared

with 1 out of 8 in 1959 and 1 out of 16 in 1952. The specific figures show that 17,010,000 Americans now own stocks. When we add to that number the more than 80 million Americans who have life insurance policies and savings bank deposits and those who are interested in pension and welfare funds or have similar interests which depend upon investments, we begin to see why a serious debacle in the stock market, such as the one we have had, impairs the willingness and will of Americans to go forward, and why it is absolutely essential to give some incentive and indication by the Government that that confidence is justified which we ask of people in order to enable that economy to go forward.

I have advocated the kind of tax cut which would be an incentive tax cut and which could be compensated by other matters in a package such, for example, as getting the bogged-down present tax bill enacted into law by taking out of it what we know cannot be passed, such as the provision relating to the withholding tax on interest and dividends, and by doing something about oil depletion, which can bring in additional revenue to the Federal Government.

By reducing the taxes of those in the lowest and highest brackets and making some token reduction in the corporate income tax, we could give America the signal to go forward. I think we can understand the blow to confidence in what has occurred when we see that 17 million Americans are directly involved. Those are not manipulative bourbons in the old sense of stock exchange parlance. It represents the considered judgment of a great section of the American people. Indeed, there is new backbone. We have always talked about it in terms of the farm. Without in any way detracting from or depreciating the value and independence of our farmers, in the 17 million direct security holders is the new vertebra of our country, the new backbone of the American economic system. It is that particular voice which I think needs to be listened to now.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Seventeen Million Stockholders," published in the Daily News today.

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

SEVENTEEN MILLION STOCKHOLDERS

Every 3 years, the New York Stock Exchange takes a census of the number of Americans holding corporate stocks, directly or through trust funds and investment companies.

Results of the 1962 stockholder census have just been released, and we'd call them most interesting.

"Nearly 1 out of every 6 Americans," says Stock Exchange President Keith Funston, "is a shareowner today, compared with 1 out of 8 in 1959 and 1 out of 16 in 1952."

The specific figures: 17,010,000 Americans now own stocks, as compared with 12,490,000 in 1959—and with only 6,400,000 in 1952. Of the 17,010,000, 55.1 percent are women and 44.9 percent men.

Nor are these stockholders a bunch of plutocrats. Their average yearly income is only $8,600; and 55 percent of them are in the $5,000 to $10,000 bracket.

Their average age is 48, while the average age of persons buying stocks for the first time is 39.

New York State has the largest number of stockholders for any one State, with California second and Pennsylvania third.

Interestingly enough, since the market took its May 28 nosedive, numerous brokerage firms report large numbers of new customs coming around to buy stocks.

We'd call this news encouraging, and we hope the number of U.S. stockholders will go on increasing, despite the market's current horsing around.

Solid companies are still paying dividends, and seem certain to go on doing so. Shrewd—or shrewdly advised—investors can expect to pick up bargains at current prices, and to make fair profits if they hold onto them for a while.

The more stockholders we have, the more widespread should be the appreciation of the blessings of our profit-and-loss system, and the more cautious future Presidents should be about calling all businessmen s.o.b.'s.

That, we feel, would be a gain all around—and here's luck if you're a stockholder or planning to become one.

SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is always a great pleasure when a colleague, especially a colleague from my own State, is lauded by one of our great newspapers for a particular achievement in terms of world peace, the security of our own Nation, and the security of the free world. Senator KEATING, my colleague from New York, is most favorably spoken of in an editorial published in today's issue of New York's Daily News. The editorial is entitled "Russia Fights With Oil." Oil is a very critical element in the cold war.

As Chairman of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians, I can testify from knowledge over the years to the very important impact of this problem upon the likelihood of our success in the cold war. Senator KEATING has taken a very important part in that effort. It is properly noted, and he is lauded for it by the New York Daily News. I think it would bring satisfaction to our colleagues to read it in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in my remarks.

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

RUSSIA FIGHTS WITH OIL

At the request of Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, a Library of Congress research expert named Halford L. Hoskins has just completed a study of Soviet Russia's use of petroleum in the cold war.

Russia has considerable oil, and it is using a good deal of it—and plans to use more—in efforts to shrink free world oil companies' business by selling the stuff at cut rates, building refineries for Russian oil in countries stupid enough to accept such Soviet "help," and employing various other crafty devices.

HOW FREE WORLD CAN FIGHT BACK

This oil offensive, says Senator KEATING, "represents a grave threat to the free world."

To combat it, the Senator urges several steps on the part of the free nations. Among these are curbs on imports of Soviet oil, uniform oil policies for all the North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations, bans on free world sales to Russia of pipeline and oil-processing equipment, persistent publicizing of Soviet dirty pool in cutting oil prices, and in other ways trying to undermine the free world's oil trade.

It is to be hoped that the free nations, and particularly our own, will take Senator KEATING's and Mr. Hoskins' warnings seriously, and act together on them as fast and resolutely as possible. KEATING and Hoskins deserve the free world's gratitude, we believe, for having sounded this alarm so promptly and so vigorously.

SCHOOLS MUST STRESS MORE FUNDAMENTALS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, as our scientists and engineers make more and more advances, they are faced with a literally bewildering need for knowledge—knowledge in many fields. Some of them already are beyond calling this era the age of space and are terming it the age of complexity.

I was particularly struck by the approach taken in a recent speech at a high school dedication in California by Mr. John R. Moore. Mr. Moore is a former college professor, a distinguished scientist, and president of Autonetics, a division of North American Aviation. Under him are more than 32,000 persons, many of them scientists, engineers, and highly trained technicians.

Mr. Moore's conclusion that our schools must stress more fundamentals if they are to do the job needed for our Nation in the years ahead is one which I have been making for many years. His reasoning for this conclusion and some of the insights he gives into the problems of the age of complexity are well worth the time and attention of my distinguished colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have Mr. Moore's speech printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY JOHN R. MOORE AT THE DEDICATION OF NEW PACIFIC PALISADES HIGH SCHOOL, JUNE 6, 1962

This is the second dedication in 6 days in which I have had the honor to participate. Last Friday we dedicated at Autonetics our own new research center. It is delving in some mysteries of science which even we, who deal with such matters almost as commonplace, would call "way out."

For example, just a few weeks ago I was telling what I thought was a joke to emphasize microminiaturization. As you know, we have been able in recent years to compress into small tablets the properties and functions found in tubes and wires and rectifiers and amplifiers which would have filled a large speaker's stand. I would show such a tablet. Then I would dig around in a pocket, turn it inside out, like this, and finally announce that I did not tell our scientists to make it "that small." And yet, today in that new research center we are working on electronic circuits which would be so minute as to be invisible.

That is typical of the speed with which our world of science is moving today, in research facilities all over the world. And

yet, there is a great similarity between such a research center and a school. Both are dedicated, hopefully and prayerfully, to a brighter, fuller future for all mankind.

That future is vastly complex. It will stretch far into space and far beneath the surface of the ocean. It will be built on machines and mechanisms which are infinitely complicated. It will use scientific knowledge of great depth and breadth. It will have automatic planners; automatic controls; automatic production. It will have controlled environments. It may even have smooth-flowing, safely controlled traffic on our freeways.

Despite the computer and automation—despite everything we can foresee, it will require not less, but more factors which can be brought to it only by the intelligent being. We tend, in our military and in our industry, away from a large number of simple devices to smaller number of more complicated devices and machines. The ratio of personnel in the factory to personnel in the technical departments of our defense industries, for example, has changed from 20 to 1 during World War II to 2 to 1. This ratio is declining even further in such projects as Mercury, Saturn and Apollo so that the time is not far off when more expenditure will be required for technical work in the aerospace-electronic industry than for the production of its complex products.

This means a continuing increase in the number of technical jobs without a corresponding increase in factory employment. It means that any devices combined into complex systems must be far more reliable than ever before.

We come here to one common problem of the school and the new industry: personal motivation. Where can the student dropout, without even the fundamentals gained through a high school education, turn for opportunity in the world ahead? And, within our programs, such as building the very complex system of constant readiness, control and guidance for the Minuteman missile, we have found the motivation of employees one of the greatest tasks.

A radio set may contain 50 parts. The guidance system for a missile may contain 25,000. This is an increase by a factor of 500. In order to achieve the same reliability for the whole system, the average reliability of each individual part must be increased by a factor of 500. The failure of just one part, at a critical moment, could imperil the defense of our Nation. This is true whether the failure stems from engineering, from inspection, or from a momentary lapse on the part of any individual in the manufacturing process.

This is a story which management in the electronics industry must keep in front of each of its workers. We do it by much the same methods as a school board and faculty. We bring it to the attention of our workers repeatedly, in a dozen different ways, including in-plant television and classroom training.

To motivate, we must communicate. And communications is another great problem of science and industry today. This involves not only the ability to express ideas, directives and other products of mental activity. It involves the ability to comprehend the expressions of others.

This means that specialists must have some knowledge of scientific, business and management considerations beyond their own field. It is a matter of both understanding and efficiency. With the explosive growth of scientific knowledge, we have, for example, a great problem of information retrieval. My own company is spending many man hours and days in an attempt to find new ways to store, classify and recover new knowledge—and if the librarian for this fine new school has made any breakthroughs in this field we will gladly hire her away from you.

We attempt to make optimum use of electronics to assemble and analyze great quantities of information in such a way as to exhibit the special cases which are the basis of sound management decision. If the basic information is cluttered with nonessentials, or if it does not contain the latest advances, even the best of computers cannot do a thorough job. If the management personnel who study the situation do not understand both the economic and the scientific language, or factors, then no amount of data selection will bring a sound decision. It is a hollow satisfaction to prove that something new and wonderful can be done unless means are found to ensure that it is done.

This is indeed the space age. But it might better be termed the age of complexity. And all of the needs of this age of complexity impose some very important requirements on education. The advance of industrial specialties will certainly continue. But the ultimate limitation to progress will be our ability to combine these specialties into useful systems, whether they be mechanical or social.

Education must develop people with increasingly broad backgrounds. It is far more important today than ever before that students be given a sound grounding in fundamentals. We must look anew at the trend in higher education particularly to concentrate primarily on the intensive training in specialties. So much specialization is concentrated in our corporate and government laboratories that it would be impossible for our schools to match them. And advances are so swift that the details of specialty learned in the schools often are obsolete before the student can bring them to practical use.

Modern management is looking more and more for the generalist not the specialist. The requirements are for a solid background of physics and mathematics, practical courses in economics and politics, a sense of history and a feeling for language, both English and foreign. With the increasingly international flavor of our lives and economy, we can no longer depend on those of other nations to communicate with us in English. It is quite evident that while many of them seem to speak English, they do not understand it to the extent required for accurate, efficient, international business and technical communication. Our schools must attempt not only to teach the mechanics of a foreign language but also to teach the meaning and the customs which lie behind the mechanics.

And while discussing communication, let me say that we get a gleam in our eye when we hire the young man who has been a high school or college debater. The chance is that he learned to analyze his arguments and those of his opponents, to present a maximum amount of information in a minimum time and to think on his feet. More important, he has learned a degree of objectivity, so important in decisionmaking.

In the age of complexity, it is essential that the courses and their teachers continually maintain touch with the overall objective of the student's education—with the real world in which this learning will be applied. For instance, in the field of science and mathematics, there are so many actual problems that it is not desirable to clutter up the minds of our students with those which are not likely to occur. It is essential that our education continually emphasize the practical—keep touch with reality. We haven't time not to do so.

Finally, education in the age of complexity must concentrate on improving the ability of people to think—accurately, intensively, rapidly, and objectively. This means courses in rapid reading. It means training in recognizing the point of diminishing returns, so that time is not wasted on items of no consequence. It means a recognition that the most valuable commodity, and the most valuable asset of our country today, is the consecutive time spent by its good people thinking about things on which they are experts. I emphasize the word "consecutive," because nothing is so inefficient even to the best of brains as to have too little time to think about a problem. But it also means that, if there is any single objective which merits the fullest support of our society and our Government, it is that objective of medicine or psychology or electronics aimed at improving the mental capacity of the individual. This is the absolute improvement. It is the improvement which regenerates itself and from which dramatic progress in all facets of life will spring.

The challenges of the age of complexity are many. A requirement for meeting these challenges is a system of education geared to the changing conditions of an exploding technology and a new era of interrelationships far more complex than any with which we have been familiar in the past. It is up to every member of society to help our educators do their most important part in successfully meeting these challenges and changing the age of complexity from an age of incipient frustration and confusion to a new age when man is truly master of his life.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE MORRILL LAND GRANT ACT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, today, July 2, 1962, is the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Morrill Land Grant Act by President Abraham Lincoln. This memorable act is, of course, responsible for the granting of public lands to the States and territories for the purpose of establishing and supporting of colleges and universities designed to promote liberal and practical education for the youth of our Nation.

Today there are 68 land-grant colleges and universities in existence as a direct result of the Morrill Act. One of these, I am proud to say, is today one of the leading universities of my State of Colorado—or perhaps I should say one of the leading universities in the land, located in my native State of Colorado.

I am referring, of course, to Colorado State University located in Fort Collins, Colo. Colorado State University is a coeducational land-grant institution located in the valley of the Cache la Poudre River, where the Great Plains meet the foothills of the Rocky Mountains. It is the oldest State educational institution in Colorado, having been established by the territorial legislature in 1870. Classes began in 1879, and three students constituted the first graduating class. Today, more than 6,500 students are enrolled.

In addition to academic instruction, Colorado State University is responsible for operation of a research foundation, an experiment station for research in agriculture, engineering, and home economics, and the extension service which disseminates information throughout the State in agriculture and home economics. The State 4–H program also originates at Colorado State University.

The university is 5,000 feet above sea level, 65 miles north of Denver, and 45 miles south of Cheyenne, Wyo., at Fort Collins, Colo. Fort Collins is noted for bright clear days. The air is dry and

relatively free from dust, with annual precipitation of 14.77 inches. Quarterly temperatures means are January, 26.1; April, 46.1; July 69.4; and October, 48.6.

The 68 land-grant colleges and universities are very fittingly devoted this centennial year to a look ahead. The past is being reviewed carefully to determine those areas in which improvement may be indicated, but the emphasis is on the future.

I know the Senate will join with me today in commemorating this milestone in the history of these great educational institutions, and in wishing them all success in attaining the goals they have set for themselves as they embark on their second century of progress. And, I hope the Senate will join with me as well, in a tribute to a Congressman from the great State of Vermont, Justin Smith Morrill, who in 1862 had the foresight to propose this historical piece of legislation offering each State 30,000 acres of Federal lands or land scrip for each of its Members in Congress, to be sold and the proceeds to be used to endow at least one college in the State.

We in Colorado are proud of Colorado State and its many contributions to our State. We are grateful to those who, in their proven and practical wisdom, were able to foresee the need for such institutions and had the courage to carry their beliefs through to a successful culmination.

INCREASE IN PRODUCTIVITY CREATED BY ADDITIONAL CAPITAL INVESTMENT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have recently been in correspondence with Mr. John S. Carlson, a lawyer in Tulsa, Okla., whom I have known for some 30 years, who is the son of a former Governor of Colorado, and who himself is a Phi Beta Kappa and a Rhodes Scholar.

In a letter to me of June 22, 1962, he points out some very unusual but nevertheless, I believe, very sound approaches and conclusions with respect to the recent controversy arising from the steel price dispute between the administration and the steel companies.

I believe that the conclusions he has arrived at will help all people to arrive at a sounder evaluation of the circumstances and conditions which resulted in that particular affair.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

In re Kennedy versus United States Steel.
Fallacious conclusions reached by misappropriation of increase in productivity created by additional capital investment.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 22, 1962.*

The Honorable GORDON ALLOTT,
Senator from Colorado,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: The increase in employee benefits negotiated earlier this year by the steelworkers was adjudged to be within the limits of the administration's formula. The administration declared it to be noninflationary on the basis of the increase in productivity. To my knowledge, the right of Kennedy and labor to measure the wage increase as being within the "increase in productivity" has not been seriously questioned. Although this increase in productivity is primarily, if not solely attributable to the investment of additional capital, it was commandeered by Kennedy for labor. Apparently no one has questioned their right to arrogate it to their own use in justifying the determinations made. Meanwhile the steel companies whose additions to capital created the increase were derisively denied relief. Once again we have been deluded by the sophisticated reasoning now rampant in Washington. Perhaps we have become so enchanted in the aura of Kennedy sophistication that we are no longer capable of applying clear and simple reason and logic.

By what process of logic, law or reason did labor acquire the right to appropriate the increase in productivity created by additional capital investments? To this day I have not seen any public announcement by the press, by any public figure, or by any representative of the steel industry, discussing this concept which is basic to the issues raised by Kennedy's action in his bout with United States Steel. It is indeed pertinent to inquire: Who created and what caused the increase in productivity in the steel industry?

No claim has been made that the increase in productivity is the result of more vigorous and strenuous efforts by the laborers. No one has questioned that the increased productivity is directly attributable to increased efficiency of plant and equipment resulting from increased investment by the steel companies.

Nevertheless Kennedy and his apologists have repeatedly described the increased labor benefits negotiated this year by the steelworkers, and sanctioned by the Government, as noninflationary because the increased benefits were within the limits of the increase in productivity. Thereafter vigorous and unprecedented Executive pressures were used to stop an attempt on the part of certain steel companies to increase the price of steel.

Repudiation of the specious reasoning propounded by Kennedy and his apologists is inevitable and immediate upon reaching a clear understanding of the reason why productivity rose and who was responsible for the rise. The increase in productivity in the steel industry was primarily, if not solely, due to increased investment of capital.

It would be useful to consider comparable situations in simplified form. If I buy a power lawnmower to replace a manually driven lawnmower and the user is thereby enabled to cut three times the area of grass in the same period of time, should his wages be increased from $2 per hour to $6 per hour? If a bank lends an additional $100,000 as an addition to a $1 million, 6-percent loan, would anyone say that the additional $6,000 interest per year should be paid to the bank clerks and denied the banks? If a tractor is purchased to replace horses and the number of acres of land plowed in 1 day is thereby quadrupled, would the erstwhile driver of the horses received a fourfold wage increase as a result of the increase in productivity? In each of these instances, the increased productivity was caused by an increase in the capital invested or used. The establishment of an arithmetic or mathematical formula relating increased productivity to wages would be impossible.

I wish it to be crystal clear that I make no issue of the wisdom or propriety of the increase in wages under discussion here. My point is that by specious reasoning the basis of the increase in employee benefits has been misstated. The real issues have been beclouded with muddled thinking. As a result a number of fallacious conclusions have been reached which could be avoided by an honest, straightforward recognition of the true basis of the wage increase.

This is not written to question the increase. I believe in a high standard of living for the largest percentage of the population feasible. I also believe in a healthy and expanding economy. In addition, and contrary to the apparent belief of many, the achievement of this result is enhanced when issues are discussed with clearheaded reality and represented to the public in this manner. When a wage increase is made, let the true reason for the increase be stated by those who sponsor or support it. In my judgment, the use of a false premise to justify such an action is either the result of fuzzy thinking or downright misrepresentation. The former could only indicate ineptitude and the latter involves the employment of deceit. In these times, we cannot tolerate occupany of high positions of responsibility and trust by persons who are either incompetent or dishonest.

Let us not be misled by justification of a wage increase on a spurious basis which can bear no relationship to the real reason for its being granted. Such woolly thinking beclouds the fact that higher costs are inevitably caused by the higher wages. Success by the sophist in creating this confusion permits him to lead us to a second mistaken conclusion. He then explains that the higher labor costs are merely an offset to the increase in productivity. Therefore, the increase in wages did not create an increase in costs to exceed the permissible amount, i.e., the amount of the added productivity. Using this final fallacy as the basis of his reasoning, he then concludes that no price increase is needed to compensate the investor for the increase in wages.

I cannot avoid observing that the cleverist mathematician cannot produce a correct answer to a problem in arithmetic if his original assumption is that 2 times 2 equals 7. Whatever arithmetic gymnastics are employed thereafter, the answer will always be wrong. In like manner, the most adept deceiver cannot establish a formula reliant upon the relationship of cause and effect of economic forces when no causal relationship exists between the two. Nor can adroit linguistic legerdemain vitiate the existence of true cause and effect when they are present. The simple facts are that the higher productivity was caused by the added investment and was in no way caused by or related to labor's activities.

If we assume that a 5-percent increase in productivity were caused by an increase in investment of exactly 6 percent and if, in these circumstances, wages were increased by an amount sufficient to absorb the increase in productivity, the investor would receive nothing for his added investment. In such event, labor would be the beneficiary of something to which it made no contribution while the actual creator would remain unrewarded. A windfall to one—confiscation of the property of the other.

When increased capital investment increases productivity, the cause has been the increased investment and the effect is the greater productivity. In these circumstances we cannot conjure up any causal relationship between this enlargement of productive capacity and the efforts of the laborers. Hence, attribution of this increased productivity to justify a wage increase is specious.

By employing the foregoing economic fantasy Kennedy dodged the right of the steel companies to increase prices to offset increases in labor benefits. These two factors do have a direct causal relationship.

Increases in capital invested caused increased productivity. Labor did not contribute in any substantial way to this increase in productivity and hence it has no causal relationship therewith. Increased wages do cause increases in costs. When

wages go up, costs increase. No justification exists to divert the benefits of increased capital investment from the investors and transfer them to labor.

Recognition of the economic factors having real causal relationship with each other in this situation dispels the confusion and makes the real issues stand out in bold relief.

To the extent that the increase in productivity created by added investment is transferred to labor and denied to the investor, the investor's additions to capital are effectually confiscated. He is thereby deprived of the benefits of the productive capacity of his property. Stagnation of industry is inevitable when the fruits and benefits of investment are subject to arbitrary appropriation and thereby taken from the true owners and awarded to others. No wise investor will continue to increase his investment in property, plant or equipment if the anticipated return therefrom is subject to willful and capricious appropriation by supervening authority.

The issues in the steel dispute have been presented to the public in a confusing manner by the administration. The use of false grounds to obtain public acceptance of the propriety of a wage increase is political chicanery. When used to deny the right to compensation for the resultant increase in costs, it is doubly opprobrious.

I sincerely believe that politicans can be and should be statesmen. I also believe that occupancy of a high political position in this great Nation of ours requires the highest degree of integrity, honor and truthfulness. It is a high and worthy calling where great good can be accomplished. I believe that the great majority of the American people have the same feeling and that they enthusiastically support men in political office when they possess and practice the basic virtues.

I cannot believe our present administration is totally incompetent. I therefore am forced to the conclusion that the obfuscation of issues, having direct and serious effect upon the economy and the daily lives of each of us, is deliberate. Would that it were not so.

Yours very truly,

JOHN S. CARLSON.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1962—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12154) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to direct a question to the Senator from Louisiana. On page 6 of the conference report there appears section 7 (e)(1), as follows:

(e)(1) None of the proration established for Cuba under section 202(c)(3) for any calendar year and none of the deficit prorations and apportionments for Cuba established under section 204(a) may be filled by direct-consumption sugar.

The bill makes provision for a certain allocation, including 10,000 tons of direct-consumption sugar, which, according to the understanding of the Senator from Oklahoma, who sponsored the amendment in the Senate, and from what he understood from the conferees, would make it possible for the allocation of that much to be made to the country of Ireland. The question I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana is whether it was the intent of the conferees—in the event the Secretary of Agriculture, on his behalf or that of the President wanted to allocate, under the authorization for the 10,000 tons, to the country of Ireland—that the language setting forth the authority for the allocation in the bill is such that it would not be adversely affected or denied either by what I have just read or by any other section of the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was the intention of the conferees that Ireland should be eligible for this allocation of direct-consumption sugar. It was intended that this should not be defeated by any other provision in the bill.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma understands that the chairman of the House conferees made that very plain on the floor of the House. I should like, if it is consistent with accuracy, as I understand it to be, to have made perfectly clear on the floor of the Senate the understanding of the Senate conferees.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That was the understanding of the Senate conferees. I believe it will be reflected in the statement on the House side by the chairman of the conferees when he submitted the report on the part of the managers of the House.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Incidentally, I believe it should be stated that Ireland has a sugar industry and produces substantial amounts of sugar.

Mr. KERR. And exports sugar. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on that point, with respect to Ireland?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who has the floor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator said that Ireland has a sugar industry and exports sugar.

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does it export sugar which it produces?

Mr. KERR. That is the information I have. The statement on the floor of the House on the part of the chairman of the managers of the bill on the part of the House, was to the effect that Ireland exported in the nature of 15,000 tons a year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true that it has imported 50,000 tons of raw sugar during each of the past 5 years?

Mr. KERR. I am not in a position to answer that question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am. The fact is that it has imported that amount of sugar. I have a table issued by the International Sugar Council in its statistical bulletin dated April 15, 1962. Ireland has imported some 50,000 tons of raw sugar. It processes this sugar and reexports it.

Mr. KERR. I understand that it is exported in two forms; first, in manufactured products—candy, and so forth—and, second, in refined sugar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. It has exported in excess of 15,000 tons a year of refined sugar. What it had exported or imported was not in the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma when he offered the amendment on the floor, which was contained in the bill as it passed the Senate. My information was that it was the intent of the conferees that authority for the President to allocate that amount of a quota of direct-consumption sugar was retained in the bill by the conferees. That was the statement of the chairman of the managers on the part of the House, which was made on the floor of the House. I merely confirmed it by asking the same question of the manager of the conference report on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Much has been said by the Senator from Minnesota and others about the danger of Cuban sugar. It so happens that Ireland imported from Cuba in 1957, 9,754 tons; in 1958, 31,030 tons; in 1959, 3,106 tons; in 1960, 20,167 tons.

Her principal suppliers have been Cuba and the Dominican Republic. Ireland does not have an excess of sugar.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma did not take the position that the production of sugar originated in Ireland.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want to clarify the RECORD. I gathered that from the response of the Senator from Louisiana, because he said it has an industry and exports sugar.

Mr. KERR. Yes. It has an industry and it exports sugar. It could not export it without an industry to produce it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The sugar exported is largely that which comes from Cuba and the Dominican Republic. During the past 4 years that has been the situation. I think the RECORD should show it. This is not relief that is being proposed for a producing country. Ireland refines and reexports sugar. That is what happens.

Mr. KERR. The observations of the Senator from Arkansas are perfectly pertinent. I am neither desirous of nor in a position to question their accuracy. I was only making legislative history with reference to the purpose of the conferees in connection with the language of the bill as passed by the Senate and as agreed to in conference. I regret that the Senator from Arkansas does not like it. However, that is neither here nor there. He is in perfect position to argue against it. I wish to make the record clear that the action of the Senate and the conferees resulted in a certain situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think this ought to be made clear on the record, with reference to the reasoning, if any. I do not know of any reason why it was allocated to Ireland any more than it was allocated to South Africa. I have not heard any reason given here all day.

Mr. KERR. I was not in the posture of trying to satisfy the Senator's curiosity for any reason.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are giving Ireland $1,600,000 in sugar purchases. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. KERR. Not at all. The language in the bill gives the President the authority to do it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has stated that he understands, and expects the President to fully understand.

Mr. KERR. No; it is the hope of the Senator from Oklahoma that the President will follow it; but he is not compelled to do so, as the Senator from Arkansas knows.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, as a general rule, I am opposed to having the Senate conferees retreat when they meet with the House; but in this case their retreat from the Senate position—or their advance from it—was, I think, a commendable one. I would have urged them to go somewhat further in making allocations of the Cuban quota which has been withdrawn from that country. I said in the debate on the bill last week that this program would cause us trouble. I did not think the trouble would arise as soon as it has. I think we have evidence today that the only unrealistic proposal that was made was to allocate a certain portion of the sugar that we purchase outside the United States to some countries and pay them a premium price, and then turn around and buy the rest of our supplies at what is called the world market, which really does not exist. What does exist, and is called the world market, is really a "dumping market."

We have set the stage for future trouble. From 5 o'clock to 7 o'clock is what might be called the hour of prophecy in the Senate, so I will prophesy: We will be back time and time again in the course of the next 2 years, seeking adjustment of the Sugar Act in such a way as to meet new problems and crises as they arise.

I should like to place in the RECORD references to three more or less international statements concerning the problem of sugar in international trade. The first is from the United Nations in its sugar report, which states:

> Sugar exhibits to an unusual degree the features which make an unregulated market undesirable.

The second reference is to the fact that the regulatory mechanism of the International Sugar Agreement has broken down because of Cuba's refusal to abide by its quota.

Third, under the agreement made at Punta del Este, we made a more or less formal attempt "to find a quick and lasting solution to the grave problem created by excessive price fluctuations in the basic exports of Latin American countries on which their prosperity so heavily depends."

Title 4 of the charter deals with basic export commodities and states:

> National measures affecting commerce in primary products should be directed and applied to—
>
> * * * * *
>
> 2. Avoid market instability:
>
> Therefore:
>
> A. Importing countries should * * * be ready to support, by adequate regulations, stabilization programs for primary products that may be agreed upon with producing countries.

What we have done is to create greater instability than that which already exists in the international market. I wish the Senate might have taken more time to study the program, and that we might have fulfilled what I consider to be the constitutional responsibility of the Senate: to act as a kind of check upon the executive branch of the Government when it fails to meet its responsibility, particularly in matters touching upon international relations; and along with that, to act as a check in giving proper direction to the House of Representatives.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, when the sugar bill first came before the Senate, I reluctantly supported it, first, because I thought it was a much better bill than the iniquitous measure passed by the House, which at that time seemed the only alternative; and second, because the Senate bill at least got away from the logrolling procedures of the past by establishing out of the Cuban quota a global quota which could, at a later date, be reassigned to a free and democratic Cuba, or in the alternative could be used to support the democratic governments and economies of other sugar-producing states which might be under foreign or domestic totalitarian pressures, as, for example, the Dominican Republic.

Something has been said today on the floor of the Senate about the needs of the Dominican Republic. Some Senators think they are substantial; some think otherwise. My own view is that we in this country have an obligation to support the new democratic government of that Republic in any way we can. The case for the Dominican Republic is well stated in an article entitled "Dominicans Fear Crisis Over Sugar," published in the New York Times of today, July 2. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

DOMINICANS FEAR CRISIS OVER SUGAR—UNITED STATES MOVES TO SOFTEN IMPACT OF QUOTA CUT—SENATE DUE TO ACT ON SLASH TODAY

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON, July 1.—White House and State Department officials worked throughout the weekend here trying to avert a major crisis in U.S. relations with the Dominican Republic over this country's new sugar legislation.

The new Sugar Act, approved yesterday by the House of Representatives and scheduled for Senate action tomorrow would, in the opinion of Dominican officials, greatly reduce their sugar exports to the United States.

The Dominican Government, struggling to carry out a transition to democracy and to move toward basic reforms after three decades of dictatorship, fears that this would lead to an economic collapse and a political upheaval that would favor the pro-Communist elements in the country.

Last night the Dominican Council of State issued a statement in Santo Domingo repeating its earlier intention to suspend all Alliance for Progress programs in the country if the new Sugar Act is signed.

The Dominican argument is that if the Republic is prevented from continuing to earn an adequate income through premium sugar exports, it cannot assume the burden of accepting loans under the U.S. aid program for Latin America.

The cost of producing sugar in the Dominican Republic is well above current world market prices. But by selling sugar in the United States, which pays a premium above world prices, the Dominicans are assured an income.

While the Kennedy administration sought to abolish the system of national quotas for sugar-producing countries, a compromise worked out Friday night in a House-Senate conference provided for payment of premiums on only 1,205,000 tons of imported sugar. This is about one-fourth the annual foreign purchases of the United States.

Furthermore, the premiums would be reduced gradually over the next 30 months.

Under the compromise version—the House bill had maintained in full the national quotas—the Dominican Republic would be awarded 190,000 tons annually, or 95,000 tons for the second half of 1962.

This compares with 476,000 tons that the Dominicans exported to the United States in the first half of the year, based on their permanent quota and a temporary assignment of nearly 4,000 from the frozen Cuban quota.

AN 80-PERCENT SLASH

In practice, therefore, the compromise bill would cut the Dominican exports to this country in the second half of the year to about 20 percent of what they were in the first half.

The big temporary assignment from the Cuban quota was given to the new Dominican regime last January, when the Council of State was established, as a gesture designed by President Kennedy to assist the Caribbean country in its transition toward democracy.

Although the administration has made it repeatedly clear to the Dominican Government that the big windfall of January could not be a permanent allocation, both United States and Dominican officials recognize now that the drastic reduction in the quota will have the effect of pulling the rug from under the new regime.

They concede that the loss of the sugar revenues would more than nullify the impact of the $25 million in Alliance for Progress loans already granted the Dominican Republic.

The point made by Dominican officials—and now recognized here—is that the sharp and sudden cutting of the quota may shatter all the efforts to lead the Dominican Republic toward democracy.

After the last remnants of the dictatorship of the late Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina were removed from the Dominican Republic in January, the United States saw in that country the bright promise of establishing a vivid contrast between the prosperity of a democracy there and the hardships under the Communist regime in nearby Cuba.

DISCUSSIONS DELAYED

But all these plans ran into the sugar problem, and a major crisis in relations has developed instead. Although the administration has considered a global quota system—removing the premiums and the national quotas—since last August, no effort was made until the last moment to discuss the situation with Dominican officials.

Dominican officials believe that if the United States had reviewed the problem with them some time ago, it may have been possible to work out quietly some method of phasing out the Dominican sugar from the premium market while assisting the country, through the Alliance for Progress, in programs for diversifying its economy.

But no such conferences were held until after a political crisis developed in the Dominican Republic 2 weeks ago when the

House Agriculture Committee issued its list of quotas, reducing considerably the Dominican share of the U.S. market.

While the Dominicans were protesting the House bill, the new compromise version hit them even harder.

Only early last week did planning begin here in earnest on how to assist the Dominican Republic, after the realization spread in the administration that the Dominican situation was a special case affecting the U.S. national interest.

With the Senate vote on the compromise bill slated for tomorrow, high-ranking officials held urgent conferences all day yesterday and today. They sought to present the Dominican Government with acceptable proposals on shoring up its economy in the light of the blow that would be dealt the Republic by the sugar legislation.

PLAN GIVEN DOMINICAN GROUP

Tentative proposals were communicated to a Dominican delegation, headed by Finance Minister Ramon Caceres, which returned to Santo Domingo today.

Officials agreed that speed was essential, to avert the possibility that approval of the legislation might lead to a political explosion in the Dominican Republic, forcing what is an essentially pro-U.S. Government to take a hard nationalistic attitude.

The confusion surrounding the sugar legislation caused additional foreign policy problems today when Argentine Ambassador Roberto Alemann protested that a 10,000-ton quota for his country, granted under the House bill, was eliminated from the compromise bill. Argentina has never had a quota.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senate conferees have now returned with a conference report which, in my judgment, is not much better than the House bill. I say again that I believe the Senate conferees did their very best. I commend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] for his efforts. However, the difficulty is that the House has been adamant on sugar legislation for many a long year, and it has become almost customary for the Senate to yield to the House on the ground that if we did not yield, there would be no bill, and what has been described in the argument today as chaos would be perpetuated.

I regret that the conventional argument has again taken hold. It seems to me that the conference report perpetuates the logrolling deals under which 23 countries, 12 of them for the first time, are given a share of the American market at the premium price; and this allocation is made, although this is clearly a matter of our foreign affairs, not by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, not by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, but by the House Committee on Agriculture.

I hope very much that when another sugar bill comes before the Senate, as in due course it will, the part which deals with foreign quotas will be referred by the Parliamentarians of both bodies to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; and that if it is not so referred, we in the respective bodies will see to it that those two committees pass upon the bill in the interest of our foreign policy before it is brought to the floor of either body for a vote.

I point out that such a procedure is frequently followed in connection with other proposed legislation. I recall that in our efforts to have the Delaware River compact passed in the Senate last year, it was necessary to have the measure run the gauntlet, first, of the Committee on the Judiciary, then the Committee on Public Works, and finally the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We succeeded in jumping all those hurdles, and the bill was passed.

I think we could ask that a bill dealing with sugar quotas, but which vitally affects the foreign policy of the United States, should be required to jump at least two hurdles, instead of only one. I raise the question whether the Committee on Finance has any legitimate interest in the bill; whether it is not a question for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on Foreign Relations. Why should we not take a close and careful look at our rules and the jurisdiction of the various committees, in order to determine whether the Committee on Finance has not, over the years, acquired a jurisdiction which was never intended at the time the rules were originally adopted?

The bill has fixed quotas as a result of no consultation with the Secretary of State or either of the congressional committees charged with the consideration of matters of foreign policy. When we are dealing with a matter as sensitive in the conduct of foreign policy as the allocation of sugar quotas, the President of the United States should have the same broad powers over sugar as I hope we are about to give him over other segments of world trade.

This serious threat to the intelligent conduct of our foreign policy is compounded by the unjustified increase in the share of the domestic market reserved for high cost beet and cane sugar producers in the South and the West.

The people of Pennsylvania have no interest in increasing the price of sugar. The interest of the more than 11 million people of our Commonwealth is in lower, not higher, prices for sugar. There are occasions when a Senator must think of the national interest, even if his vote may not be popular at home. But this, I submit, is not such an occasion. This bill, I argue, is not in the national interest. It is definitely opposed to the interest of all Pennsylvanians, because we want lower—not higher—sugar prices.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I shall vote against the conference report, in the hope that after further consideration a bill more in the public interest can be passed.

It is said that we must have this bill immediately, lest the country be flooded with cheap sugar, since the present act which maintains the support prices has expired. But, Mr. President, in my judgment this would be something far short of a catastrophe. The long-range damage which this measure would do to our foreign policy far outweighs any short-range harm to the artificial domestic support price of sugar which would result from postponing enactment of this legislation until we can get a decent bill.

I regret that the administration has not told us why it has abandoned its original opposition to the conference report—an opposition which was widely circulated as late as this morning. I hope that on further consideration the President will decide to veto this measure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall vote against the conference report. However, I wish to say that I highly commend the conferees for obtaining the best possible bill from the conference, under all the circumstances which prevailed.

For a number of years at about this time of the year I have been subjected to the proposition that time is running out, and that unless we act at once, irreparable damage will be caused the country. Each year for the last several years, at about June 27 or June 26, there hurriedly comes before this body a sugar bill which requires passage by midnight of June 30.

I wish to be free in the exercise of my judgment, without having presented to me the argument that unless I act at once, irreparable damage will come to the Nation. I cannot understand how it is that this annual, identical coincidence occurs—that the sugar bill comes to us at a late hour, making it impossible for the Senate to exercise its voluntary, independent judgment.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the very structure of this allocation of quotas to different nations of the world creates a flood of lobbyists who not only are promised fixed fees, but also are promised contingent fees, dependent upon their success in procuring for their principals assignments of sugar sales. I do not wish to be in the position of subscribing to what I saw in a pamphlet, which was placed on my desk, about the inordinate fees—contingent and otherwise—being earned by those who have come before the committees to present the cause of the nations who are so frantically fighting for the assignment of quotas.

At one time I taught, in law school, the subject of agency; and I recall that there is a principle of law that whenever an agent is hired, on the basis of a contingent fee, to procure the performance of an act by an executive public official or by a legislative body, that arrangement is contrary to public policy, and is invalid.

In connection with the measure before us, we cannot reach into the private agreements on a contingent basis which have been made by various countries with special agents to procure the passage of the pending measure. But I will not by my vote indirectly and impliedly give approval to this nefarious practice. I will vote against this measure, if on no other basis than the fact that these countries should be told that we do not subscribe to such procedure.

To the nations which rely upon their ambassadors, I express commendation; and if I could have my way, I would give them special benefits because of that very fact.

Next, Mr. President, from the standpoint of foreign relations, our country should be able—without the involvements and entanglements which will come from the creation of these new as-

signments of quotas, and I understand that there are to be 12 of them—to deal freely with Cuba, if and when Castro no longer is there. But through this program of assigning quotas now, regardless of the efforts to mollify the assignments, the problem of dealing with Cuba in the event Castro no longer is there will become more complicated.

In conclusion, I commend the conferees for what was done; I think they did a superlative job. But I still believe that the allocations to individual nations are not helpful to the United States. They throw a cloud upon what is happening in the other body and what is happening in the Senate. I do not want lobbyists to laugh while I am voting to give approval to what has been done. From my standpoint, I notify them that the moment they appear on the basis of contingent fees, that very act will stamp their conduct and the conduct of their principals as improper, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I promise to take not more than 1 minute; but I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who was one of the conferees, that I hope he recognizes—as I do—that on page 4 of the report there is a provision that special consideration shall be given to the nations of the Western Hemisphere. The following language appears:

> In authorizing the purchase and importation of sugar from foreign countries under this paragraph, special consideration shall be given to countries of the Western Hemisphere and to those countries purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities.

Does not the Senator from Louisiana believe that language was written in carefully, prayerfully, and purposely; and does he not agree that we do intend that special consideration shall be given to these countries?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, that is definitely intended; and it is hoped by those who wrote this report, as well as by those who agreed to it in the conference, that this measure will be administered in such away that those countries in the Western Hemisphere would be preferred—if that can be done—in connection with the purchases of sugar, because they have been our historic sources of offshore sugar; and also we want consideration given in this connection, insofar as possible, to countries which have been purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. On that point, the House conferees may say that the House is very anxious to protect countries which have purchased U.S. agricultural commodities, and that therefore we should have an opportunity to do this for those countries, if that is at all possible.

I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and I think he also agrees that this consideration should be given.

For myself, I wish to say that I hope it will be given, because these countries have been our historic sources of our offshore sugar, and they have also been purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities. So I believe they certainly should be given this special consideration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And I hope the State Department will take steps to see to it that such special consideration is given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] would each vote "yea."

I also announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Maryland [Mr. BEALL and Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are also necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 12, as follows:

[No. 110 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Aiken	Hayden	Metcalf
Allott	Hickey	Monroney
Anderson	Hill	Morse
Bennett	Holland	Moss
Bible	Hruska	Mundt
Bush	Humphrey	Muskie
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Robertson
Cannon	Johnston	Scott
Cooper	Keating	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kerr	Stennis
Curtis	Kuchel	Symington
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Dworshak	Long, La.	Wiley
Ellender	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Engle	McCarthy	Yarborough
Fong	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—12

Case	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Clark	Lausche	Proxmire
Douglas	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Miller	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—33

Bartlett	Ervin	Murphy
Beall	Goldwater	Pastore
Boggs	Gore	Pearson
Burdick	Gruening	Pell
Butler	Hart	Prouty
Capehart	Hartke	Russell
Carlson	Jordan	Saltonstall
Carroll	Kefauver	Smathers
Chavez	Magnuson	Smith, Mass.
Church	McGee	Sparkman
Eastland	Morton	Tower

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

IMPORTATION OF ADULT HONEY BEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1530, H.R. 8050, to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8050) to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 202(c)(4) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended by inserting "(A)" after "(4)", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(B) Of the quantity authorized for purchase and importation under subparagraph (A), the President is authorized to allocate to countries within the Western Hemisphere, for the six-month period ending December 31, 1962, an amount of sugar, raw value, not exceeding in the aggregate 75,000 short tons, and for the calendar years 1963 and 1964, an amount of sugar, raw value, not exceeding in the aggregate 150,000 short tons."

(b) Section 202(e) of such Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to sugar exported by any foreign country to the United States to fill any allocation made to it under subsection (c)(3)(C)."

(c) Section 207(e)(2) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to any allocation made to a foreign country under section 202(c)(3)(C)."

(d) Section 213 of such Act, as amended, is amended—

(1) by striking out "(4)" each place it appears in subsections (a) and (b) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "(4)(A)";

(2) by striking out "paragraph (3) of section 202(c)" in the first sentence of subsection (c) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (3) and (4)(B) of section 202(c)"; and

(3) by striking out "(4)" each place it appears in the first sentence of subsection (c) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "(4)(A)".

(e) The amendments made by this section shall be effective as if they were enacted as a part of H.R. 12154 entitled "An Act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended", Eighty-seventh Congress, second session.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, notwithstanding the title of the bill, I should like to make an explanation of the proposed amendment. First, I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am not sure that I correctly understand the amendment. If I correctly understand it, it would restore to the basic quotas 150,000 tons of sugar for foreign producers and deduct that amount from the so-called global quotas. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct; from the global quotas.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. From the global quotas. If I correctly understand the mathematics, assuming the Senate adopts the amendment and the bill is enacted, we shall have established permanent basic quotas of 7,000 tons more than Mr. COOLEY proposed or than was provided for in the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am not at all certain about the figure. If the proposal were adopted, it would operate on the same basis as is operative with respect to other countries which have been given quotas under the conference report which the Senate just considered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand the situation, the conferees took 143,000 tons out of the permanent, basic quotas assigned under the Cooley bill and added that amount to the global quotas. This proposal would take 150,000 tons from the global quotas and put it back in the basic quotas column. The net result would be, after all this debate, premium payments on another 7,000 tons.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I always accept the Senator's word.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under the circumstances I wonder if administration officials who denounced the Cooley bill do not now owe the gentleman on the other side of the Capitol an apology. I cannot support this proposal.

Mr MANSFIELD. I will take the Senator's word.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin desires to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana. However, the amendment of the Senator from Montana is not printed. It is difficult for the Senator from Wisconsin to draft an amendment in the time available.

If the President were to be given such discretionary sugar authority it would be greatly preferable, in the judgment of this Senator, that the quota come not from the global quota but from the national quota. In other words, there should be a pro rata reduction of the quotas which have now been provided to the various countries. Out of that amount 150,000 tons could be made available for distribution, apparently to Argentina and the Dominican Republic.

Under those circumstances the Senator from Wisconsin would be willing to support the bill. If the Senator from Montana will modify his amendment to provide that the quotas shall come from the national quotas, I will not have to offer my amendment. If the Senator is not willing to do so, however, the Senator from Wisconsin will ask the Senator from Montana if he would be willing either to hold the bill over until tomorrow, so that an amendment could be drafted, or to provide the necessary time so that the Senator from Wisconsin might have such an amendment drafted accurately by counsel.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope the Senator, if it will not inconvenience him too much, will try to draft an amendment of that nature tonight, so that, if possible, the Senate can consider it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I understand the problem in this regard. I have indicated as much in the course of the debate on the conference report.

Those of us who supported the Senate position were supporting the position of the administration in the conference, when we contended that no more than about 300,000 tons should be on a premium basis, and that even that amount should be phased out over a period of 5 years. As I have indicated, the administration had no idea as to what the outcome on the conference report was likely to be.

Our friends on the House side, for reasons best known to themselves—I suppose for tactical reasons if no other—insisted that there should be no administration advisers in the room to advise the conferees on the foreign policy problems that would be created by the conference. Under the circumstances, having supported the Senate position and trimmed the House figures to the lowest point to which we were capable of trimming them, I understand that the President feels that if we are to put additional quotas in, there should be some flexibility and discretion on the part of the President to allot some additional quota to Argentina and perhaps to some other country within this hemisphere in order to meet the various foreign policy considerations that might confront the President and his advisers.

I point out that the House bill would have assigned quotas to various countries. They were the quotas that were carried into the conference. For example, the Republic of Peru was to be assigned 350,000 tons. We reduced that amount to 190,000 tons, a reduction of 160,000 tons. More sugar was involved in that reduction than the proposed amendment would involve, insofar as adjusting the entire quota in the hemisphere is concerned.

The Dominican Republic was to be assigned 350,000 tons. We reduced that amount to 190,000 tons, which was a reduction of another 160,000 tons.

That is more than the Senator's amendment contemplates. According to the House bill, Mexico was to be assigned 350,000 tons. That amount was reduced to 190,000 tons.

Mauritius was to have been assigned 110,000 tons. We reduced that amount to zero.

South Africa was to have been assigned 120,000 tons. We reduced that amount to 20,000 tons.

India was to have been assigned 130,000 tons. We reduced that amount to 20,000 tons.

Australia was to have been assigned 200,000 tons. We reduced that amount to 40,000 tons.

Brazil was to have been assigned 340,000 tons. We reduced that amount to 80,000 tons.

The point is that we made a reduction of 1,635,000 tons in the amount proposed in the bill that the House had passed, and we reduced the premium prices as well. While he has not personally asked me, I understand that the President has said that since the conference report made the allotment of 1,200,000 tons and added additional countries, the President would like more flexibility to make adjustments.

As a practical matter, if we were to try to do what the Senator from Wisconsin has proposed and undertake to take the proposed adjustments out of the allotments made to countries that have already an agreed quota, the House Committee on Agriculture would not consider it. It might be possible to bring about the desired result the other way around. We could give the President the necessary flexibility to assign an additional quota to Argentina, or perhaps make some increased adjustment insofar as the Dominican Republic is concerned. But, as a practical matter, if we were to try to do it the other way around, by taking a quota away from some country that the House held out for to the very end, I regret to say, the probabilities are that the House would not consider it and the House Committee on Agriculture would not act upon it if we did it that way.

I personally objected, as did my senior colleague from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to going back to conference to consider the question. I believe that my judgment in the matter is vindicated by what has happened in the Senate. We have had an all-day debate, even when the question was not raised. That being the case, it seems to me that if we would give the President the flexibility he has requested, we must keep in mind that we are working with quotas. Neither the President nor any of his advisers was consulted about what the new quotas were to be. We in the Senate were fighting for what we thought the position of the administration to be. We agreed to no more new premium quotas than we were forced to accept. The President now says, "If you are going to put new quotas in the bill, there should be some flexibility to make adjustments in order to meet what might be a bad international situation."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. There have been a good many discussions on the floor of the Senate today. I have understood that the proposed amendment to the honey bee bill would allow the President to set up the 20 million tons for Argentina and provide some additional leeway to deal with the Dominican Republic or perhaps with other countries that had not been, in his judgment, reasonably or fairly treated. Is that the understanding of the distinguished majority leader?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The figures would be at the discretion of the President, and the countries mentioned would be given consideration. But the whole amendment would apply only to the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that it would apply to the Western Hemisphere, but I also understood all day, during the various stages of the debate, that the amendment to be offered would take care of the Argentina problem and afford the President leeway to deal with the Dominican Republic.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the measure would give the President such flexibility.

Mr. HOLLAND. And it is so intended?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am perfectly willing to accept that explanation of the majority leader, though I shall always be glad to join in an amendment if the Senator from Wisconsin prepares one which will clarify our purpose.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to be sure that I correctly understand the purposes of the Senator's proposed amendment, if he decides to offer it. In explaining it, he said that his amendment would provide that instead of taking the proposed sugar quota from the global quota, it would take the new quota from the national quota, which is subject to two interpretations I wish to establish for the record that the Senator would not propose taking the quota away from the national quota so far as it applies to the United States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Oh, no. I am delighted to have the Senator from South Dakota emphasize that point.

Mr. MUNDT. The quota would come from the quotas given to foreign countries.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct—the national quotas to other nations, not the domestic quota.

Mr. MUNDT. I wished to clear up the ambiguity. I was sure that the Senator had that in mind.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am grateful to the Senator from South Dakota for clearing up that point.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to ask a question of Senators who handled the conference and who are now handling the amendment to the honey bee bill. I think it is a record for the Senate to attempt to embrace a program almost before it has been adopted. The question I raise is, Why do we not show full confidence in the administration by giving the President authority to assign quotas or to negotiate the necessary international agreements with regard to all the unassigned quotas?

It is my opinion that something of that kind will have to be requested in any case, because if we go into the world sugar market to purchase sugar, I believe we shall be in violation of at least three international agreements that we have signed.

First, I think we shall be in violation of commitments we have made in the United Nations.

Second, I think we shall be in clear violation of our commitment under the International Sugar Compact.

Third, we shall be in violation of the charter of the Punta del Este Conference, which we signed most recently.

I believe that now would be a good time for the Senate to say, "We will give the President authority to reassign quotas and to enter into agreements with regard to all the quotas in keeping with our commitments under the three international compacts."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My colleague has pointed out some important developments and facts that we must face. I have in my hands a copy of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958. In article 21 of that agreement the United States as a party to that agreement has recognized the minimum sugar price which will permit a realization of the objectives to be achieved. As set forth in article 21 of the agreement, the objective is 3¼ cents a pound. The present world price is 2.7 cents a pound. We have fixed our signatures to an agreement, which has been adopted and ratified by the Senate, in which the objectives of the act, as specifically outlined in article 21, will require a price of 3¼ cents a pound. I think the Senator has made a good point, and I think an analysis of the Sugar Agreement in my hand will so demonstrate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of the historic policy of the United States to maintain a fair world price for sugar.

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

HISTORIC POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES TO MAINTAIN A FAIR WORLD PRICE FOR SUGAR

The United States has long been a party to the International Sugar Agreement. The latest version of the agreement was ratified by the Senate of the United States as recently as 1959.

In transmitting the agreement for ratification on May 13, 1959, Acting Secretary of State Douglas Dillon stated the policy of the United States as follows:

"U.S. sugar producers have consistently supported the negotiations of sugar agreements in the realization that the United States should do its part to help avoid a drastic decline in the price of sugar in the world market, with its attendant effects on the sugar industries of friendly foreign countries."

In support of this policy objective, the United States has agreed under the International Sugar Agreement of 1959 not to allocate quotas for the importation of sugar into the United States to countries that do not participate in the International Sugar Agreement.

Furthermore, the United States as a party to the agreement, espouses the following principles which are set out in article 1 of that document:

"The objectives of this agreement are to assure supplies of sugar to importing countries and markets for sugar to exporting countries at equitable and stable prices and, by these and other means to assist in the maintenance of the purchasing power in

world markets of producing countries or areas and especially of those whose economies are largely dependent upon the production for export of sugar by providing adequate returns to producers and making it possible to maintain fair standards of labor conditions and wages."

The United States, as a party to the agreement, has also recognized that the minimum sugar price which will permit these objectives to be achieved is 3.25 cents per pound, as set out in article 21 of the agreement.

The United States as a signatory to the International Sugar Agreement, and in its own interest and that of its friends and allies, must recognize that the present world price of sugar, at 2.7 cents per pound, is not an adequate price.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator would agree that we could adopt that kind of language and send it to conference. In the meantime there can be some consultation with the State Department, the administration, and those responsible to see that we carry out our international agreements.

SUGAR QUOTAS—EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 8050

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended by H.R. 12154, Cuba is given a quota of 57.77 percent of the total quotas for all foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines. Based upon estimated domestic consumption of sugar of 9,700,000 tons, Cuba's quota for 1963 and 1964 would be 1,635,000 tons.

However, under the provisions of the Sugar Act, as amended by H.R. 12154, the quota for any foreign country is suspended during any period during which the United States is not in diplomatic relations with such country, and a quantity of sugar equal to the amount of the suspended quota is authorized to be purchased and imported from other foreign countries. Thus, during the remainder of this year, and during 1963 and 1964, the Cuban quota of 1,635,000 tons would be available for purchase and importation from other foreign countries.

Subsection (a) of the proposed amendment authorizes the President, for 1963 and 1964, to allocate to countries within the Western Hemisphere 150,000 tons of the suspended Cuban quota, leaving a balance of 1,485,000 tons which could be authorized for purchase and importation from foreign countries under the so-called global quota. For the 6-month period beginning July 1, 1962, and ending December 31, 1962, 75,000 tons could be allocated by the President to Western Hemisphere countries out of the 817,500 tons assigned to the global quota for this 6-month period.

Under section 213 of the Sugar Act, as added by H.R. 12154, an import fee is imposed on all sugar purchased and imported under the global quota. This fee has the effect of eliminating the premium price for sugar so imported. The new section 213 also imposes an import fee on sugar imported under the regular quota provisions in effect for the remainder of 1962 and for 1963 and 1964. However, in the case of sugar imported under the regular quotas, the import fee is 10 percent of the full import fee for the remainder of 1962, 20 percent of the full fee for 1963, and 30 percent of the full fee for 1964. The effect of this provision is to reduce gradually the premium price for sugar imported under the regular quotas.

Subsection (d) of this proposed amendment provides that sugar imported under allocations to Western Hemisphere countries made by the President under the authority given to him under subsection (a) will be subject to the import fee provided for sugar brought in under the regular quotas and not the import fee provided for sugar purchased under the global quota. Thus, a portion of the premium price would be paid for such sugar—90 percent for the balance of 1962, 80 percent for 1963, and 70 percent for 1964—the same as would apply to sugar imported under the regular quotas.

Subsections (b) and (c) of the proposed amendment are in the nature of technical amendments to provisions of the Sugar Act, as amended by H.R. 12154, to carry out the intent of the Senate and the conference committee with respect to the 10,000 tons of sugar which the Secretary of Agriculture may allocate to foreign countries for which no regular quota or allocation is provided in the law. Subsection (b) of the proposed amendment makes it clear that the provisions of section 202(e) of the Sugar Act, as amended by H.R. 12154—relating to countries which export sugar—are not to apply to an allocation made by the Secretary under the provision referred to above. Subsection (c) of the proposed amendment makes it clear that the provisions of section 207(e)(2) of the Sugar Act, as amended by H.R. 12154—relating to restrictions on the importation of direct-consumption sugar—are also not to apply to sugar imported under an allocation made by the Secretary under this new provision.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to make inquiry at this time of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin as to whether he intends to offer his amendment and; if so, how much discussion may be involved.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have discussed the amendment with the majority leader. If it is agreeable, I should like to discuss the amendment tonight and vote on it tomorrow under a time limitation. In this way there would be no inconvenience to Senators, because they could go home now. We could vote tomorrow without delaying the Senate. I believe the Senator from Montana has suggested that the Senate meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, and that the vote come at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to reserve the right to offer an amendment also.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can we arrive at an agreement as to how much time Senators would like for discussion of their amendments?

Mr. McCARTHY. Whatever the Senator suggests. Perhaps 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senate could convene at 11 o'clock, and vote at 12 o'clock. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. MORSE. I would suggest that the leadership put off the vote until Thursday if a unanimous-consent agreement is desired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Speaking only for myself, I am completely satisfied with the Senator's statement that he expects the Argentine quota to be taken care of without fail out of this amount, and that the rest of the amount can be used in the discretion of the President, with consideration, of course, of the Dominican situation and of any other situation which the President thinks requires consideration.

Mr. KERR. In this hemisphere.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In this hemisphere.

Mr. HOLLAND. In this hemisphere only.

ORDER FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY TO MEET DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INCREASING SUPPORT FOR INVESTMENT CREDIT PROPOSAL

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two items which are significant as indicators of the increasing trend of support within the business and financial community for the investment credit proposed by the administration to stimulate modernization and expansion of the Nation's productive equipment.

One is an excerpt from a report by the Research Institute of America of the results of a survey it conducted among its more than 30,000 members, constituting a representative segment of American business. This report showed remarkable support for the administration's tax and tariff proposals. In particular, it showed a 2 to 1 favorable margin for an 8-percent tax credit on investment in new equipment. As the institute's summary points out, contrary to current estimates in some business and political circles, two-thirds of the responding businessmen favored the investment tax credit. Only about a quarter were opposed and about 8 percent were noncommittal.

This extensive support for the investment credit is all the more impressive, expressed as it is by a group which frankly opposed many other administration policies. The investment credit was in fact almost as widely supported as the Treasury's forthcoming liberalization of depreciation guidelines, which was favored by 79 percent of the responding businesses.

The other significant indicator is an article entitled "Appraisal of Current

Trends in Business and Finance" which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of July 2. It is written by Mr. George Shea, one of the most knowledgeable and astute observers of the American financial scene.

Mr. Shea notes, in his lucid and penetrating discussion, that the investment credit is in fact a specific technique of tax reform which effectively supplements the shorter depreciable lives and liberalized depreciation procedures to be announced by the Treasury Department within the next week or so.

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

BUSINESSMEN FAVOR J.F.K. TAX AND TARIFF MEASURES BUT RETAIN OPPOSITION TO ADMINISTRATION

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 26.—Remarkable support for the Kennedy administration's tax and tariff proposals was expressed by a representative segment of the American business community in a detailed poll conducted among its more than 30,000 members by the Research Institute of America. The results included a 2 to 1 favorable margin for the 8-percent tax credit on new equipment, a majority vote in favor of the foreign income section of the 1962 tax bill, opposition to a temporary tax cut now, overwhelming support for the trade bill and for the promised depreciation revisions.

(NOTE TO EDITORS.—The results of the questionnaire sent to over 30,000 business executives representing every type and size of business firm located across the country, are attached. This tabulation of returns is the largest response ever received by the Research Institute of America in a poll of its members. The nature of the cross-section of American business surveyed and the exceptional number of responses makes this poll an unusually sensitive reflection of the attitudes of American businessmen.)

The single exception to the favorable response to the administration's tax and trade packages was the significant opposition to the provision calling for the withholding of tax on interest and dividends, which was opposed by over 75 percent of the business executives who responded to the poll by the Research Institute, the Nation's largest private, industry-supported, business advisory organization.

These results are made all the more noteworthy by the fact that the same survey, which received the largest number of responses in the Research Institute's 26-year history, demonstrated that the anxiety in the business community about the administration is extremely high, and that opposition to a number of the nontax aspects of the Kennedy legislative program was overwhelming.

Contrary to current estimates in some business and political circles the businessmen responding favored two of the three most controversial sections of the tax bill passed by the House and currently under Senate Finance Committee scrutiny; the 8 percent tax credit provision which was favored by 65.1 percent, with 26.9 percent opposing and 8 percent no opinion. The provisions for taxing of foreign income were favored by 43.4 percent, opposed by 41 percent with 15.6 percent noncommittal. On a related tax matter, the businessmen supported the administration's position by voting against a temporary reduction of corporate and personal tax rates now by a margin of 61.7 percent to 35.3 percent, with 3 percent expressing no preference. Also, only 1 out of 10 respondents expressed opposition to the coming revision of the depreciation schedules.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 2, 1962]

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By George Shea)

A curious aspect of this year's debate on the tax measure which the Senate Finance Committee is laying aside for the present has been the nature of the opposition to the proposed credit for new investment in equipment. Sources that say they speak for business, and sources that say they speak for labor unions and liberals, have both opposed it.

As passed by the House the credit would let businesses deduct from their income-tax bills 7 percent of what they spend on additional equipment. The business opponents say they would rather have a reform of the law governing the depreciation, for wear and tear of property, that may be deducted from taxable income. The leftwing opponents say that if there's any tax reduction at all it should be in the lowest brackets of individual income tax rates.

Reform of depreciation can be accomplished, basically, in only one way. That's by allowing depreciation to be deducted faster than is now permitted. Such will be the net effect of an announcement expected later this week from the Treasury, setting forth new and simplified categories of so-called useful lives of various kinds of property. It will enable businessmen to depreciate in, say, 15 years, property which previously could not be written off in less than, say, 25 years.

The argument in Congress isn't over these coming schedules. What the business group which opposes the credit wants is a law that would give businesses even more freedom than the Treasury can grant them under present law.

Complete reform would let businesses write off facilities at any rate they liked, even writing off 100 percent of a piece of property in the year it is bought. The Government would lose revenue in that year, because the deduction would reduce taxable income more than now permitted. But in subsequent years, as long as the property was in use for profitmaking activities, the Government would gain revenue, because that property would yield no further deductions from income. Assuming no change in the number of years the property is used under either method of depreciation, the Government would neither gain nor lose in the end.

Actually, the Government, and also the economic system, would probably gain through such complete freedom. The reason is that the faster any property is written off, the less tendency there is to keep it in use after it becomes obsolete or even mildly inefficient. Then, any earlier replacement of, say, a machine would not only stimulate economic activity, but would also bring earlier income-tax revenue to the Government on the profit made by the builder of the new machine.

However, the chances of getting the Government to give businessmen that much leeway are pretty small. For one thing, the Government might indeed lose a great deal of revenue the first year. For another, many legislators would be vaguely afraid businessmen might get away with something thereby.

Thus the problem becomes one of political strategy, in which the essential difference in results between the credit or a more liberal depreciation law must be judged. Actually, the resemblance between the two is greater than appears at first sight.

The credit would work this way: A business buys $100 of equipment. That year, after calculating its income tax the usual way, it is allowed to reduce the tax by 7 percent of $100, that is, by $7.

Methods of fast depreciation now available in the law let a business write off equipment more heavily in the first few years of use than in later years. For instance, one such method available in present law, if applied to a piece of equipment with a useful life of 15 years, lets a business write off in the first year one-eighth, and in the 15th year only one one-hundred-and-twentieth, of the value. The first-year deduction on the $100 piece of equipment thus can be $12.50, which, at the corporate tax rate of 52 percent, would save the business exactly $6.50 in tax in that year.

Thus, the credit, which would save $7 in tax in the year of purchase, could be looked upon as the result of extra depreciation. The amount of depreciation which would save $7 at a 52-percent tax rate would be $13.46.

A special feature of the proposed credit is that it would be available in addition to the full predication deductions already permitted by law. Thus, the buyer of the $100 of equipment with a life of 15 years could, in the first year of using it, save both the $7 through the credit and the $6.50 through using the depreciation method drescribed above. That's a total saving of $13.50. And the amount of depreciation which would save $13.50 at a 52 percent tax rate is $25.96.

As far as the taxpayer is concerned that's the equivalent of a depreciation deduction on the $100 facility of more than 25 percent in the first year. While technically this is not the same thing as a new form of accelerated depreciation, it has the same result.

One argument of some business opponents of the credit has been that it is a gimmick which could be repealed very easily. That's a matter of opinion, of course, the counter-argument being that tax concessions once specifically granted by Congress are difficult to repeal.

Another argument is that the credit would be a windfall for businesses which have been planning to spend money on equipment, and thus would discriminate against those that aren't planning to spend or don't have the money. However, the same thing might be said of depreciation reform; when such a law was passed in 1954 it was made applicable only to newly purchased facilities.

And even if a new reform measure were applied to all property, businesses purchasing new facilities would get the greatest benefit from it; it would apply throughout the life of the new facilities but only to the remaining life of the old.

Complete reform of depreciation rules would surely be desirable. The question of political strategy at this time is whether half a legislative loaf is better than the possibility of getting none at all by helping the liberals fight the proposed credit.

DISCRIMINATION IN DEFENSE SPENDING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in recent days Senators have received a communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Roswell L. Gilpatric, releasing the results of a study of the shifting pattern of Defense prime contract procurement.

Boiled down to its essence the Gilpatric report, "The Changing Patterns of Defense Procurement," says the following:

First. Three out of four dollars of prime contract money awarded to universities and nonprofit research institutions were centered in five States—Massachusetts, California, Maryland, New York, and Illinois—and the District of Columbia. Over $300 million out of the total of $431 million awarded in fiscal year 1961 went to these five States and the District. Thirty-five percent of the total went to the State of Massachusetts alone.

Second. Of the total research, developmental testing, and evaluation contracts let in fiscal 1961—a total of $6 billion—over 41 percent went to California. New York had 12 percent. The other 48 States shared less than 47 percent of the total of this $6 billion.

As Mr. Gilpatric points out, the concentration of this R.D.T. & E. effort in California and the eastern seaboard States is of major importance because any company which has contracted or managed the research, design, development, and testing work on a new weapons system—or major component—and has assembled the engineering, talent, and experience for this purpose, is obviously in an exceptionally strong position to compete for the follow-on production contracts, and for new developmental contracts, as well.

Third. The Gilpatric report stresses this latter point by listing the military prime contract awards by region and demonstrating that California alone, which had 41 percent of the R.D.T. & E. contract money, also had 24 percent of the total military prime contract awards. New York, which had 12 percent of the total R.D.T. & E. contract money, had 12 percent of the total prime military contract award money. Massachusetts, which had 5.8 percent of the R.D.T. & E. contract money also had 4.8 percent of the total prime contract awards.

We do not have the figures from Mr. Gilpatric for fiscal year 1963, but a general idea of the Defense Department's contracting pattern can be assumed by examining the published figures for NASA's fiscal year 1963 $3.7 billion budget request, published in Missiles and Rockets, June 11, 1962. Four States will get almost two-thirds of the NASA budget. California is scheduled to receive almost $1 million—$947,767—which is over one-fourth of the total NASA budget. Florida with $543 million, Louisiana with $395 million, and Alabama with $341 million, account for another one-third of the NASA budget. Texas, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Maryland, and Virginia will receive over $100 million each of the NASA budget. This leaves 40 States to share one-half of a billion dollars of the NASA budget, with only 10 States accounting for over $3.2 billion dollars—a very heavy concentration, indeed.

Mr. President, we are very proud in Minnesota of the great Institute of Technology at the University of Minnesota—an institute which has won worldwide acclaim in many fields, including those of aeronautical engineering and electronics.

We are also very proud of the fact that in the Minnesota area we have the second or third largest complex of electronics work—more than 170 firms, almost all of them founded within the last 5 years and almost all of them heavily engaged in both commercial and defense subcontracting. The number of people employed in the electronic industry in Minnesota by the end of 1961 had increased 75 percent over the year 1955.

It includes such giants as Remington Rand Univac, IBM, and Minneapolis Honeywell. It also includes scores of bright young firms employing a handful of engineers.

There is no question but that the meteoric rise of the electronics industry in Minnesota is directly related to the presence there of a great university and its superlative institute of technology. Even now, industry leaders have been planning with the University of Minnesota a huge new industrial research facility.

What concerns me is that in Minnesota, as doubtless in other areas of the country in which there are other great universities, the Defense Department and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have simply fallen behind the times. They have evidently taken the easy way out in the award of prime contracts, both for research and development and production.

Mr. President, I am interested in knowing why the Department of Defense feels it has to put fully half of its entire R.D.T. & E. money into California and New York. I am interested in knowing why half of the money for R.D.T. & E. contracts awarded to schools and nonprofit institutions must go into the States of Massachusetts and California.

Is it now about time that those managing the Defense Department's research and development programs recognize the tremendous economic dislocations and distortions which are created by this imbalance in the award of R.D.T. & E. prime contracts?

Mr. President, it is time that the Department of Defense assumed the responsibility to develop a better balance in the award of R.D.T. & E. contracts, by insuring that a reasonable share of these funds go to qualified institutions and business firms which can do the job equally as well as those in Massachusetts and California. A gross imbalance can be seen when one compares the funds allocated for R.D.T. & E. work in Minnesota schools and other nonprofit institutions—a total of less than $3 million—as opposed to the awards to Massachusetts schools and nonprofit institutions of $120 million. This is a ratio of 60 to 1.

Mr. President, will all due respect to that great institution, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, they are just not that good. And the Institute of Technology at the University of Minnesota is just not that relatively unable to do the job. Neither are the schools and nonprofit institutions of California—which shared in fiscal year 1961 over $80 million of R.D.T. & E. funds—40 times more creative and capable than the schools and nonprofit institutions of Minnesota.

Mr. Gilpatric points out:

> The Midwest, with its great university resources, and with its heavy annual production of Ph. D.'s and other professionals, did not in fiscal year 1961 obtain a share of defense prime contract awards, either for production, for general R.D.T. & E., or for nonprofit research proportional to its share of the Nation's scientific and technical skills.

Mr. President, I would quarrel, however, with Mr. Gilpatric's conclusion that certain institutions, companies, and communities have been "far more alert, more active, and more effective in their quest for Defense R.D.T. & E. contracts than others have been." While this may be partially true, it is also the responsibility of the Defense Department to do a better job on its homework, to know better than it has so far demonstrated it knows what resources are available outside California and Massachusetts, and to make a conscious effort to communicate with the professional communities in areas such as Minnesota so that the opportunities to bid on these R.D.T. & E. contracts are more fully understood and more widely disseminated.

When two States so dominate the R.D.T. & E. pattern of the country, something is wrong and it cannot be wholly ascribed to lack of initiative on the part of the business and professional community. Those who direct the procurement program of the Defense Department, and who persist in following the easy way—that is, to award the contracts to the big corporations and to the big institutions, must bear the major share of responsibility for this major distortion in the pattern of military procurement.

Mr. President, Senator McCARTHY, Representative BLATNIK, Representative KARTH, and I are continuing a major effort to correct this distortion by bringing Defense Department and NASA procurement people to Minnesota to see what we have. We intend to persist in this effort. We have a vital, creative, alert, and aggressive professional community in Minnesota. We have a concentration of brains and initiative in our State that should be used to its fullest if the Defense Department is going to tap the best potential of the country.

Mr. President, I intend to ask the Defense Department to provide me with a monthly report of the total R.D.T. & E. contracts being awarded, listed by State, and I hope to be able to work with the Department of Defense and NASA in creating a healthier, more equitable and more efficient pattern of the distribution of this vital work.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S VISIT TO MEXICO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have just had ample evidence of the good that can be accomplished by personal diplomacy at the highest level. It is fair to say that President Kennedy's trip to Mexico this past weekend was a triumph—not only a personal triumph for the Chief Executive and his host, President López Matéos of Mexico, but a triumphant demonstration of the common interests and the common principles binding two great republics of this hemisphere.

President Kennedy's visit to Mexico was of significance to all nations of the Western Hemisphere. It proved that whatever may be the policy differences between the United States and a sister republic, there are unbreakable bonds of sympathy and understanding between the peoples. Thanks to his recognition of the liberal and humanitarian motives behind Mexico's political actions, President Kennedy was able to translate these excellent people-to-people relations into excellent government-to-government relations. The symbol of this change was the hearty "abrazo" from President

López Matéos on Mr. Kennedy's departure at the Mexico City airport yesterday.

Thus the main effect of this visit was a rebirth of trust and cordiality between the Mexican and United States Governments. Ever since the Cuban invasion of April 1961, entirely too much attention has been paid to the different approaches taken by Mexico and the United States toward such problems as Castro's Cuba and the Alliance for Progress. Clearly it would be impossible for a single state visit to remove these differences in 3 days, but the important thing was that they were put in perspective; they were relegated to a secondary position behind each country's shared ideals of social justice and political liberty, behind a shared revolutionary commitment to the rights of man, including his right to individual and family dignity.

In this atmosphere a beginning could be made on specific economic and political problems. The U.S. loan of $20 million for aid to Mexican agriculture under the Alliance for Progress was both timely and symbolic. Likewise, great progress was made toward a settlement of the damage to Mexican cottonfields caused by the high salinity of the Colorado River. For its part, Mexico appeared to give its hearty endorsement to the social ideals and financial principles of the Alliance for Progress. Unqualified participation of Mexico in the Alliance could be instrumental in making the Alliance a success. Mexico has much to teach her neighbors throughout Central and South America. As President Kennedy so correctly stated in reply to the welcoming speech by President López Matéos on June 29:

> The Mexican revolution has helped to show what could be done—that the path of freedom is the path of progress. In the almost 20 years since Franklin Roosevelt came to Monterrey, your supply of goods and services has tripled, your per capita output has increased nearly 8 percent, you have become virtually self-sustaining in agriculture, and you have maintained the most consistent and impressive rate of growth of any Latin American nation.

Not only that, but Mexico is no longer a byword for cashiered elections, frequent and violent changes of government, and corrupt dictatorship. The dominant factor in her economic progress has been Mexico's remarkable political stability. Mexico has avoided the extremes of the revolutionary left and the reactionary right. Always anti-Communist, Mexicans are beginning to recognize the subversive danger of the present regime in Havana. Neither Americans in Mexico nor the U.S. Government have had any reason to fear or to misinterpret President López Matéos' celebrated remark that—

> My administration is of the extreme left within the Constitution.

If Mexico adheres to her liberal Constitution, which is almost a foregone conclusion under present circumstances, the result can only be a continuation of the progress registered in the past 20 years.

I have stated on previous occasions, Mr. President, that President Kennedy could do a world of good for the Alliance for Progress if he would make a personal visit to as many countries as possible in this hemisphere. His earlier visits to Venezuela and Colombia proved the accuracy of this thesis; his visit to Mexico proved it even more conclusively. And when he goes, I hope that he will always be accompanied by our gracious First Lady, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, who never fails to impress her hosts with her knowledge of Spanish and her unfailing appreciation of the history and culture of the countries she visits. In short, Mr. President, I am all for the kind of personal diplomacy we have just witnessed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the following:

First. Excerpts from speeches by López Matéos and John F. Kennedy, June 29.

Second. Biography of Adolfo López Matéos, New York Times, June 30, 1962.

Third. United States-Mexican communique—June 30, 1962.

Fourth. Christian Science Monitor, June 29: "Goals in Latin America."

Fifth. Christian Science Monitor, June 29: "What Kennedy Sees in Mexican Trip," by Robert R. Brunn.

Sixth. Washington Post, July 2: "Mexico Bids Kennedys Fond 'Adios'" by Carroll Kilpatrick.

Seventh. New York Times, July 2: "Vivas for Kennedy End Visit to Mexico."

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

[From the New York Times, June 30, 1962]

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY LÓPEZ MATÉOS AT LUNCHEON IN MEXICO CITY AND TEXT OF KENNEDY'S REPLY

The Charter of the Organization of American States assures us in words through which shines the depth of conviction that "the historic mission of America is to offer a man a land of liberty, and a favorable environment for the development of his personality and the realization of his just aspirations."

We have tried in Mexico for more than 150 years to live in accordance with this precept. And not without price—although perhaps with an understandable lack of modesty—I can say, Mr. President, that you, having come from a free nation, have today entered another land of liberty where a people that loves its independence works incessantly toward the realization of social justice.

In the world of our day, agitated by the immensity of the threats which hang over it, the symbolic meeting during these days between two free peoples is full of significance.

Our international relations with all countries are founded upon the classic principles of the law of nations and, first among these, that of the juridical equality of states, since equality, the sovereign parity of all peoples, together with the democratic equality of citizens, is the essential element within which harmony and peace may fully prosper.

This principle of international democracy, applied by us with that respect and consideration which our peoples and our Governments have toward each other, is the one that today so happily inspires our cordial relations with the United States of America.

MOTIVE FOR UNDERSTANDING

It pleases me greatly to know, Mr. President, that the Mexican Revolution, now finally understood in the United States by its profoundly humanistic base, is identified with the sentiment of liberty that never departed from the great American nation; it pleases me to know—I repeat—that our revolution is now, in addition, a new motive for understanding between our two countries and a stimulus that permits their Presidents—while fear, ignorance and poverty exist in many regions of the world—to converse in terms that help to advance the realization of just and time-honored aspirations.

Neither humanity nor any nation has ever sought its own destruction. It is their destiny to live to the end. And we must not permit fear or petty interests to take over in our spirits, leading us to suppose that the world can be saved through inaction or asphyxia. As you said in your speech at Yale University only a few days ago, and you said it very well, "For the great enemy of truth is very often not the lie—deliberate, contrived and dishonest—but the myth—persistent, persuasive, and unrealistic."

In the course of 50 years of revolution, or better yet, since the revolution entered its constructive stage, there have been effected in Mexico wonderful political, economic and social changes that if not impeded by events in the world, will place our country within reach of attaining its true greatness, that is to say, the highest expression of its national personality.

I do not wish to develop further an analysis of what Mexico has gained by means of the revolutionary movement of 1901, but I cannot in justice do less than invite those coryphaei of skepticism so that they may confirm with their own eyes, in a quick comparison between the Mexico of the beginning of this century and the Mexico of today, the immensity of the differences between the two, and above all—since this pleases us even more than does our still incipient economic development—that they reflect upon the magnitude of the social task that is evident in the continuity and progress of the agrarian reforms, the multiplying increase of schools, the prosperous growth in social security, the continuous building of housing developments and the effective protection of health and human life.

DIGNITY AS A HUMAN BEING

But more than that, the transformation of the spirit of the Mexican who has today full conscience of his dignity as a human being and of all his fundamental rights; who knows that he has a country which protects and shelters him; who has a national ideal and shares, therefore, the destiny of Mexico; who is sure that his sons will have larger opportunities and better chances to fulfill their destiny; who knows also that his dignity, freedom, and sovereignty must be respected in the same manner as he respects the dignity, freedom, and sovereignty of others.

All this justifies the interest with which Mexico has followed the development of that vast program of cooperation which you, Mr. President, have conceived as an alliance of the American republics for the realization of their progress, and which we have always interpreted—and I am happy to reaffirm it now—as a movement in which all the republics of this hemisphere that desire to participate in it have a position of responsibility, and not simply as a unilateral program of aid from the United States of America. This is one of the reasons that has moved Mexico to give it its support.

Behind the determination to bring to a satisfactory conclusion numerous economic and social reforms in the structure of many colonial or semicolonial institutions that have acquired a strange survival on American soil; behind that determination there is the inspiration of clear revolutionary thought that coincides in its entirety with that of our recent Mexican history. To deliver to all peoples the ripe fruit of revolution, avoiding the painful stage of fratricidal struggles, constitutes at last a historical experiment of incalculable importance.

LIBERTY HELD BASIC

Little by little inter-American cooperation has been becoming a concrete fact, and it is already possible to anticipate that our system, in spite of its defects and errors, and thanks to programs like the Alliance for Progress, which are restoring to our system its original revolutionary concept, will find its true path and take accelerated steps to travel along this road.

The welfare of the people forms an integral part of the historic mission of America. Man, his liberty and his dignity; the people, their well-being and their prosperity, have always been basic preoccupations of the American nations.

We have our flags, Mr. President; no one has seized them from us nor shall we allow them ever to be taken from us. All that we have to do is to raise them on high and as they wave in the air, march confidently toward the future, where peace with justice may be assured, as also the dignity of the human being with liberty, and the friendship of all peoples with the sovereignty of nations.

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I propose that we drink a toast to the prosperity and the welfare of the United States of America and to the health and the personal well-being of its illustrious President, His Excellency John F. Kennedy, his most gracious wife, Mrs. Kennedy, and the distinguished members of his party; may their stay in Mexico be a pleasant one and may it remain fresh in their memories for many years.

BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY

It is with both pleasure and reverence that I have crossed the peaceful border which separates our two nations. For Mexico and the United States share more than a common border. We share a common heritage of revolution, a common dedication to liberty, a common determination to preserve the blessings of freedom and extend its fruits to all.

While geography has made us neighbors, tradition has made us friends. Economics has made us partners. And necessity has made us allies—in a vast Alianza para el Progreso. Those whom nature hath so joined together, let no man put asunder.

Two great and independent nations—united by hope instead of fear—are bound to have differences and disappointments. But we are equally bound to discuss them in a frank and friendly manner, to agree whenever we can agree, and to respect each other's views whenever we disagree. As cotenants of the same continent, we cannot meet our mutual needs in disarray. But, working together, we can face the future together with confidence.

There is much to be done in the future. As President López Matéos has said, the ideals of the Mexican revolution will not be fulfilled "while there is even one child without a school, one illiterate adult, one family without its own home, and while there is even one farm or city worker who does not receive enough salary to lead a decent life."

We are committed to those goals in my own country, for our own people. No nation can seek social justice abroad that does not practice it at home. But now, in addition, the United States of America is committed to help fulfill these goals throughout the Americas—to work together with Mexico and all other nations of the inter-American system to create a society in which all men have equal access to land, to jobs, and to education—a society in which no man is exploited for the enrichment of a privileged few, and in which every arm of the government is dedicated to the welfare of all.

This effort is not a one-way street. We in the United States have much to learn as well as to teach. There are commodities we must buy as well as sell. There are national burdens to be shared as well as individual burdens to be lifted. Where barriers stand between us, they must be shattered on both sides.

And so, my friends, I do not come to speak of what my country offers yours, but of what together we can do for our children. Your President and I, your people and mine, are united in our ideals and aspirations for this hemisphere. Together we shall work—together we can succeed.

Aspirations listed

Permit me now to remind you of a few of those common aspirations.

1. First, we are determined to reinforce the inter-American principle of absolute respect for the sovereignty and independence of every nation. That principle was at the heart of the good-neighbor policy—and we remain good neighbors today. That principle is the foundation of our Alliance—and we shall always be allies for progress. We recognize the right of every nation to order its own affairs, to formulate its own policies, to decide upon its own actions, subject only to the obligations of international law and the rights of other nations. And all nations who seek forcibly or by subversion to impose their will on any American country will find the free nations of this hemisphere united and determined to preserve the independence of all.

2. Secondly, we are dedicated to the ideal of a free and peaceful hemisphere of free and equal nations." "Democracy," said Benito Juárez, "is the destiny of humanity; freedom its indestructible arm." This was the destiny of the Mexican Revolution—this was the destiny of the American Revolution—and this destiny will not be achieved in full until the entire Western Hemisphere is a community of free democratic nations, committed to the individual freedom of their citizens.

3. Third, we are devoted to increasing social justice for all. National independence means little to the man who is not yet independent of poverty and illiteracy and disease. New factories and machinery mean little to the family without a home, to the student without a meal, to the farmer who has given up hope of ever owning the land he tills. If you and I and our two great nations believe in peaceful revolution—if we believe that social justice can be achieved without the sacrifice of freedom or progress—then we have ample opportunity in this hemisphere to carry out those convictions.

But it will not be easy. Ending outmoded systems of land tenure—reforming unjust systems of taxation—expanding the opportunities for better housing and better health and better education where no opportunities have existed before—all this will not be easy.

Path of freedom

But the Mexican revolution has helped to show what could be done—that the path of freedom is the path of progress. In the almost 20 years since Franklin Roosevelt came to Monterrey, your supply of goods and services has tripled, your per capita output has increased nearly 8 percent, you have become virtually self-sustaining in agriculture and you have maintained the most consistent and impressive rate of growth of any Latin American nation.

These are, I realize, only statistics—but behind these statistics I know hope has replaced despair and opportunity has replaced misery. And while, as your President López Matéos has said, your revolution is far from completed in this nation, we must now work together to bring such hope and opportunity to all the Americas.

There will be delays. There will be setbacks. There will be frustrations. We cannot double the number of classrooms, double the rate of literacy, reduce by three-fourths the rate of infant mortality and increase by 50 percent the average life expectancy in a matter of months or even years. Commodity price agreements are difficult to work out. Power and transportation systems are a long time in building. And basic internal reforms are certain to be resisted.

But now we know where we are going—and we are on our way. We do not seek to change or direct any nation's political or economic system. But we do seek to assist the Latin American nations to make fundamental changes in the life of the peoples of Latin America—and thereby to change the course of human history. If we can pursue this course with the unyielding determination you have shown—we shall surely prevail in the end.

A century ago President Abraham Lincoln declared that the independence of Mexico was a cardinal object of American policy; and he instructed his Secretary of State to tell the people of Mexico of his "respect for the * * * heroism of her people and, above all, their inextinguishable love of civil liberty."

Today, 100 years later, that deep respect remains in the hearts of the people and the President of the United States. For our two nations have been blessed with the same blessings of liberty in the past. We will dream the same dreams of opportunity in the future. And our two continuing revolutions have now been joined as one—one great effort—on one great continent—in one great Alianza para el Progreso.

[From the New York Times, June 30, 1962]

A HARDENED MEXICAN—ADOLFO LÓPEZ MATÉOS

MEXICO CITY, June 29.—President Adolfo López Matéos, who was inaugurated for a 6-year term December 1, 1958, is a grimmer and grayer man as he welcomes President Kennedy to a state visit to Mexico.

According to his intimates, the Mexican leader is also a considerably tougher man as he nears the two-thirds mark of his administration. He recently observed his 52d birthday.

Mexico's political system being what it is, the Presidency carries an awesome power, and it makes a proportionate demand on the incumbent. There has never been an easy Presidency in Mexico, but the term of Adolfo López Matéos has been more difficult than most.

He inherited great social and political uneasiness. A series of violent demonstrations had been quelled forcibly in the capital less than 4 months before he took office. The seeds of a nationwide railroad strike had already been sown, and when it took place 15 months after he was inaugurated, it threatened to cripple the national economy.

STRIKE LEADERS ARRESTED

The President, who in the previous administration had been Minister of Labor, broke the back of that strike by ordering the left-dominated leaders arrested. Most of them, including the leader, Demetrio Vallejo, are still in prison.

Mexico's well-known muralist, David Alfaro Siqueiros, later admitted in court that the Mexican Communist Party, of which he was the leading figure, gave moral and physical support to the strike. Subsequently he was arrested for fostering antigovernment, anti-U.S. demonstrations. He, like Senor Vallejo, is still in prison.

Once known as an expert in finding an acceptable compromise, the President early in his administration began showing an unexpected toughness. Later he attempted to placate Mexico's astonished left wing, which had considered him as leaning their way.

The President said flatly: "My administration is of the extreme left, within the Constitution."

A BOXER IN SCHOOL

Senor López Matéos, who stands 5 feet 10 and weighs about 180 pounds, was an amateur boxer in school, and a great hiker. On one of his school vacations he walked from

Mexico City to the Guatemalan border and back, a distance of 851 miles. The journey took 46 days.

The President is a music lover and especially favors Beethoven. He also is fond of sports. He owns three automobiles of European make and drives whenever he gets a chance.

He was a wide-ranging reader until the social and administrative demands of office became overbearing. Long able to read in English, he has been practicing lately to speak it. It is said he may make an attempt at it in his conversation with President Kennedy this weekend.

Since taking the Presidency, Senor López Matéos has traveled widely. Besides taking many trips throughout his own country, he has made state visits to various Latin American countries and to the United States and Canada. There are plans for similar visits to Japan and India, and possibly to the Soviet Union.

Senor López Matéos was born May 26, 1910, in Atizapan de Zaragoza, near the capital. His family, well off by provincial standards, was descended on both sides from soldiers, revolutionaries, and intellectuals.

Before entering politics, the President was director of the Toluca Scientific and Literary Institute, from which he has been graduated with a law degree. He was elected to the National Senate in 1946.

The President is married to the former Eva Samano, a former teacher, of Mexican and English parentage. They have a 19-year-old daughter, Eva.

UNITED STATES-MEXICAN COMMUNIQUE

MEXICO CITY, June 30.—Text of a joint communique issued by President Kennedy and President López Matéos:

"President Adolfo López Matéos and President John F. Kennedy have held a series of conversations which mark a new era of understanding and friendship between Mexico and the United States.

"Both Presidents reaffirmed the dedication of their countries to the ideals of individual liberty and personal dignity which constitute the foundation of a civilization which they share in common. In consonance with their dedication to these ideals and acting always as sovereign and independent countries, which decide their own policies and their own courses of action, they propose to respect and maintain the principles of nonintervention—whether this intervention may come from a continental or extracontinental state—and of self-determination of peoples. Therefore they are resolved to uphold these principles in the international organizations to which they belong, to defend and strengthen the democratic institutions which their peoples, in the exercise of their sovereign rights, have constructed, and to oppose totalitarian institutions and activities which are incompatible with the democratic principles they uphold.

"Both Presidents fully accept the responsibility of every sovereign nation to form its own policies, without outside dictation or coercion. They also recognize that the republics of the hemisphere share the commitment they have recently accepted, in accordance with the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance and the Charter of the Organization of American States to defend the continent, and to foster the fundamental democratic values. This principle of common responsibility, without impairment of national independence, is the cornerstone of the Organization of American States."

THE 1961 CHARTER BACKED

"Another dimension of this principle was expressed at the Punta del Este Conference in August of 1961. The two Presidents reaffirm their support of the Charter of Punta del Este and of the program of accelerated social and economic progress which that charter embodies. In fact, Mexico and the United States, together with the other countries of the inter-American system, are closely associated in a vast endeavor, without precedent, to promote the well-being of all the inhabitants of the hemisphere.

"President Kennedy recognized that the fundamental goal of the Mexican revolution is the same as that of the Alliance for Progress—social justice and economic progress within the framework of individual freedom and political liberty.

"The two Presidents also discussed the economic and social development program of Mexico. President Kennedy reaffirmed his country's commitment, made in the Charter of Punta del Este, to continue to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in the endeavor which it and the Mexican people are carrying out to accelerate the economic and social well-being of all the inhabitants of the Republic. The two Presidents agreed that the Alliance for Progress is essentially a program of mutual cooperation, in which the greater effort should come primarily from the nation which is seeking its development. Mexico and the United States are determined, so far as they are concerned, to continue such an effort until hunger, poverty, illiteracy, and social injustice have been eliminated from this hemisphere.

"The two chiefs of state concurred in the need of intensifying the efforts which are being made through the various international organizations including the United Nations, the inter-American system, and the European Economic Community to achieve expanding levels of trade, with special attention to the elimination of discriminatory and restrictive practices against exports of basic commodities from Latin America. They agreed that it is indispensable that a broadened and more stable market should be provided in order to improve the income of the exporting countries. Of such income, workers and farmers should have an equitable share to permit increases in their levels of living. Cotton, coffee, sugar, and metals were the subject of special discussion.

"ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

"The two Presidents discussed the importance of achieving higher rates of economic growth in their respective countries. They agreed that government has an essential role in stimulating and supplementing the efforts of private enterprise for attaining this objective, especially through sound economic and fiscal policies. Both Presidents agreed that inflation and financial instability have an adverse effect on economic development and the level of living of the general public. President López Matéos expressed the continued determination of his Government to pursue policies which would promote financial stability and economic growth, and President Kennedy promised the cooperation of his Government toward that end.

"The two heads of state exchanged views on the importance of the United Nations in promoting international understanding and peace and in encouraging economic and social progress. They decided, in consequence, that their Governments should consult each other with the view of cooperating even more closely in all matters which maintain and strengthen the purposes and principles of the San Francisco Charter.

"Both Presidents expressed the strong desire that, within the scope of the United Nations, and particularly at Geneva, negotiations should continue for general disarmament as well as for the termination of nuclear tests, both based upon effective means of control.

"Both heads of state feel gratified by the manner in which their Governments are collaborating in the eradication of illegal drug traffic, and agreed to redouble their efforts and their cooperation to put an end to this criminal activity.

"DAM PROJECT REVIEWED

"The two Presidents reviewed the progress of the joint undertaking of their countries in constructing the Amistad Dam and Reservoir project and expressed satisfaction that this project is proceeding on schedule.

"The two Presidents discussed the problem of Chamizal. They agreed to instruct their executive agencies to recommend a complete solution to this problem which, without prejudice to their judicial position, takes into account the entire history of this tract.

"In relation to the problem of salinity of the waters of the Colorado River, the two Presidents discussed the studies which have been conducted by the scientists of the two countries. The two Presidents noted that water which the United States plans to release during the winter of 1962–63 for river regulation and such other measures as may be immediately feasible should have the beneficial effect of reducing the salinity of the waters until October 1963. They expressed their determination, with the scientific studies as a basis, to reach a permanent and effective solution at the earliest possible time with the aim of preventing the recurrence of this problem after October 1963.

"The Presidents finished their conversations by emphasizing their determination that whatever temporary difficulties may at times arise between Mexico and the United States, the two Governments should resolve them in a spirit of close friendship, inasmuch as they are fundamentally united in defense of those values of liberty and personal dignity which their revolutionary ancestors struggled to establish."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 29, 1962]

WHAT KENNEDY SEES IN MEXICAN TRIP

(By Robert R. Brunn)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy will spend a good part of his time in Mexico with President López Matéos talking about the Alliance for Progress.

He will encourage President López Matéos to bring Mexico into a more active role in the Alliance and reassure private investors in Latin America.

U.S. officials disclose their country will spend something like $3 billion in the next 5 years for the Alliance but analysts agree the flight of Mexican capital is disturbing.

Mrs. Kennedy accompanies the President, as well as floor leader Senator MIKE MANSFIELD and Mrs. Mansfield, and Teodoro Moscosco, coordinator for the Alliance for Progress. Fifty American newsmen are flying down from Washington.

RELATIONS BETTER

This trip comes when relations with Mexico have improved somewhat in the past 2 years although a residual Mexican distrust of American economic motives remains.

A dip in relations began with the Cuba invasion and was further accented by a Mexican nationalization program. The effect of both forces has abated to a sizable degree.

President Kennedy indicated the thrust of his talks with President López Matéos at his press conference on Wednesday. He said he hopes the talks can uncover "what we together can do to strengthen the democratic fabric in all of Latin America."

Mexico so far has been cautious about the Alliance. President Kennedy hopes to convince the Mexicans that they should not only participate in the Alliance as a beneficiary but as a donor.

MADE OWN CONTRIBUTIONS

President Kennedy, it is expected, will remind President López Matéos that Mexico put into practice the social principles of the Alliance for Progress long ago. Officials here say that Mexico could contribute tremendously to the success of the program with its

experienced technicians in such fields as land reform and planning.

Experts here agree that if President Kennedy could sell the Alliance to Mexico and bring Mexican technicians to Latin American countries that are on the verge of social revolutions, the Alliance would be measurably strengthened.

As President Kennedy left for Mexico it was announced the United States will soon sign an agreement for a $20 million loan to Mexico under the Alliance.

CAPITAL FLOWS OUT

The loan will help to provide medium and long-term credit for small farmers, combined with public and private Mexican funds in an expanded program of agricultural extension services by the Mexican Government.

At the same time World Bank officials left for Bogotá to discuss implementation of a global economic aid consortium for Colombia that could revolutionize the Alliance for Progress. A consortium such as those working in India and Pakistan uses West European funds plus American aid.

If successful in Colombia, consortium development is expected to spread to other countries and deemphasize the role of the United States, which would still provide the Alliance money now committed.

American investors have been shying from Latin America and Latin American capital has been fleeing. The Alliance is pushing social evolution. President Kennedy is expected to discuss this problem with President López Matéos.

Mexico itself, with its nationalization program, has frightened American capital away. This Mexicanization emphasis was designed to give Mexican enterprise an advantage, arguing that Mexican enterprises should not be unfavorably affected or their future development frustrated.

At the start of 1960 the Mexican economy slowed up to a walk and a balance-of-payments problem developed. U.S. Ambassador Thomas C. Mann worked hard with the Mexican Government to convince it that the "gringo" days are gone. To prove it, for example, the United States gave a $75 million stabilization fund to draw on to solve the payments crisis.

ECONOMY PICKS UP

Since 1961 the dynamic Mexican economy has improved with industrial production beginning to climb again, exports picking up, and the payments gap narrowing a bit. This all seems to go along with the López Matéos decision to deemphasize the nationalization policy.

The flight of capital from Mexico has been arrested and not reversed and the Government has been working hard to reassure private industry inside and outside the country.

Mexico is the best U.S. customer in Latin America. In 1960 Mexico bought more than $802 million in U.S. goods; it shipped goods worth more than $445 million to this country. U.S. investors have more than $1 billion interest in Mexican industry; more than 500 U.S. firms active in Mexico keep the dollars flowing across the border.

CUBA STANCE SHIFTED

The Kennedy visit comes at a point where the economical condition is improving and when the Mexican stance toward Cuba has shifted.

It is now plain to the Mexican people as a whole that the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City is a center of subversion and propaganda. The Mexicans are quite sophisticated about communism and the final revelation of Castro's Marxist-Lenin philosophy ended a slow process of deglamorization for the majority.

So Cuba is no longer the friction point that it was with the United States and this makes the Kennedy visit much more possible. However, the pro-Castro movement is still politically powerful in Mexico. Mexico still stands on the principles of nonintervention and self-determination in Cuba and continues to recognize the Castro government.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 29, 1962]

GOALS IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Bertram B. Johansson)

The concept that the $20 billion Alliance for Progress aid program in Latin America must become a vast political undertaking as well as the economic achievement it is intended to be is gaining a wider acceptance and circulation in Washington.

None other than Felipe Herrera, the articulate President of the Inter-American Development Bank—which is itself injecting huge amounts of funds into the hemisphere's economies—is giving voice to this view.

President Kennedy's trip to Mexico this weekend is a step in achieving wider political acceptance of the Alliance.

AIMS SPELLED OUT

The objectives of the Alliance, Mr. Herrera says, besides being economic, are also political "since they are designed to create in Latin America a united group of strong, independent, and progressive countries whose presence in world affairs represents a positive force in defense of man's ethical and spiritual values and in furtherance of international understanding."

Postponed consideration of the political problems inherent in the Alliance is one of its chief limitations, Mr. Herrera believes, and may impair its chances of success.

Mr. Herrera expressed these views at a colloquium on Latin America at Georgetown University this week.

SUPPORT NEEDED

The awakening of broad political support among the masses is a precondition for activating development policies and plans, he said. (Provisions for a public information program for the Alliance were turned down at Punta del Este months ago.)

Mr. Herrera observed that a complex set of political factors, including the fact that there are 20 separate Latin nations often going their own separate ways, determines the insufficiency of a public information program to bring about the desired climate in hemisphere public opinion.

Often, he said, when one country receives a loan, persons in another country, instead of realizing the overall value of the loan to all of Latin America, carp about their own country not receiving enough.

COOPERATION INVOLVED

In the United States, the realization is necessary that the Alliance is a cooperative effort of all the Americas that entails reciprocal responsibilities and benefits.

Mr. Herrera urged mobilization of public opinion in all the hemisphere's countries by chief executives and political leaders, rather than just by economists, who are not particularly equipped for this sort of effort.

He urged, too, the establishment of machinery for economic cooperation such as Europe has found so useful, and which was approved at the highest political levels, such as the Organization for European Cooperation, now superseded by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and the European Coal and Steel Community.

BANK ROLE REVIEWED

The IADB President, who is a Chilean, reviewed some of the activities of the Bank in its short period of existence, which included the following projections:

At the time of termination of projects already approved by the bank and under active consideration, the number of houses constructed will be 166,336, benefiting 1,088,437 persons.

The number of water supply and sewerage systems installed will be 1,005 in 864 locations for the benefit of 16,686,410 people.

And the number of persons benefiting from projects in the agricultural field will be 724,086.

RESEARCH STIMULATED

IADB also has helped the Alliance stimulate study of Latin American economic and social problems and preparation of national development plans (a concept many Latin countries have resisted for years).

The amount of foreign resources that must be invested in Latin America in the current decade has been determined, targets established for the rate of growth in per capita product and for improving significant indices of social conditions.

Mr. Herrera urged that in the light of recent European experience, "we must give serious thought to the possibility of establishing institutions such as a Latin American parliament and executive bodies designed to carry out economic integration in specific sectors of our economy, as Europe has done with the Coal and Steel Community."

TRAINING MUST EXPAND

To provide a solid footing for the technological revolution Latin America needs, "We must expand our current effort to train our national labor force and raise its cultural and technical levels," he commented.

The total of Latin American technicians and professionals today is about 50,000 persons, or the equivalent of 0.24 professional persons for every 1,000 population. By comparison, the United States has a technical force of about 1,100,000, or the equivalent of 6 professional persons for every 1,000 population.

A massive effort in the technical training field is, therefore, imperative, said Mr. Herrera, to raise the number of Latin American professionals to 110,000 by 1970, or an increase of 120 percent over current levels.

[From the Washington Post, July 2, 1962]

MEXICO BIDS KENNEDYS FOND "ADIOS"

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

MEXICO CITY, July 1.—President Kennedy's visit to Mexico ended today, as it began on Friday, on a wave of emotion.

Several hundred thousand persons crowded the streets to wave goodby as the President and Mrs. Kennedy drove from the historic Shrine of Guadalupe, where they attended mass, to the airport.

The crowds today, while smaller than those on Friday that set a record here, were largely unexpected and showed no signs of being organized. They were as friendly as any a political leader could wish for.

If there was any anti-U.S. sentiment, often advertised here, it did not show in the smiling faces that greeted the Kennedys throughout their visit.

At the famous shrine tens of thousands of persons jammed the plaza to applaud the Kennedys as they entered and departed. Inside the great church itself 5,000 worshipers forgot tradition and vigorously applauded the American guests.

There were many more thousands along the entire 10-mile route through some of the poorest sections of the city to the airport, where President and Mrs. Adolfo López Matéos bade their guests farewell.

Although there is strict separation of church and state in this Catholic country the people seemed to applaud the President's choice of the Shrine of Guadalupe, the center of Catholic authority and tradition, in which to worship.

The Mexican President followed tradition by staying away from church, and no high official accompanied the Kennedys to the shrine. Mexicans said it would be in viola-

tion of the spirit of the Constitution for President López Matéos to attend mass.

But the Mexican people were delighted when the first Catholic President of the United States went to their most hallowed church.

Mexican and United States officials called the weekend visit a personal triumph—and the President took off for Washington at 11:30 a.m., Mexican time (1:30 p.m., e.d.t.), in a mood far different from that of a year ago as he returned from his Vienna meeting with Premier Khrushchev.

[The presidential jet landed at Andrews Air Force Base at 5:30 p.m. (e.d.t.). Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy traveled by helicopter to the White House.]

What the visit seemed to accomplish was not a change in the politics of either country but a change in attitude on the part of Government and people here. Difficult problems still exist and longstanding suspicions have not been entirely forgotten.

But a new basis for discussion apparently was established.

As one expert explained the situation, the Government will not feel compelled to play upon anti-U.S. sentiment but will be able to approach difficult Mexican-American problems with a desire for settlement.

President Kennedy began his day with a symbolic gesture as significant as his visit to the shrine.

He went to the Monument of the Revolution to lay wreaths on the tombs of Francisco I. Madero and Venustiano Carranza, thus identifying himself with the revolution which the Catholic Church opposed and which Mexican history books say the United States has always opposed.

Then the President and Mrs. Kennedy drove to the shrine where an Indian peasant is said to have seen the Holy Mother on December 9, 1531.

Since that time the Virgin Mary has been regarded as the protectress of the Indian people and the patron saint of Mexico.

The Most Reverend Miguel Dario Miranda, archbishop primate, met the Kennedys and Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, and Mrs. Mansfield at the door and escorted them to their seats.

It was at this point that the worshipers first broke into loud applause. Some shouted "viva." Then the congregation and choir sang the moving "Hymn of Guadalupe," which they sang again as the services ended.

Speaking in English, the archbishop welcomed the U.S. visitors and praised them for helping to strengthen peace and good relations between Mexico and the United States. He invoked God's blessings and said the mass was celebrated to promote friendship between the two peoples.

After the archbishop read the Mass, Mrs. Kennedy, kneeling, presented a bouquet of red roses as an offering to the patron saint of Guadalupe.

The rose is the flower of the Virgin of Guadalupe because the Indian peasant who is said to have seen the Holy Mother was admonished by Zumarraga, to whom he reported the vision, to return with some evidence. The peasant, Juan Diego, went back to the top of the hill where only cactus had grown and found roses.

The archbishop blessed the roses that the First Lady presented, took them to the altar and then returned them to Mrs. Kennedy.

At this point she was inducted into the order of our Lady of Guadalupe an the worshipers applauded for the second time. They applauded again when the Kennedys began to leave for the drive to the airport.

In contrast to the well-guarded drive into the city Friday, there were few people and no soldiers guarding the route today and the motorcade often was slowed to avoid accidents.

There were no farewell speeches at the airport, but President López Matéos embraced Mr. Kennedy as he said goodby. On Friday, there had been only a formal handshake. Today's brazo signified the Mexican President's warmer feeling.

Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy shook hands with several hundred diplomats and Government officials, and the President was given a 21-gun salute before he boarded his jetplane.

[From the New York Times, July 2, 1962]

VIVAS FOR KENNEDY END VISIT TO MEXICO

(By Paul P. Kennedy)

MEXICO CITY, July 1.—President Kennedy left Mexico today after having received the applause of crowds as fervid as those that greeted him Friday.

More than 200,000 people crowded into the area of the Basilica of Guadalupe, where the President and Mrs. Kennedy attended Mass in the morning.

Waving and cheering Mexicans, dressed in holiday attire, later lined the entire 11-mile route from the basilica to the International Airport, from which the President left for Washington. He left behind a triumph in the establishment of better relations between Mexico and the United States.

After a final farewell at the airport, Mr. Kennedy and President Adolfo López Matéos embraced in the traditional Latin American abrazo. On Friday, when they had met, they shook hands formally, and the absence of an abrazo was conspicuous.

The change from a formal handshake to an embrace paralleled President Kennedy's achievement of a switch in Mexico's attitude toward the United States from coldness to warmth and understanding.

In the talks between the two Presidents and in a joint communique issued yesterday there was no overt reference to the coolness that had developed in relations over the last few years.

President López Matéos aroused a certain amount of ire when he cautioned the foreign press to "write the truth about what has happened here in this meeting." But aside from this, there was virtually complete rapport between the two Presidents and between the Presidents and the press in general during the talks.

The harmonious discussions also provided a setback for extreme leftist elements that had attempted to have Mr. Kennedy's visit canceled.

PROBLEM NOT INSOLUBLE

It appeared evident that there were only a few concrete results from the visit. However, the two Presidents proved—apparently to their mutual satisfaction—that the insoluble problems of the past that had barred harmonious relations were now not as insoluble as they had seemed.

Mexico has won an assurance that President Kennedy would use his energy and authority to help solve some of her principal problems with the United States.

President Kennedy, on his part, appears to have alined Mexico, with only minor reservations, as a strong supporter of the Alliance for Progress, which is designed to speed social and economic development in the hemisphere.

The attitude of Mexico regarding Cuba has not changed, but there appeared to have been little hope of bringing about a change even before the talks had started.

Mexico regards Cuba's Socialist ideology as incompatible with democratic principles, but she has refused to support measures that would isolate Cuba from other nations in the hemisphere.

On the Alliance for Progress, which the United States regards as its best long-range weapon for defeating any spread of revolution by Cuba or the Soviet Union in the hemisphere, Mexico agreed that the plan "is essentially a program of mutual cooperation, in which the greater effort should come primarily from the nation which is seeking its development."

The Mexican statement is expected to aid the United States in its efforts to promote the Alliance as a partnership in which self-help, rather than one-way aid, is stressed.

During the talks, President Kennedy announced a $20 million agricultural loan to Mexico under the Alliance program.

The Presidential discussions also led to an interim settlement of the thorny problem over the Colorado River waters that are used to irrigate farmland in Mexico. The United States agreed to take measures to reduce the waters' high salt content, which has ruined many acres of Mexican cotton land.

Mr. Kennedy also pledged to use his efforts to reduce trade barriers between Mexico and the United States.

Overall, President Kennedy worked hard and consistently at advancing the idea that the revolutionary heritage of the United States was similar to that of Mexico. Observers viewed this approach as one of the factors that contributed to the success of the President's visit.

VISIT TO TOMBS

Mr. Kennedy and his wife began their official day early by joining in the placing of wreaths at the tombs of Mexico's two revolutionary heroes, Francisco Madero and Venustiano Carranza.

Later, as they entered the Basilica of Guadalupe, a crowd of about 5,000 worshipers broke into applause. The Right Reverend Miguel Dario Miranda y Gomez, primate archbishop of Mexico, welcomed them and later led a prayer in English for the "full success to all the efforts" made during the President's visit.

KENNEDY RETURNS TO UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, July 1.—President Kennedy's plane landed at nearby Andrews Air Force Base at 5:35 p.m. today after a 4-hour flight from Mexico City.

President Kennedy dispatched a thank-you message expressing friendship for Mexico to President Adolfo López Matéos while flying back to Washington.

He said their talks would provide a firm basis for continued cooperation between their two countries. He then added: "I came to meet a President and a statesman, I have left you as a friend. Viva Mexico."

[From the New York Times, July 2, 1962]

FIRST LADY VISITS SHRINE OF MEXICO

MEXICO CITY, July 1.—Mrs. John F. Kennedy offered a bouquet of red roses at the shrine of the patron saint of Mexico today and was enrolled into the Roman Catholic order that is dedicated to spreading devotion to Our Lady of Guadalupe.

Five thousand worshipers watched as Mrs. Kennedy climbed the steps of the huge altar of the church and knelt at the top step with the bouquet of roses, the official flower of the patron saint.

She offered the flowers to Archbishop Miguel Dario Miranda y Gómez who was celebrating the Mass in honor of President and Mrs. Kennedy on their departure from Mexico.

The archbishop took the roses to the altar, blessed them and then selected three and gave them to the wife of the President. Kissing the medal that had been placed about her neck, Mrs. Kennedy was inducted as a Dame of Our Lady of Guadalupe.

SITE DATES TO 1531

The shrine to Mexico's patron saint was built on the site where, on December 9, 1531, the Blessed Virgin was said to have appeared to an Indian named Juan Diego.

For a doubting bishop who demanded proof, Diego put into his serape some roses said to have suddenly bloomed on the barren land. When he unfolded the serape in

front of the bishop there were no roses inside, according to the story, but a picture of the Virgin. This picture is displayed in glass at the high altar of the shrine.

The archbishop addressed President Kennedy and his wife as they sat in a second-row pew:

"We pray that all the efforts made by all of you will bring understanding. We pray to assure full success to all the efforts made in the past few days you have been in the capital of our country. We pray for the peoples of both countries and to the peace of the hemisphere."

MEXICANS CHEER HER

The visit to church ended the 2½-day state visit by President and Mrs. Kennedy. Cries of "Jackie, Jackie," and "Viva Jacqueline" signaled the part that Mrs. Kennedy had played in the happy capture of Mexico's capital.

Mexican women were fascinated by Mrs. Kennedy's wardrobe. She changed her dress several times daily during her brief visit, but only once did she repeat her costume, a white outfit she wore Friday and today.

There was praise today for a First Lady, who had apparently done her homework up for the trip. She impressed Dr. Eusebio Davalos Hurtado, director of the National Anthropology Institute, with questions that showed some knowledge of Mexican anthropological history. In fact, after her visit to the museum she and Dr. Davalos persuaded President Kennedy to break into his tight schedule and sneak away late yesterday afternoon for an unscheduled tour of the institute.

Perhaps Mrs. Kennedy's biggest success with the Mexicans was her decision to speak in Spanish at a luncheon yesterday of scholars, writers, and industrialists.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business for today has been concluded, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TUESDAY, JULY 3, UNTIL NOON ON THURSDAY, JULY 5

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

IMPORTATION OF ADULT HONEY BEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8050) to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes at 12 o'clock on Thursday next, the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] be acted on under a 30-minute limitation of debate on each amendment, 15 minutes to a side; and that at the conclusion of the debate on those two amendments, the vote be taken on the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, does that mean that the honey bee bill will not be considered tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It will be considered or not?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will not be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What will be the order of business tomorrow? I understood that probably the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, which would be eligible for consideration tomorrow, following compliance with the 3-day rule, might be considered tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The HEW bill will not be taken up tomorrow.

Instead of voting on the passage of the bill on Thursday next at the hour of 1 o'clock, there will be a vote on the amendment now pending, offered by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, does the Senator have in mind including in the unanimous-consent agreement the usual provision about relevancy to provisions in the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. It is intended to have such a provision incorporated in the unanimous-consent agreement when it is completed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I approve of the unanimous-consent request. For clarification, I am wondering if there are to be two yea-and-nay votes, and 1 hour of debate, a half hour on each amendment, if the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Montana might not come at 1:30 o'clock. I wanted to make certain that there would be a full half hour on the McCarthy amendment, the Proxmire amendment, and the Mansfield amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to clarify the RECORD, the unanimous-consent request was to the effect that 30 minutes be allowed on each amendment, 15 minutes to a side; to include the McCarthy amendment, if offered; the Proxmire amendment, if offered; and the Mansfield amendment, now pending; to be followed by a vote on the bill itself. Is my understanding correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the agreement which has been reached, the time will begin to run at noon on Thursday; and a morning hour will be held, if need be, after the disposal of the bill, as amended, if it is amended.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That effective on Thursday, July 5, 1962, immediately after the Senate convenes, during the further consideraiton of the bill (H.R. 8050) to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honeybees, debate on amendments by Senators MANSFIELD, PROXMIRE, and MCCARTHY shall be limited to 30 minutes, each, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received: *Provided further,* That after the disposition of the Mansfield amendment the Senate proceed to vote on the final passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3840) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Carolina Power & Light Co.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 12154) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE SIGNING OF THE MORRILL LAND-GRANT ACT

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, today our Nation is observing the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Morrill Land-Grant Act by President Abraham Lincoln. In all 50 States a total of 70 universities and colleges benefit from the provisions of that act.

Although the University of Hawaii at Honolulu, Hawaii, did not receive a grant of land such as that provided for State colleges under the Morrill Act of 1862, today it is a Federal land-grant institution and shares in the benefits from the Second Morrill Act of 1890, the Nelson Amendment of 1907, and subsequent legislation.

Earlier this spring, the University of Hawaii, now in its 55th year, held ceremonies marking the centennial year of the Morrill Act at a convocation.

The University of Hawaii was established in 1907 as the College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii. Four years later, in 1911, the name was changed to the College of Hawaii.

In 1919, the territorial legislature passed a bill creating the University of Hawaii in 1920 and the charter provided for two colleges. The College of Hawaii became the College of Applied Science, and the College of Arts and Sciences was added. In 1931, the legislature combined the Territorial Normal School with the University School of Education to form Teachers College and now the College of Education.

Subsequently, the College of Tropical Agriculture was established in 1946, the College of Business Administration in 1949, the College of General Studies in 1956, the Colleges of Engineering and Nursing in 1959, and the East-West Center in 1960.

Prior to 1951, all graduate work was performed under the supervision of the graduate division, but in that year the name was changed and designated the graduate school.

The Hilo campus on the Island of Hawaii, the southernmost island in the chain, was opened in 1947. Total enrollment on both campuses exceeds 9,000 students at the present time.

The Morrill Act of 1862 provides for the endowment of at least one agricultural and mechanical college in each State. Thirty thousand acres of land or land scrip was offered each State for each Senator and Representative from that State, to be held or sold to provide for permanent endowment for one or more colleges providing education in the fields of agriculture and the mechanic arts.

Until 1960, Hawaii was the only State which had not received a grant under the Morrill Act or under legislation in lieu thereof.

Prior to becoming a part of the United States in 1898, Hawaii was an independent country. Unlike most of the States, our lands in Hawaii were not initially owned by the Federal Government. Thus we have never had public lands in Hawaii, as this term applied to the Western States. Under the treaty of annexation of 1898, the public lands of the Republic of Hawaii were ceded to the United States to be held in trust for the people of Hawaii.

If Hawaii were to be treated in similar fashion to her sister States under the Morrill Act, she would have been entitled to 90,000 acres of land—30,000 acres for each Senator and Representative. But such lands were not available on Oahu, where the University of Hawaii is located, or elsewhere in the eight-island State.

In the Hawaii omnibus bill of 1960, designed to amend relevant Federal statutes so that Hawaii would be treated on an equitable basis with her sister States, a section entitled "Land-Grant College Aid" provided for an appropriation of $6 million to the State for the support of the college of agriculture and the mechanic arts to be invested pursuant to the provisions of the Morrill Act of 1862.

Congress authorized the $6 million sum in lieu of a land grant in 1960 but only $2,225,000 was appropriated that year. Last year I appealed to the Senate Appropriations Committee to appropriate $3,775,000—the balance of the authorized funds—for the university. And this was accomplished. Today Hawaii is on an equal basis with other States with respect to the Morrill Act.

I am very pleased that the University of Hawaii, originally established as a land-grant college in 1907, shares in this Federal program with 69 other land-grant universities and colleges throughout the 50 States and Puerto Rico.

Although the University of Hawaii held its centennial celebration earlier this year, I am sure that today, July 2, 1962, is appreciatively and meaningfully commemorated as the centennial of that historic act, authored by Congressman Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont, providing education for all those who are able and willing to learn.

PAN AMERICAN FLIES 100,000TH TRANSATLANTIC TRIP

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, at approximately 8 o'clock tonight a jet aircraft will depart from Idlewild International Airport, bound for London, Frankfurt, and points beyond, around the world to San Francisco. This will be Pan American World Airways' flight No. 2 and it will be particularly significant because it will mark the 100,000th time that Pan American will have crossed the Atlantic.

The departure of the 100,000th flight from Pan Am's glistening umbrella-shaped terminal at Idlewild will be vastly different from the takeoff of history's first flight of paying passengers across the Atlantic on June 28, 1939.

On that day, 5,000 spectators cheered and a brass band played as 22 passengers filed out on a yacht-type pier in Port Washington Bay in Long Island, N.Y., to board the clipper *Dixie*, a flying boat capable of the then considerable cruising speed of 150 miles per hour.

That plane, a Boeing 314, flew to Marseilles, via the Azores and Lisbon, in 29 hours, 20 minutes.

The jet clipper *America*, a 600-mile-per-hour Boeing 707 that can carry 161 passengers, will be more than three-quarters of the way around the world in the same elapsed flying time.

Since the historic flight of the clipper *Dixie*, Pan Am has carried 3,590,000 passengers across the Atlantic and now operates 204 transatlantic passenger flights on clockwork schedule every week.

The jet clipper *America* will be flying one of the two round-the-world flights Pan Am makes every day as part of its service to 114 cities in 80 lands around the globe.

From New York to London, it will be commanded by Capt. Robert D. Fordyce of Locust Valley, N.Y. At London, Capt. Benjamin S. Harrell of Manhassett, N.Y., will take over the controls, taking flight No. 2 as far as Beirut with intermediate stops at Frankfurt, Munich, and Istanbul.

Captains Fordyce and Harrell were junior flight officers on the June 28, 1939, trip. Their combined flight experience equals the number of years that have elapsed since the Wright brothers first flew at Kitty Hawk, N.C.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, I commend Pan American for its many pioneering accomplishments and feel certain that I reflect the opinions of my colleagues.

GOVERNMENT, POLITICS, AND STUDENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, through the years much has been written about the influence and effects of politics upon the functioning of the Federal Government. Unfortunately, many people are under the impression that politics has nothing but an adverse effect on government, molding policies to its own end, which is thought always to be selfish.

However, it must be realized that, because of the size and complexity of our Government, politics is not only present in the Government, but essential. When a country like ours is governed by elected representatives, politics is the method by which varying views concerning vital issues are brought to light and discussed. Wherever there are people to be instructed and informed, politics plays a large part.

Students are expressing increasing interest in the operation of our Government and are now taking part, to a greater degree than ever, in government activities in their municipalities and States. Their interest is indicative of a growing realization that they will play an active part in the events of this critical decade.

Within recent weeks I have had direct evidence of their interest. Each year I invite seniors in New Jersey high schools to participate in a competition for summer scholarships in my office. Judges select the scholarship winners on the basis of their achievements in school and community, together with essays submitted by all applicants. The three students selected by the judges spend 2 weeks at my office in Washington observing at firsthand the workings of their Government.

This year, I asked the students to submit essays discussing the relationship between students and politics and government. I was interested in seeing their concept of the role politics plays in government and how they, as students would form their own ideas and actively work with groups whose views they supported.

Their responses were immediate and most encouraging. I have discovered that students do take a great deal of interest in government machinery at all levels, and many of the essays expressed a desire for more high school courses dealing specifically with the functioning and current problems of government. More than 200 seniors in New Jersey high schools wrote essays which were intelligent and surprisingly comprehensive.

Judges must have had a difficult time in choosing the final winners. The students wrote seriously, and in some cases, since they were already active in their communities, from experience.

I was once again impressed with the fact that here, in our youth, lies our country's greatest resources. We must do all we can to encourage students to develop their talents and abilities, to formulate high ideals and strong convictions, and to actively carry them out in their professions and their communities.

The final winners were Ronald Bettauer of Teaneck High School; Irvin Richter of Bridgewater-Raritan High School in Somerville; and Ronald Weinstein of Trenton Central High School. Their essays succinctly reveal much about them as students and Americans.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent to have the essays printed in the RECORD.

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

GOVERNMENT, POLITICS, AND THE STUDENT

(By Ronald Bettauer)

What will determine the political future of America? "It is just a question of how much the people know, how much they are called upon to do," answered Sam Rayburn. It is necessary "to bring them face to face with their responsibilities as citizens, or as a part of a group of citizens, or as a party, and let them know that their responsibility right now is terrific."[1] How are people brought face to face with responsibility? What will motivate them to fulfill that responsibility? It is a question of how much the people know. Education is the answer. Education can instill the patriotic sense of national destiny in the people, and it can enable them to recognize their responsibility to society.

Consequently, the primary political concern of the student is to educate himself. His is the task of learning history, not just of America, but of the world. He should learn about the political structure of his society—the Federal, State, and local units of government. He should be aware of the happenings in the world, and, moreover, he should have a deep concern about these happenings. In modern times diplomacy based on ignorance cannot succeed. Therefore, the student must first know his Government well, but also must be informed about other contemporary governmental systems.

The Government's prime political responsibility to the student is to give him the opportunity to learn about the Government itself. He must receive the necessary training in history, which is the foundation of the present. Without doubt, there is much to be learned from European and Oriental history as well as from American history. Political philosophy is an integral part of the history course. These fields are surely as important to our national destiny as are those mentioned in the National Defense Education Act. Why are they not included? The success of a democracy depends just as much on an educated voting populace as it does on scientists and mathematicians. The proposed School Assistance Act of 1961 would have been an assertion of Government responsibility in fields of education other than science and mathematics, for the State could have determined the allotment of its share of the aid. However, as it is, the State and local governments have the responsibility of expanding and heightening their standards to include if not a more extensive, a more intensive program of social studies—a deeper penetration into the world situation today and how it became what it is today, a deeper penetration of the problems of the United States.

Youth is the time to interest a person in the affairs of his country. Youth is the time to permanently dispell political apathy, national and international. Stimulating programs of studies in the school system are the natural means of preparation for the voting populace. The school is the institution best suited to give the student the power to discuss and define issues in the light of reason and to choose what is best. It can give him an open mind, a mind focused both on reality and on idealistic aims.

Hence, the Government, be it local, State, or Federal (whichever has the best facility to do so), is charged by the precepts of our Republic to provide the student with the opportunity to become educated; and it is the duty of the student, as a future voter, to become intimately acquainted with our political structure. It is a question of how much the people know. If the populace is educated, democracy cannot fail, for education will instill in us the spirit of democracy and show us how to govern ourselves best. This is the essence of the relation between government, politics, and the student: the student must educate himself politically so that he may assume his position in society when the time comes, and the Government must provide the opportunity for him to do so. A secure future is the dividend of a sound investment that has reached maturity. That investment is education. As President Kennedy said, "Our progress as a Nation can be no swifter than our progress in education."[2]

[1] "Sam Rayburn Takes a Look at the World," U.S. News & World Report. vol. LI, No. 15, Oct. 9, 1961. p. 58.

GOVERNMENT, POLICIES, AND THE STUDENT

(By Irvin Richter)

In this new mass society in which we live, the role of government—that complex of institutions that have a monopoly of organized force in internal and external affairs—of necessity has changed. The state, the organized political community, needs a certain degree of stability in the social system in order to maintain its own equilibrium; this requires not only the adjustment of conflicting demands by different groups in the social and economic order, but also the deliberate creation of social well-being demanded by the new doctrine of equality.

Thus, government, as the agent of the state, has been forced more and more to assume positive responsibility for the creation and distribution of wealth. In doing so, it has become big government, both in scope and in the numbers of those employed in carrying on its responsibilities.

To keep government responsible and yet effective places a tremendous strain both on the machinery and the personnel of government as well as on the alertness and activity of the public. The democratic way of political life is not an easy one, but its rewards are great. No form of government is simpler than that of one man ruling over others; yet all history stands as a record of the abuse of power so concentrated. Democracy requires from its citizens a level of political intelligence, experience, maturity, public spirit, and self-restraint which is lacking in large parts of the world; and it also demands the exercise of ingenuity in finding solutions and developing the political machinery appropriate for a system which desires freedom and responsibility. The great strength of democracy is that its way of life fosters and encourages these very qualities.

Democracy is dependent upon the character of the people and it cannot operate successfully unless they are sufficiently intelligent and educated to form sound judgments, sufficiently self-disciplined to act with integrity and honor, and free to express their own opinions and to organize effectively to carry them out.

The demands of this new world, like the demands of the political community, are first to all demands that we think and learn. When it comes to learning through the political community, the object is to learn how to be a responsible citizen, enjoying liberty under law. The freedom of the individual must be protected, but in addition the citizen must grow in responsibility if our country is to become conscious of itself as a part of humanity and to think humanity in order to organize it. Individual freedom and liberty under law are not incompatible, and they are both indispensible.

[2] House or Representatives, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Doc. No. 92, "Messenger from the President of the United States Relative to American Education," Feb. 20, 1961. p. 1.

Education in politics is indeed the order of the day. Education which so molds the spirit, morals, and minds of men that they will accept the responsibilities of active citizenship is of first importance in the modern democracy. There is none better than the practical and idealistic student to provide the higher education needed for free societies. Once more the student, on a new scale, has the duty of forming a more perfect union, which will involve establishing justice, promoting the general welfare, and securing the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

GOVERNMENT, POLITICS, AND THE STUDENT

(By Ronald Weinstein)

"Government of the people, by the people, anf for the people"—thus runs the description of American government. For nearly 200 years the people have experimented in democracy. Government on local, State and National levels has grown, reformed, and matured. The people have grown in responsibility with it. Political parties and political activities have taken on new emphasis. Able and clearly defined leadership is a necessity in today's world, for our National Government in the 1960's is in crisis. It faces domestic problems as well as assaults from the outside. Our State and local governments also face urgent problems as the United States of America is becoming increasingly urbanized. Tomorrow's citizens will have to be acquainted with the government and its problems as today's citizens must be. The students of today are the voters and leaders of tomorrow. Government, politics, and the student form a very intimate relation.

The student usually first learns of his government in a high school history course. Previous to this, he may have followed government occurrences in the newspapers, magazines, television, or radio. An early interest and knowledge of government is important. Although direct participation is, of course, impossible, the student can begin to be active in other ways. Political rallies in school create great enthusiasm during election campaigns. "Get Out and Vote" projects, such as one I directed in the 1960 campaign for Key Club, inform the voter and urge him to cast his ballot. There is more the student can do besides directing his attentions to the excitement of elections. He can study the government by keeping in close contact with acts and measures. This past year I had the opportunity to interview over radio the chairman of the charter commission in Trenton. It is in ways like these that a student obtains a keener view of the workings of his government.

It is in high school, too, that the voter of tomorrow first learns about political parties and issues. The student finds that all politicians are not the sly, money-grabbing characters that are usually portrayed in books, even though there is much evidence in history to bear out this fact. Politics is a delicate balance of power, a game in which more than two can play. Third parties and other groups often affect the march of history to a great extent. In short, the student becomes aware of many political parties, many platforms, and numerous ideas. No narrow path is set for a student to follow; after studying what is before him, he is free to form his own opinions. This, of course, is the way it should be. But it is important to remember that the student never ceases to be a student. He will always be learning something new, judging with different views, and acting in new manners. This allows for great expansion in our way of thinking. It allows us to move ahead with the times. It makes our democratic form of government elastic yet strong.

Politics and government are many times looked upon by the voters in a lackadaisical manner. They cast them aside as being either

too complex to understand or too trivial to care about. It is the student's responsibility to learn to care about and understand his Government and its politics. In an age when ever increasing, vital decisions are being made by the Government, it is imperative that citizens take an active part. The student must be prepared to take his proper place in the community. The student should be prepared to enliven the politics of his area. What is a student's ultimate purpose? It is to serve his country—actively and wisely.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, with the passage of more than a decade since enactment of the urban renewal program, we have perhaps come to take it for granted. Yet the program represents a unique and brilliant reconciliation of the interests of private enterprise and the interests of those who want better cities. The program is, I think, a tribute to the resourcefulness of our country, and from time to time it is useful to contemplate this fundamental fact.

On June 21, Mr. William L. Slayton, Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration, took the occasion to discuss the basic framework of the urban renewal program in a talk to the Practicing Law Institute in New York.

In examining "The Differences in Viewpoints of the Government and the Private Developer," Mr. Slayton noted that—

> The traditional relationship between public and private interests has been characterized by the imposition of controls and regulations by the public on private enterprise to prevent private enterprise from doing that which the public decrees as undesirable. In urban renewal, however, the association is a cooperative one in that the public agencies must work closely with private enterprise to achieve the positive—rather than negative—goals established by the public.

As Mr. Slayton observes it is this new partnership in urban renewal that provides the great opportunity "to experiment; to attempt to provide new ways of urban living; to build new kinds of neighborhoods; and to build good architecture." And it might be added that urban renewal provides this opportunity without replacing private enterprise by complete Government action.

Mr. President, I think the Members of this body would find Mr. Slayton's comments on this still evolving partnership between the public and private interests both illuminating and rewarding. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Slayton's speech be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

DIFFERENCES IN VIEWPOINTS OF THE GOVERNMENT AND THE PRIVATE DEVELOPER

(Remarks by William L. Slayton, Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, at the conference on urban renewal and housing, presented by the Practicing Law Institute, Hotel Astor, New York, N.Y., June 21, 1962)

The urban renewal program under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, relies upon both public activities and private action to achieve renewal objectives. These objectives are removal of slums through either demolition or rehabilitation, rehousing of families displaced by slum eradication, replanning of the renewal area to meet local objectives and standards, and rebuilding of the area by private enterprise in accordance with the public objectives and criteria stated in the urban renewal plan.

There are two areas of major emphasis in this process. The first is the exercise of control by the public to make sure that the rebuilding accomplishes the public objectives. The second is the rebuilding by private enterprise. Thus, public direction and private enterprise are linked to carry out the program.

It is a rather unique arrangement in that the history of public administration, association between public and private activities has been characterized by the imposition of controls and regulations by the public on private enterprise to prevent private enterprise from doing that which the public decrees as undesirable. In urban renewal, however, the association is a cooperative one in that the public agencies must work closely with private enterprise to achieve the positive—rather than negative—goals established by the public. This new approach to public administration, in the field of its relationship to private enterprise, has not created a standard operating procedure nor has it been accomplished with great ease. It is still evolving and has not really achieved a body of experience that is adequate to guide public administrators in their dealings with private enterprise.

And on the other side of the coin, private enterprise has not yet accustomed itself to this kind of relationship to Government. It has not fully absorbed the basic tenet of the relationship; namely, that it is expected to achieve objectives—public objectives—which, in a normal operation, would not be major, motivating objectives.

Under our system of private enterprise, modified as it is to achieve public objectives, the motivation of private enterprise is to make a profit. Its control is the competition of its competitors. Government, on the other hand, in dealing with the actions of private enterprise, frequently restricts the free action of private enterprise to achieve the public good. Thus, for example, Government, through the zoning ordinance, imposes limitations on the use of land to protect the welfare of the city as a whole, because private enterprise is expected, and does, operate to use land to its best financial advantage. Its motivation is expected to be, and it is, to realize as much profit as possible from the use of the land.

It is this kind of alinement—the Government establishing limitations on the activities of private enterprise—which has been the background of the relationship between private enterprise and Government. Now we are confronted with a program that has hopefully been viewed as a new kind of relationship between private enterprise and Government. In urban renewal we have approached the rebuilding operation with the hope that a spirit of cooperation could replace the standard relationship—one that could achieve a positive result satisfying to both Government and private enterprise. For it is only through this cooperative endeavor that we can achieve the new forms of urban living that are so essential to the future of our cities.

We can always retreat to the old modus operandi, but to do so would be to lose much of the hope that urban renewal now offers. Therefore, I would like to discuss this urban renewal program from the standpoint of establishing a working relationship between the private developer and the local government to achieve the public objectives of the urban renewal program.

First let me talk just a little about these objectives. You are all familiar with the standard subdivision development and with the standard apartment house. With but a few exceptions, they do not evidence any advance in site plan, livability, or architecture. It is expensive for the developer to experiment. If he does not produce a salable or rentable item, he loses money. He is much wiser to stick to the proven last. For this he cannot be blamed; but at the same time, society loses. The consumer's choice is limited; those with different tastes must build their own—or else accept that which is on the market. The consumer cannot import a house from Europe as he imports a car.

In urban renewal our one great opportunity is to experiment; to attempt to provide new ways of urban living; to build new kinds of neighborhoods; and to build good architecture. The city cannot compete with the suburbs, except in travel time, unless it concentrates on rebuilding areas that offer greater attractions to a market that now resides in the suburbs. Our standard developments do not offer such competitive advantages.

The question is how can we achieve this better way of building and achieve it with a private enterprise that has been operating in the standard development pattern? Cities can require something new and better in the way of development—but they cannot achieve it unless private enterprise can be persuaded to build it. Thus, one must analyze what is necessary to persuade private enterprise.

Let me point out that to date the urban renewal program has been very fortunate in achieving its goals of better design, better site planning, better architecture. By and large, developers have done extremely well in selecting top architects and in being willing to experiment with new approaches to design and site plan. But if urban renewal is to achieve any volume, it must begin to rely on more than a few pioneers.

Let's examine this relationship between public agency and private developer. First, I believe that in the urban renewal program, the city and the private developer have a common area of interest. But the product is not a standard product. It is a specialized product designed to meet the needs of a particular area and to achieve a particular objective. The city specifies the objective and the developer tries to achieve it. Only by close collaboration, in an atmosphere of mutual respect, can they achieve their objective.

We need a change in attitude, I believe, on the part of both. On the public side, the public official must look to the builder as a responsible, capable, and effective producer of the desired goods. On the other side, the builder must recognize that he is involved in a program that has well defined public objectives. This is not a situation that is purely private, comparable to acquiring land, say, for a section 207 rental housing project. The public objectives must be achieved, and the builder has to recognize that he must amend his procedures and adjust his operations to make sure that these objectives are met. A builder who cannot function in this manner should not be a participant in the urban renewal program.

Public officials must also recognize that the end result cannot be fully achieved unless the profit motive is adequately recognized. The public official is not always conversant with the financing and developmental problems that confront the builder. Frequently he does not understand the nature of risk capital. We must try to further his education in this respect, and refrain from putting the stamp of approval on restrictions that hamper the builder in achieving his expectation of a reasonable profit.

The private builder is not always sympathetic with the public objectives of the public official nor does he readily understand the procedures that officials must follow in

order to achieve these objectives. The private builder is not used to having the director of the planning commission and his staff looking over his shoulder when he prepares a site plan or when his architect prepares a preliminary plan for the new structures. Nor is he in the habit of having his plan reviewed in detail by a public body. But this review, this evaluation—this constructive criticism from the public body—is essential in urban renewal projects, and the builder should be able to adjust himself accordingly.

But I recognize that we live in a real world and that although we desire and preach cooperation there are bound to be differences in viewpoint between the public agency and the redeveloper. Although the public agency and the redeveloper may indicate that, in broad general terms, they have the same objective, the realities of hard bargaining often reveal differences in the approach to that objective.

For example, what about money? The redeveloper naturally is interested in investing the smallest amount of cash possible and in maximizing his return on that investment.

To be effective, on the other hand, each public agency is going to have to emphasize design. It will want as much amenity as possible built into the redevelopment project. It will want the most housing or best commercial space for the least money in terms of rents. These obviously are contrary to smallest investment possible and maximum return. Therefore it is necessary to strike a balance—but a balance that does not jeopardize the public objectives. We have tried to achieve this balance by devising financing methods for housing under FHA that makes it attractive—presumably—for builders to build housing in urban renewal areas. Equity requirements are low and there is an assurance of financing because of the role of the Federal National Mortgage Association if private financing is not available. This has proved successful in attracting developers.

Nevertheless, some local agencies have viewed their operations not in terms of social objectives but in terms of real estate operations—attempting to maximize the amount of money obtained on the sale of the land. High land prices tend to persuade the redeveloper to put less money into the building and more money into the land. His mortgage amount is pretty well determined by the maximums set by FHA and he has a problem of distribution between land and structure. Where the public objective is to achieve a particularly good design, the developer will have to put relatively more money into his structure than he would normally be expected to do in the operation of the free and unpublicly directed market.

Consequently, I personally feel that in land disposition methods we are far better off establishing a reuse value that is agreed upon by FHA, the LPA, and URA—and then selecting developers on the basis of the competence and attractiveness of their design, rather than on the basis of one single factor—how much they would pay for the land.

We see, then, that it is essential for the public agency to insist upon the kind of standards that will produce the best kind of development. It is also incumbent upon the public agency to recognize that (a) private enterprise must operate with an adequate profit, and (b) if the monetary requirements are made too stringent, they will discourage private enterprise from participating. We must always make sure that our public objectives are not compromised, but at the same time be sensitive enough to the operation of the private market to establish realistic regulations. Thus, there is no need to acquire greater financial security than is absolutely necessary to make sure that the public interest is protected. For example, a developer must put up a cash deposit before he can undertake a redevelopment project. We should not require that such a deposit be retained after he has acquired the land, for at this time the local public agency has the land itself as security for performance of contract obligations by the redeveloper. Nor should we expect a developer to wait patiently while the public agency takes its time in performing the necessary functions in making the land available.

I am thinking particularly of the installment of site improvements that are essential to the project. I have found that some public agencies have a very cavalier attitude toward such items as paving of streets and installation of sewers—items that obviously are essential to the functioning of the project. A redeveloper must naturally wait for these to be installed before he can begin his construction, or in some instances, before he can start renting his apartments or stores. Waiting is costly for the developer. It is costly and means that he is not able to use his capital profitably during this period. Time is something that public agencies seem more willing to waste than does private enterprise.

Another difference in viewpoint is design itself. As I said earlier, I feel that we have an urban renewal obligation to experiment in many ways with new housing types, new site plans, and various financing techniques. We must rely upon the private redeveloper to undertake these experiments. But the builder is reluctant, naturally, to risk his money in experimenting with a relatively untried new type of housing, or a new arrangement of housing on the site. He knows also that doing something different means running into more difficulty all along the line. Consequently, he must be persuaded—and he will not be persuaded if the objectives in new design set by the redevelopment agency becomes more difficult to achieve because of obstacles created by other bureaucracies.

Thus, the private developer must have the sympathetic cooperation of all local public officials. For instance, new ideas in design generally mean something different from the standard controls found in zoning ordinances. Whoever administers the zoning ordinance must have some sympathy for the new approach. If the developer is to stick his neck out, so should the city, in accepting new and different concepts from those that have governed city development for the past 30 years.

So here, in recognizing the difference in viewpoint and working to achieve its public objectives, the public agency must take positive action to assure the developer—who may be a reluctant participant—that what is being proposed and supported by the local public agency will also receive all other necessary governmental approvals.

And certainly there is a difference in viewpoint on social objectives. The public agency will often feel strongly that urban renewal should achieve certain basic social objectives. On the other hand, the developer may be somewhat reluctant to jeopardize his investment in trying to meet social objectives that have not proved easy to achieve. Integration is obviously a social objective that may create concern for the redeveloper, and yet its achievement is essential. There is an obligation on the public agency to acquire all the information possible and to work with the developer and local groups to make sure that the public objectives are understood, and that the resources of the entire community are mustered in support of these social objectives. Certainly, we cannot rely exclusively upon the redeveloper to be our social experimenter.

Another difference in viewpoint that should not be too difficult to reconcile but one which has damaged redevelopment in the past is the question of when community facilities such as schools will be built to serve a redevelopment area. The developer naturally wants to have the school available and operating when he starts to rent or sell. The school board or the city, on the other hand, frequently takes the position that it is a waste of public money to build a school until large numbers of children are clamoring to attend it. Here we have the anomaly of either (1) a housing development with no school or (2) a school with no housing development—to take the most extreme positions.

Here I believe that in the long run the viewpoint of the developer is in the greater public interest than the viewpoint expressed by some public agencies.

In renewing our wornout slum areas, it is essential to establish a new character. Families with children must be persuaded to move to the project area. There must be strong attractions. The attraction of reasonable rents and sales prices, locations and designs are basic—but, insufficient. Mother wants to make sure that her children will have a conveniently located and well-equipped school to attend.

I think the southwest Washington redevelopment project with its Amidon School provides an excellent example of the wisdom of developing a new school and a good school early in the redevelopment process. The apartments and houses being rented and sold in the southwest area are now advertised as being within the district of this new school. This has become a selling point by the developer and has been an important factor in making southwest Washington such a success.

One other item that I would like to refer to is timing. The public agency is naturally anxious to get construction underway, but at times it appears as though, even with the money it may be costing him, the redeveloper is not acting with the greatest possible speed. Here I feel that the apparent difference in viewpoint is more apparent than real—for it should be to the basic interest of both to get construction underway promptly. The redeveloper will ordinarily be anxious to initiate construction. However it may in some instances be a shortrun benefit to the developer to drag his feet because he may be busy elsewhere, or he may not have the front money available immediately and so wishes a postponement.

Here I feel that the developer cannot be accommodated. Here it is essential that the agreement between public agency and the redeveloper be very specific and that the penalties for nonperformance or inadequate performance be clearly stated and actually invoked by a public agency. We cannot permit developers to delay activities at the expense of the community's interest in prompt development.

One other difference in viewpoint concerns the kind of investor. I am referring to the public interest in having a long-term investor as a redeveloper. This is in contrast to the way in which private enterprise normally builds office buildings and housing developments. Our experience has been with the entrepreneur developer who has a small amount of equity and an interest in using that equity to create a capital asset—constructing an office building or apartment house and selling it for a capital gain when it is providing sufficient income. This is the standard entrepreneural operation and has created most of our postwar building.

However, it is to the interest of the city and public agency to have an investor who looks upon this investment as a long-term investment. When an investor knows he is going to stay with it for quite awhile, he will be interested in building better, in building in maintenance-free items, and in designing more lasting and attractive structures. In short, his interest as a long-term

investor will be more in accord with the interest of the public agency.

I think we are going through something of a revolution in investment in redevelopment and that this is due in part to the realities of a situation. Redevelopment projects by their very nature generally take longer to rent up; it takes some time to build up the character of an area. I think that some of our early investors who started out as basic "get-in get-out" investors have had to become of necessity long-term investors. They haven't been able to get out because they haven't been able to sell their property for what they would like to make out of it. I think we are now attracting the longer term investor. As I meet with and talk to new developers coming into urban renewal, I find that their interest seems to be more in the long term rather than in the short term.

These, it seems to me, are the basic differences in viewpoint between the redeveloper and the public agency. They are differences that shouldn't be disturbing, since they are only natural in the way our public-private system works. On the whole we have been fortunate in attracting the kind of developers we have. Basically their wishes and objectives appear to be in accord with those of public agencies. Naturally, in the achievement of these objectives their viewpoints differ at times from that of the public agency. On the whole, however, I think that these differences have been resolved without compromising the objectives of the public agency or the objectives of the renewal program.

However, even though the experience has been relatively good and we seem to have developed this new kind of public administration approach on the relationship between public and private and the way in which the public selects a developer, I feel it is essential to continue to recognize that there are differences in viewpoints and that we must be specific in providing systems for resolving those differences.

We must always keep in mind what Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver recently said: "We are concerned not simply with building and investment. It is what we build, where we build, and for whom we build that is important. It is what we do about the communities we have already built that will shape the opportunities, the living standards, and the business growth of the American town and city."

No developer should come into the program unless he really recognizes that the public objectives must be achieved. And at the same time no public agency should go into this program without recognizing that certain elements are essential if private enterprise is to be able to function in its role in enabling the public agency to achieve its public objectives.

President Kennedy has pointed out that "The unfinished business of our society still lies stretching before us." He was referring to, among other things, the great task of rebuilding our cities. In this unfinished task we need the energy, ingenuity, and cooperation of private enterprise as well as public agencies. And it is urban renewal that has opened up ways of cooperation, to make our cities the centers of vigor, industry, and culture.

NEED FOR NEW LOOK AT BUY AMERICAN ACT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on March 3, 1962, the Buy American Act passed its 29th birthday. During that long span of years the act has been amended only twice—in 1946 and in 1949. Both amendments served to clarify the original purpose of the act so that congressional intent has remained unchanged.

However, with the passage of Executive Order No. 10582, December 17, 1954, the whole implementation of the act has been altered. This order attempted to set uniform standards for administration of the act. Its most important features are: First, the procuring agency may give the domestic bidder a preference differential of 6 percent of the foreign bid, or 10 percent if exclusive of applicable duties and all costs after arrival in the United States; second, materials are considered foreign if the cost of the foreign component is 50 percent or more of the total cost of all components of the material. The procuring agency (a) may reject any bid for reasons of national interest, and (b) may reject a foreign bid in any situation in which the domestic supplier offering the lowest price for furnishing the desired materials undertakes to produce substantially all of such material in areas of substantial unemployment. The preferential treatment for areas of substantial unemployment was doubled to 12 percent by the Department of the Interior in 1955 and generally has been followed since that date.

Let me submit, Mr. President, that the price differential under the Buy American Act is too small under present world economic conditions. Today our industries must comply with a host of Federal acts which materially increase costs of production in comparison with such costs for foreign industries. Other nations frequently do not have such stringent laws as we do. American wages are four to nine times more than those of our competitors. This more than compensates for our lower materials expenditures.

Recently, the Navy announced the purchase of nearly $500,000 worth of German steel to be used in fabrication of our Polaris submarines. This action had been approved by the head of Naval Material, Vice Adm. George Beardsley and Adm. Ralph K. Jones, of the Bureau of Ships. I would not censor these officers because they rigidly and properly applied the Buy American Act to this purchase which had been bid at approximately 30 percent less than competing bids from U.S. firms.

The reasons for the low bid may be a matter of dispute. But, I do not believe there is any dispute on the need to face economic realities and to do so rapidly. I think it incumbent upon the administration to raise the preference differential to more realistic levels which would assist our own economy.

Originally, the Buy American Act established a price differential of 25 percent which was adequate to permit American firms to compete with foreign businesses for Government contracts. When Executive Order No. 10582—1954—changed the differential as I have described, in many areas, the probability of American bids competing successfully with foreign bids became virtually impossible. Perhaps with world economic conditions of 1954 such action was necessary, as a temporary measure to help foreign nations rebuild their economies, but today's situation is entirely different. Our balance of payments is such that every effort must be made to alleviate it.

Today we have more unemployment than most nations. Our annual growth rate is below that of any other major industrialized nation—ranging from 8.5 to 3.1 per cent—except the United Kingdom—2.6 percent. We have become a low-investment country; in relation to the 11 major industrial nations, we stand third from the bottom. Although not the primary consideration, import competition is a significant factor in our failure to keep pace economically with other nations. One segment of this competition is for goods purchased by the Government.

When our Government purchases from foreign concerns with a 6-percent differential, it may seem that money has been saved. But, as studies have shown, such is not always the case. Although the computations are too complex to cite, estimates indicate that the Federal and State taxes alone on a $100,000 order would be $15,449 or more than twice the so-called saving to the Government. If one were to trace through the second spending cycle, the total taxes generated amount to $36,014 or a 36-percent return on the original outlay. Of course, I realize that some of this disparity would be compensated for by import duties, but that, in my opinion, would be a very minor consideration.

In some industries, Government purchases constitute 50 percent or more of total sales. Many are relatively small; the hydraulic turbine industry, for example, has annual average domestic bookings over the last 10 years of about $27 million. Over the same period the Government has purchased about 60 percent of their orders. Foreign competition became significant in 1954 with the promulgation of Executive Order No. 10582 lowering the differential from 25 percent to 6 percent. By 1959, 52.78 percent of the dollar value of hydraulic turbines was awarded to foreign manufacturers. This has meant hardship to a small but essential industry and to its employees. Similar results could be shown for other industries.

It seems to me no more than fair that American industry be granted a preference double that at present in effect under the Buy American Act; that is, 12 percent in general and 24 percent for areas of substantial unemployment. This, among other measures, should help to solve our unemployment problem, particularly in areas of labor surplus. As I have indicated, money put to work within the United States produces tax revenues for the Federal and State Governments. An average domestic manufacturing concern will pay $6,250 Federal income tax on a $100,000 order or about the same as the supposed Government saving. As shown previously, the average $100,000 domestic sale eventually in all its cycles yields $36,000 in taxes. Spent abroad, it contributes little to our economy.

In our serious unemployment and balance of payments all possible measures must be taken that will help alleviate

the situation. Doubling the preferential on Government purchases of foreign goods is one measure that will help solve the unemployment problem and will aid in alleviating our balance-of-payment deficit. I therefore urge the President to use the authority vested in his office to raise the differential between foreign and domestic bids on Government contract purchases from 6 to 12 percent and even higher for areas of substantial unemployment.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MORRILL LAND-GRANT ACT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Congress has properly given serious attention to education needs in America and has some significant measures under consideration such as the one to aid construction of facilities in institutions of higher learning. There have been those, however, who have thrown up their hands in horror at the idea that the Federal Government would in any way participate in educating the youth of America. These opponents have predicted some dark and dire days ahead simply because the Government is trying to help education do something it cannot do by itself.

In spite of what these people seem to believe, education in America today would be quite different if the Congress had not always recognized its responsibility and acted accordingly. We can go back 100 years, to July 2, 1862, when President Lincoln signed the Morrill Land-Grant Act. This act granted public lands to the States and the income from sale of these lands was used to endow and support at least one college in each State. Were it not for this far-reaching action of Congress 100 years ago, America today would have 68 less colleges and universities for that is the number of these so-called land-grant institutions. Among the missing would be Pennsylvania State University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Illinois, New Mexico State University, Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College System, University of Wyoming, and many, many others.

Mr. President, the Nation owes a debt to our predecessors of 100 years ago who had the vision, the foresight, and the fortitude to initiate a revolution in higher education in America and we would be remiss if today we did not take note of their effort and acknowledge what was accomplished.

THE SUGAR ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that the vote I cast in support of the conference report was one that was very difficult to cast so far as I was concerned, because I believe the whole situation is a very dubious one, for the reasons that were set out in the debate on the floor of the Senate today.

However, I came to the final conclusion that I thought the conference report was undoubtedly the best report we could get at this session of Congress. The record that was made was a record that is perfectly clear to Congress that we cannot justify waiting until the 11th hour again for action on the sugar quota program.

In the next session of Congress it is the clear duty of the leadership of both Houses to see to it that we get the sugar quota matter up at a much earlier date. I am far from convinced that the 12 Senators who voted against the conference report did not have a great deal to support their position and possibly cast the sounder vote.

However, it is the old story of resolving the doubts in favor of the conference. We must also be realistic about the parliamentary situation that confronts us in the Senate. Furthermore, I decided to vote to support the conference report, because I was well aware as were most of my colleagues in the Senate, that the amendment now offered by the majority leader was to be offered as soon as the conference report was adopted. It is a very appropriate sweetener to the honey bill. It is necessary to do justice both to Argentina and to the Dominican Republic, as well as justice to the President of the United States.

First, let me say a word about doing justice to the Dominican Republic and to the Republic of Argentina. If we had adopted merely the conference report, the allocations provided in the conference report would have given ample justification to the Dominican Republic and to Argentina for deep resentment against the United States. They could charge, and I think rightfully, that we followed a discriminatory policy against them, which under the circumstances could not be justified.

Further, I take the Senate back a few months, when we were using our good offices and our diplomatic channels to seek to bring the Dominican Republic into the orbit of free nations in the Western Hemisphere. I know something about those negotiations. They were not easy. The moderates in the Dominican Republic who were finally successful in bringing the Dominican Republic into the orbit of the free nations in this hemisphere had a nip-and-tuck situation for many weeks. It could have gone either way. It could very well have fallen back into the Trujillo tyranny, or it could have fallen into the orbit of the Communists.

We owe much to the patriots of the Dominican Republic for the patriotic services they rendered to freedom in their own country and the great service they rendered to freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

Some criticism has been made on the floor of the Senate today in regard to some statements that have been made by some of the leaders of the Dominican Republic. I think some of those statements were regrettable, but they are understandable. I do not rise to object to them or to condone them. I rise to plead for understanding with regard to what produced those statements.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the majority whip, for their cooperation in arranging to have unanimous consent for votes on Thursday. It so happens that several Senators necessarily must be absent from the Senate tomorrow. We have a long way to go in order to be home for appropriate Fourth of July meetings. It would be impossible for us to be here tomorrow. That has been well known for quite some time. There are times in the Senate when it is necessary to cancel trips in order to protect what we consider to be parliamentary rights. We have a duty to be present. We are in just such a situation now in the Senate. So I express my appreciation to the majority leader, to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], for their cooperation with the senior Senator from Oregon, who is speaking not for himself alone, but also for some other western Senators who find themselves in exactly the same situation.

I also thank the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] for his cooperation in reaching this agreement. He does not know that I know, but I also wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for the good service he rendered in arranging the agreement just reached.

Mr. President, at the time it was nip and tuck as to whether the Dominican Republic would fall back into the orbit of the Trujillo tyranny or into the orbit of Castro communism, or whether it would be saved for the cause of freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

I know something about the diplomatic negotiations of that time and period, for I, along with other members of my Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, and also with the chairman of the full Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], was in frequent consultations with the administration in regard to the developments in the Dominican Republic.

I cannot pay too high a tribute to the great service rendered at the time by the patriots for freedom in the Dominican Republic. They were constantly in danger of losing their lives; but they were dedicated public servants; and in my judgment they saved the Dominican Republic for freedom.

Therefore, it is understandable—even though today there were some criticisms on the floor of the Senate—that some of the leaders of the Dominican Republic made some unkind expressions in regard to the United States, in connection with the sugar bill, for, after all, the economy of the Dominican Republic is in no small degree a sugar economy; and what happens to the Dominican Republic as regards the price paid for Dominican sugar and the income they get from sugar can very well determine, in the months ahead, whether the Dominican Republic is to remain a free nation. When we are dealing with this subject matter, Mr. President, we are dealing with a very delicate and vital matter, as it affects the future of the Dominican Republic. The cost of whatever additional allotment the Dominican Republic may receive, through the wise discretion of the President of the United States, through the Mansfield amendment to the honey-

bee bill as the vehicle for doing greater justice to the Dominican Republic, will be a small price to pay for the strengthening of freedom in the Dominican Republic.

Much the same can be said about the Argentine. I certainly need not refresh the recollection of Senators in regard to the turbulence which has occurred in recent months in the Argentine. It is my hope that we shall strengthen the cause of freedom there, too, and that at least we shall make clear at all times to the Argentine that we are willing to do what we can do strengthen the cause of freedom there. But, Mr. President, not one among us can be certain about what the situation in the Argentine will be 12 months from now. Furthermore, there are other places in Latin America where that is also true.

That is one reason why I said, earlier today, during the debate, that I would be much more inclined to favor the conference report if it had been more limited to the countries of the Western Hemisphere, but that I was at a complete loss to understand why the Union of South Africa was brought into the sugar quotas and why Australia—of all nations—should get this premium price handout from the U.S. Government, and why the talk about Ireland crept into the debate, in connection with the proposed aid to Ireland.

Mr. President, let us remember the major reason for the development of the premium price sugar program. The purpose was to assure an adequate supply of sugar close to home—not in the Union of South Africa, not in Formosa, not in Australia, not in Ireland, not in any of those remote areas. I state quite frankly that I think the application of the premium price program for sugar to those remote areas is a misuse and an abuse of the purpose and the underlying principles which in the first instance caused us to adopt the premium price sugar quota program.

The basic reason for it was to supply the American people with an adequate amount of sugar in time of war, when we were losing ships by the score. In fact, we lost more ships in our convoys than the American people yet know about. The loss of our convoy ships, particularly in the early part of the war, was extensive.

There are other reasons for the development of the premium-price program for sugar—reasons typical of our humanitarianism and our charitable impulses, although the program has not worked out in the way originally planned, because of the failure of the countries concerned, on the part of the sugar interests in those countries. We believed that this premium-price sugar quota program might benefit the field producers and the mill producers of sugar—in other words, the workers, the peons, the peasants—and, yes, I am sorry to say, Mr. President, in describing those peasants in many parts of the world I think it proper to use the term "serfs," figuratively chained to the soil. We thought our premium-price sugar quota program not only would provide an available source of sugar for our American diet—and sugar is particularly essential to the American diet—but also would make it possible for us to render deserved economic aid and assistance for the benefit of the workers.

Little did we comprehend, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] so eloquently pointed out this afternoon, that these countries, through their sugar barons, would continue to exploit the workers, irrespective of the premium price that we paid for the sugar. It is a very sad record redounding to the everlasting discredit of the oligarchs of Latin America who are guilty of exploitation of fellow human beings, and of being, as I said earlier this afternoon, so inconsiderate and inhumane in exploiting the people and then depositing their profits in Swiss and New York banks. But that is going to have to be worked out on the diplomatic level.

That statement leads me to the second reason for supporting the Mansfield amendment, before I leave tonight to be in my home State, which therefore will not give me an opportunity tomorrow to present my case in support of the Mansfield amendment.

I support it because I think it is very important that the President of the United States be given the discretionary power made available to him under the amendment. In fact, I would give the President more discretion than the Mansfield amendment would give him, if I were writing the legislative ticket, so to speak. But I have talked to the majority leader about this amendment. I do not speak for him, but for myself, when I say that I found his discussion very helpful to me in reaching my conclusion that this is probably the maximum amount of discretion that we will be able to give to the President and get the congressional support we need for granting it.

Let me say to the President that, if we are going to have any hope of making the Alliance for Progress program work, without in any way sacrificing our obligations to maintain a system of checks upon our State Department and its diplomats, and upon the President himself, I want to urge that, within our system of checks, we lean in the direction of giving to the President of the United States a maximum amount of discretion in connection with just such problems as this one. More than we may recognize at first glance, Mr. President, the Mansfield amendment has a great deal to do with making the Alliance for Progress program work, for it is going to be generally recognized in the Western Hemisphere that the sugar bill in its present form, as it exists now that we have approved the conference report, is far from a desirable bill. All that can be said for it, in my judgment, is that it is more desirable than what we would have had if we did not have it.

The Mansfield amendment seeks to give to the President at least a little leeway, at least some area for discretionary action on his part. As one who has worked very closely with the President on the Alliance for Progress program, as Senators may have heard me say before, all the major proposals in the Alliance for Progress program can be found in the recommendations which the Latin American Subcommittee made to the full Foreign Relations Committee at the time the now President of the United States was a member of that committee.

We all worked very closely together with the then Senator from Massachusetts in developing the recommendations of the Latin American Subcommittee, based upon the research studies and reports made for us by a group of scholars and experts on Latin America. From their reports really came the major recommendations for the Alliance for Progress program.

I have complete confidence in the President of the United States in respect of the Alliance for Progress program, as I do with respect to his administration generally; but I cannot emphasize too strongly tonight how important it is that the representatives of the United States, in respect of putting the Alliance for Progress program in operation, must have a great deal of latitude for negotiation.

What I say now is no reflection on our Latin American friends, and no criticism of them, but only a recognition of great differences between Latin American cultures and the culture in the United States; great differences between Latin American political norms and political norms in the United States; great differences between Latin American conceptions of negotiability in the operation of government and those of negotiability in the administration of government in the United States.

These great differences very often are prone to lead to misunderstandings on the part of Latin American representatives around the diplomatic table or at international conferences, or to the development of a noncooperative attitude, or, for want of better language, to hurt feelings, because they are accustomed to the national spokesmen, even under their democratic processes, negotiating for their government, and his negotiations becoming the word and the bond of his nation.

Under our system of checks and balances, we do not grant as sweeping a power to the negotiator for our country as they do in Latin America. For example, Mr. President, when the Secretary of State of the United States goes to a conference, such as Bogotá Conference of 1960, or the Punta del Este conference of this year, he is not in a position to sit down and make final commitments, for he has a Congress behind him as a check. His negotiations are subject, after all, to the final approval of Congress. He can negotiate on behalf of the President of the United States, because he is the President's spokesman at that conference.

So I have found, in several international conferences that I have attended in Latin America in my capacity as chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee, that there is a great deal of misunderstanding—even downright misunderstanding—on the part of Latin Americans concerning the position taken by U.S. representatives.

There is a tendency for them to feel that we are "cagey," when we are not "cagey" at all when we tell them, "This

is as far as we can go, because this is the limit of our authority, but we are satisfied we shall get approval."

How pertinent that remark is to what happened at Bogotá in 1960. At the Bogotá conference the representatives of other nations wanted the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from Oregon, and the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Dillon, to give them firm, final, and binding commitments. We could not do it, because that does not happen to be our system for international negotiations. It is their system. There was no doubt about the finality of their commitments, so far as the authority to commit was concerned. We were not in that position.

What we must do, in my judgment, if we are to make the Alliance for Progress work, is to give the maximum discretion to the President we can give under the checks and balance system. That is what the Mansfield amendment would do.

I make this statement tonight strongly urging the Senate to give support to the Mansfield amendment for the two reasons I have mentioned. I think justice and fairness to the Dominican Republic and to Argentina call for it. I think that the President of the United States has a right to have the discretion the amendment seeks to vest in him. Granting him that discretion I think will work to the best interests of the United States. I am satisfied that the President of the United States has demonstrated he can be trusted with the discretion which the Mansfield amendment would vest in him.

RECALL OF NONCOMBAT TROOPS FROM EUROPE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I was extremely gratified to learn yesterday that the Department of Defense has given orders for the recall from Europe of 7,500 noncombat support troops, and that a much larger long-term withdrawal is under consideration.

I have long been puzzled by the failure of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army to get more divisions and other fighting manpower out of the number of available troops. As I have heretofore pointed out on the floor of the Senate, we lag far behind the Soviets and the West Germans in the utilization of available manpower and the one big reason is that we have employed fighting men in positions that could well be filled by civilians. I have been encouraged by the fact that the Department of Defense has been making a full scale study of this situation. This indicates that the very serious problem has been recognized and that efforts are underway to solve it.

I might add that the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has also been making a study of this problem, and we have been kept advised of preliminary actions by the Army and the Defense Department. However, since the official studies will not be completed for some several months I will not attempt to comment on the problem or possible definitive solutions until that time.

In view of my interest in and concern over this problem, which are long standing, and because of the preliminary conclusions developed by my subcommittee, I was encouraged in May of this year to receive reports that the Department of Defense planned to recall approximately 40,000 noncombat troops from Europe. It may be recalled that I commented upon this development on the floor of the Senate on May 4, 1962, at which time I noted that we had been advised by the Department of Defense that studies were already in progress to identify these categories of military positions which could appropriately be assigned to civilian personnel.

As I pointed out then, the release of military personnel from essentially civilian tasks would have several beneficial results. First, it would result in greater economy in our Armed Forces and would result in a better utilization of our military manpower. Second, it would permit the use of the recalled troops for the purpose of building up our combat strength and aid us in reaching the 16-division goal. Third, it would help stem the outflow of American dollars and thus assist in reducing our unfavorable balance of payments.

I have also been advised that replacements of the withdrawn troops will be, for the most part, by civilian personnel. This, of course, is a move in consonance with my oft-expressed conviction of the desirability of substituting civilians for the military in essentially civilian occupations.

Following my address to the Senate of May 4, in which I stressed the fact that the recall of noncombat support manpower was desirable, I received a letter from Hon. Roswell Gilpatric, Deputy Secretary of Defense, in which he was kind enough to state that he had read my remarks with "great interest and appreciation." Then he asserted that possible steps to reduce the imbalance of our payments without impairing the efficiency of our combat forces were being studied, including the possible recall of noncombat troops and the improved rotation of other support forces. Mr. Gilpatric closed his letter with the following paragraph:

> We have long been aware of your strong view that we must make more efficient use of available manpower. Secretary McNamara and I, and all responsible officials in the military departments, share this view completely. A constructive public statement on this matter, such as the one you have made on the floor of the Senate, gives considerable encouragement to us and increases our determination to find better ways of meeting this problem.

Mr. President, I commend the attitude of the administration with respect to this matter. It is particularly gratifying to learn that this attitude is being translated into concrete action, as shown by the recall of these 7,500 troops. There is no point in issuing draft calls beyond our actual needs when the available trained manpower is already in uniform but is being utilized, in all too many instances, for the discharge of noncombat and essentially civilian functions.

I was particularly interested in the report that the recall of the 7,500 troops could be effected without weakening or reducing the strength of our combat forces. This confirms my prior convictions. Considering the large additional number of troops which have been engaged in the same or similar types of support activities, I believe that a substantial larger number can be recalled in the future. The sooner we do this and the sooner these troops are moved into combat or direct combat support billets, the greater will be our state of preparedness.

I state again, as I did on May 4., that I do not advocate that we shirk any of our obligations or commitments to our NATO allies. I merely recommend that we find a better and more economical way to do the job and that, in the interests of economy of both money and manpower, we take every available step to insure that military manpower is released from support, supply, and logistic functions which can properly and appropriately be performed by civilian personnel. In commending the Department of Defense for the first steps which it has taken in connection with this problem, I again urge that the Secretary of Defense continue to give it the high and urgent priority which its importance demands and merits.

I am confident that 40,000 troops, as originally mentioned, or perhaps even more, can be taken out of Western Europe without in the slightest degree impairing or weakening in any manner the military striking power of our forces or of forces allied with ours.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

An additional bill and joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3498. A bill to authorize the striking of certain medals at the U.S. Mint at Philadelphia for outstanding civilian achievement; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S.J. Res. 209. Joint resolution to temporarily suspend the equal opportunities requirement of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

SUSPENSION OF THE EQUAL TIME PROVISION OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution relating to section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934.

The joint resolution would do three things:

First, it would suspend the equal opportunity or equal time requirement of the Communications Act for the 1964 presidential and vice presidential campaign.

Second, it would suspend the equal time requirement for the 1962 congressional and gubernatorial campaigns.

Third, it would direct the Federal Communications Commission to study the effect of the suspension on the 1962 and 1964 campaigns, the advisability of suspending or repealing or modifying the equal time requirement for future campaigns, and the need for establishing standards with respect to any change in section 315.

Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to briefly describe the purpose of this joint resolution. It seems to me there is no question that section 315 has created difficulties for television and radio broadcasters in making adequate time available to major candidates for public office, which has made it difficult for broadcasters to adequately cover the issues and candidates during election campaigns. The broadcaster faces the problem of being forced by law to devote substantial amounts of expensive time to all manner of fringe candidates if he gives time to the major candidates. Thus a broadcaster cannot be blamed for giving little or no free time to anyone. This surely does not advance the cause of public enlightenment and the democratic process.

In 1959 section 315 was amended to exclude news broadcasts, news interviews, and documentaries from the equal time provision and in 1960 the provision was suspended for the presidential campaign. I believe the evidence indicates that the public gained considerably from those actions, and that the broadcasters by and large used their new discretion fairly and with good judgment.

Nevertheless, since the communications media occupies such an essential role in today's election process, I believe it is extremely important that Congress act with caution and restraint in its consideration of section 315, and only after careful study of the actual effects of any modification.

I think it would be unwise to repeal section 315 once and for all, without very careful consideration of the long-range implications, and without careful consideration of the questions and problems that might arise from such action.

For example, by repealing section 315 we would hope it would result in greater coverage of political campaigns and the allocation of more time to major candidates, but we do not know that this would necessarily or always be the case. We do not really know that it is section 315 which has created the inadequate coverage or whether economic or other factors are involved. Furthermore, I doubt we can generalize at this time from the experience of the 1960 presidential campaign coverage to congressional and other campaigns for public office. A presidential election is without question a "great show" which has wide appeal to viewers and listeners. Who would not want to cover an event like that? But can we be sure that substantial amounts of additional time would be devoted to congressional and gubernatorial elections if section 315 did not stand in the way? This is but one question that arises.

We would hope that broadcasters would be able to distinguish wisely between major candidates and the obviously marginal and fringe candidates, but we do not know with certainty that this would be the case. And we do not at present have any guidelines on this question.

With respect to the major candidates themselves, we would hope that, having granted the repeal, broadcasters would always treat the candidates with fairness and impartiality as they are now required by law to do, but we do not know that this would forever be true.

I mention these uncertainties, Mr. President, because I believe that section 315 provides some very important safeguards which go to the root of the election process in the electronic age of today.

As a general principle, I think suspension of section 315 as the need arises, rather than outright repeal, would be the wiser course. It would have the advantage of compelling periodic review and analysis of how well the suspension is working out in actuality.

Second, it seems to me that, at the beginning especially, it is most important to proceed on an experimental basis, and provide a mechanism for evaluating the practical and philosophical implications involved in any modification of section 315, and for studying what guidelines or codes of conduct may be necessary for the future.

The joint resolution I have introduced would suspend the equal time requirement for the 1964 presidential campaign, as the President has recommended.

In addition, it would suspend the requirement for the 1962 congressional and gubernatorial campaigns, and direct the FCC to study the effect of that suspension and the advisability of extending it in the future.

The Commission would have the benefit of using the 1962 congressional and gubernatorial campaigns as a test tube in which to explore some the questions I earlier raised.

The joint resolution would require the Commission to report its findings and recommendations to the Congress by December 31, 1963, with respect to the 1962 congressional and gubernatorial campaigns, so that Congress would have time to consider the findings and take whatever action may be appropriate in time for the 1964 election campaigns. The Commission would also be able to study what guidelines may be necessary in the event it believed continued suspension or repeal or modification of section 315 to be desirable.

Thus, Mr. President, I think Congress would be in a much better position to take action which would both enable broadcasters to serve the public more adequately in election campaigns and also protect the rights of all genuine candidates for public office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 209) to temporarily suspend the equal opportunities requirement of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PUBLIC WELFARE AMENDMENTS OF 1962—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CARROLL submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendments submitted by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators) to the bill (H.R. 10606) to extend and improve the public assistance and child welfare services programs of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

GENERAL UNIVERSITY EXTENSION EDUCATION ACT OF 1962—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 27, 1962, the names of Senators BOGGS, CARLSON, FULBRIGHT, HART, HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, LONG of Missouri, MCGEE, PELL, PROXMIRE, WILEY, YARBOROUGH, MCCARTHY, NEUBERGER, and SMITH of Massachusetts, were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3477) to promote the security and welfare of the people of the United States by providing for a program to assist the several States in further developing their programs of general university extension education, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators) on June 27, 1962.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 2, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1969. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, to provide for supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes; and

S. 3062. An act to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage under certain conditions.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 3, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate, July 2, 1962:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Frank E. Smith, of Mississippi, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the

Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring May 18, 1963, vice Herbert Davis Vogel, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 2, 1962:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

William H. Orrick, Jr., of California, to be Deputy Under Secretary of State.

AMBASSADORS

Charles Edward Rhetts, of Indiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia.

William M. Rountree, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Sudan.

Leonard Unger, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 1 to the class indicated:

To be career ministers

Samuel D. Berger, of New York.
Edmund A. Gullion, of Kentucky.
Martin J. Hillenbrand, of Illinois.
John D. Jernegan, of California.
Thomas C. Mann, of Texas.
Robert McClintock, of California.
Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., of Virginia.
Joseph Palmer 2d, of California.
G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California.
William M. Rountree, of Maryland.
Roy Richard Rubottom, Jr., of Texas.
John W. Tuthill, of Illinois.
William R. Tyler, of the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 2, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. J. Hodge Alves, rector, the Falls Church, of Falls Church, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, loving and holy Father, who has made all men and all things. We acknowledge our dependence upon Thee. We thank Thee for this good land in which we live; and for all its freedoms. Make us wise and loyal enough to preserve them. Make us humble and gracious enough to share them. Bless us, our Nation, and these sons of our Nation who serve before Thee in this House. Make them conscious of the glorious responsibility and opportunity that is theirs. Guide them this day and every day; and grant that they may ever look unto Thee and find strength. Keep them in remembrance of that noble band who, 186 years ago, "risked their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honors" for this dream that has become America. May we ever look unto Him whom our forefathers revered, Jesus, who maketh us to recognize the eternal worth of every man. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 30, 1962, was read and approved.

MEXICO'S STAKE IN AMERICA

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is an American citizen from ocean to ocean and border to border who is not personally experiencing a warm glow of pride and gratification at the tumultuous reception given our President and the First Lady by our neighbors, the people of Mexico.

Certainly, the cordiality of this reception and the evidence of public good will are a reflection of the kind of friendship and good neighborliness which should exist. I am sure, this feeling is fully reciprocated by the people of the United States.

Certainly, as President Kennedy pointed out, there is a revolution going on today against poverty. I only hope our neighbors to the south understand that in fomenting this revolution against poverty through foreign aid the United States has been undermining our financial strength. I hope other nations and we ourselves appreciate what a stake the world has in America and the stability and soundness of the American dollar and our financial strength.

Mr. Speaker, if the Alliance for Progress is to succeed—and I certainly hope it will—our foreign assistance programs must be limited to areas such as Mexico where the seeds of prosperity will fall on fertile and friendly soil. We cannot spend ourselves into economic weakness and at the same time achieve prosperity of others. I would cut out all aid to the Communists and unfriendly nations and concentrate on friendly nations such as Mexico.

LAND-GRANT COLLEGE ACT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all remarks made today by various Members of the House regarding the anniversary of the Land-Grant College Act may be assembled at one point in the RECORD, in consecutive order. Furthermore, the suggestion was just made to me that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD in connection with the Land-Grant College Act.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I had a special order on this subject. Various Members asked me to yield to them on the subject, but in view of the request that my friend just made, I ask unanimous consent that my own remarks may follow those of the gentleman from Indiana and that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the same subject.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that his remarks should precede those of all of the rest of us, and I trust he will amend his request in that regard.

Mr. ALBERT. No, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have my remarks follow those of the gentleman from Indiana and that all others who desire to do so may extend their remarks following my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana withdraw his request?

Mr. HALLECK. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AVERY. In view of the colloquy that just took place between the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Oklahoma, just what position does that place those Members that have already been recognized in regard to the Land-Grant College Act?

The SPEAKER. In connection with the request of the gentleman from Indiana, concurred in by the gentleman from Oklahoma, they will all be carried in the RECORD together in chronological order.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the Speaker for that explanation.

FEDERAL INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR LOCAL INCOME TAX PAYMENTS

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the great difficulties being experienced by State and local units of government in obtaining the tax revenues needed by them to discharge their essential responsibilities. An increasing number of local units of government have turned or are turning to one form or another of income taxation in order to meet their needs. The harrassed local taxpayer is beset on every side by taxes of nearly every description. The price of civilization is high and getting higher.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code which would, at one and the same time, provide relief for the taxpayer and an improved opportunity for other units of government to seek tax sources so badly needed by them.

My bill, designated as H.R. 12388, would provide a credit against Federal income tax for State and local income taxes paid during the taxable year. If H.R. 12388 is enacted, the Federal tax liability of individual taxpayers would be reduced by the amount of any State or local income tax paid by them.

In order to protect Federal revenues and to avoid encouraging the enactment of unreasonably high State and local income tax levies, the maximum reduction permitted under my bill is 5 percent of the individual Federal income tax liability.